

Mr. W. L. Seal \$12.50

1400 N. E. Brook. 1968

Ch. 1000's Testament.

Moody Press [1968]

kansas city



public library

kansas city, missouri

Books will be issued only
on presentation of library card.

Please report lost cards and
change of residence promptly.

Card holders are responsible for
all books, records, films, pictures
or other library materials
checked out on their cards.



MAI AUG 29 1991

DATE DUE

MAI FEB 27 1976

JUN 30 1977

MAI MAY 17 1978

MAI JUN 9 1984

MAI AUG 23 1979

MAI FEB 27 1987

MAI FEB 17 1988

MAI SEP 03 1988

MAI SEP 26 1989

MAI MAY 25 1990

SEP 19 1991

MAI JAN 16 1993

MAI APR 27 1993

MAI JAN 27 1994

MAI NOV 06 1995

The
GREEK TESTAMENT

Volume IV
HEBREWS—REVELATION

The GREEK TESTAMENT

WITH A CRITICALLY REVISED TEXT, A DIGEST OF
VARIOUS READINGS, MARGINAL REFERENCES TO VERBAL AND
IDIOMATIC USAGE, PROLEGOMENA,
AND A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

by
HENRY ALFORD, D.D.

with revision by
EVERETT F. HARRISON, Th.D., Ph.D.

Volume IV
HEBREWS—REVELATION

MOODY PRESS
CHICAGO

CHAPTER V.

1 JOHN.

SECTION	PAGE
I. Its Authorship	159
II. For what Readers it was written	165
III. Its Relation to the Gospel of St. John	168
IV. Time and Place of Writing	169
V. Contents and Arrangement	170
VI. Language and Style	177
VII. Occasion and Object	180

CHAPTER VI.

2 & 3 JOHN.

I. Authorship	181
II. For what Readers written	184
III. Time and Place of Writing	187

CHAPTER VII.

JUDE.

I. Its Authorship	188
II. Authenticity	190
III. For what Readers and with what Object written	192
IV. Time and Place of Writing	193
V. On the Apocryphal Writings apparently referred to in this Epistle	194

CHAPTER VIII.

REVELATION.

I. Authorship and Canonicity	198
II. Place and Time of Writing	230
III. To whom addressed	236
IV. Object and Contents	241
V. Systems of Interpretation	245

CHAPTER IX.

APPARATUS CRITICUS.

I. Manuscripts referred to in this Volume	261
II. Ancient Versions referred to	279
III. Fathers and Ancient Writers cited in the Digest	281
IV. List and Specification of Editions of other Books quoted, referred to, or made use of in this Volume	284

PROLEGOMENA.

CHAPTER I.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE most proper motto to prefix to this section would be that saying of Origen (in Euseb. H. E. vi. 25)—

εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκίμειτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας¹ τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν.

2. For these latter words represent the state of our knowledge at this day. There is a certain amount of evidence, both external, from tradition, and internal, from approximation in some points to his acknowledged Epistles, which points to St. Paul as its author. But when we come to examine the former of these, it will be seen that the tradition gives way beneath us in point of authenticity and trustworthiness; and as we search into the latter, the points of similarity are overborne by a far greater number of indications of divergence, and of incompatibility, both in style and matter, with the hypothesis of the Pauline authorship.

3. There is one circumstance which, though this is the most notable instance of it, is not unfamiliar to the unbiassed conductor of enquiries into the difficulties of Holy Scripture; viz. that, in modern times at least, most has been taken for granted by those who knew least about the matter, and the strongest assertions always made by men who have

¹ On the sense of *γράφας*, see below, par. 21 and note.

never searched into, or have been unable to appreciate, the evidence. Genuine research has led in almost every instance, to a modified holding, or to an entire rejection, of the Pauline hypothesis.

4. It will be my purpose, in the following paragraphs, to deal (following the steps of many who have gone before me, and more especially of Bleek) with the various hypotheses in order, as to both their external and internal evidence. It will be impossible in citing the external evidence, to keep these hypotheses entirely distinct: that which is cited as against one will frequently be for another which is not under treatment, and must be referred back to on reaching that one.

5. As preliminary then to all such specific considerations, we will enquire first into the external and traditional ground, then into that which is internal, arising from the Epistle itself, of the supposition that ST. PAUL was the Author and Writer, or the Author without being the Writer, of the Epistle.

6. Some (e. g. Spanheim, Gerhard, Calov., Wittich, Carpzov, Bengel, Baumgarten, Semler, Storr, al., and more recently Mr. Forster, Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, pp. 625 ff.) think that they see an allusion to our Epistle in 2 Pet. iii. 15, 16. But to this there are several objections (see Bleek, *Einleitung*, § 21); among which the principal is, that no passages can be pointed out in our Epistle answering to the description there given. This point has not been much pressed, even by those who have raised it; being doubtless felt to be too insecure to build any safe conclusion upon².

7. The same may be said of the idea that our Epistle is alluded to by St. James, ch. ii. 24, 25. Hug (*Einleit.* 4th edn. pt. ii. pp. 442 f.), following Storr (*Opusc. Acad.* ii. p. 376, Bl.), supposes that the citation of Rahab as justified by works is directly polemical, and aimed at Heb. xi. 31. But as Bleek well remarks, even were we to concede the polemical character of the citation, why need Heb. xi. 31 be fixed on as its especial point of attack? Was it not more than probable, that the followers of St. Paul would have adduced this, among other examples, in their oral teaching?

8. We come then to the first undoubted allusions to the Epistle; which occur in the Ep. of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, dating before the conclusion of the first century. Clement is well acquainted with the Epistles of St. Paul: he quotes by name 1 Cor. (c. 47, p. 305, ed. Migne, see *Prolegg.* to Vol. II. ch. iii. § i. 2 a); he closely imitates Rom. i. 29—32 (c. 35, pp. 277 f.); he frequently alludes to other passages (see Lardner, *Credibility*, &c. vol. ii. pp. 34—39; some of whose instances are doubtful). But of no Epistle does he make such large and

² An exception to this is found in Mr. Forster's work, where he insists on this, as he does on all his arguments, in the strongest and most decided manner.

constant use, as of this to the Hebrews: cf. Lardner, *ib.* pp. 39—42³; and this is testified by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 38:—

ἐν ᾗ (i. e. the Ep. to the Cor.) τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίων πολλὰ νοήματα παραθεῖς, ἥδη δὲ καὶ αὐτολεξεῖ ῥητοῖς τισιν ἐξ αὐτῆς χρησάμενος, σαφέστατα παρίστησιν ὅτι μὴ νέον ὑπάρχει τὸ σύγγραμμα⁴:

and by Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl., vol. ii. p. 853:—

“Scripsit ex persona Romanæ Ecclesiæ ad Eccl. Corinthiorum valde utilem Epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur, quæ mihi videtur characteri Epistolæ quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Hebræos fertur, convenire. Sed et multis de eadem Epistola non solum sensibus sed juxta verborum quoque ordinem abutitur. Omnino grandis in utraque similitudo est.”

9. Now some have argued from this (e. g. Sykes, Cramer, Storr; not Hug, see his edn. 4, pt. ii. p. 411) that as Clement thus reproduces passages of this as well as of other Epistles confessedly canonical, he must have held this to be canonical, and if he, then the Roman church, in whose name he writes; and if canonical, then written by St. Paul, But Bleek well observes, that this whole argument is built on an unhistorical assumption respecting the Canon of the N. T., which was certainly not settled in Clement's time; and that, in fact, his use of this Epistle proves no more than that it was well known and exceedingly valued by him. It is a weighty testimony *for the Epistle*, but says nothing as to its Author⁵.

10. The first notices in any way touching the question of the authorship meet us after the middle of the second century. And it is remarkable enough, that from these notices we must gather, that at that early date there were the same various views respecting it, in the main, which now prevail; the same doubt whether St. Paul was the author, or some other Teacher of the apostolic age; and if some other, then what part St. Paul had, or whether any, in influencing his argument or dictating his matter.

11. The earliest of these testimonies is that of PANTÆNUS, the chief of the catechetical school in *Alexandria* about the middle of the second century. There is a passage preserved to us by Eusebius (H. E. vi. 14) from the Hypotyposes of Clement of Alexandria, in which the latter says—

ἥδη δέ, ὡς ὁ μακάριος ἔλεγε πρεσβύτερος, ἐπεὶ ὁ κύριος ἀπόστολος ὦν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος ὡς ὦν τὰ εἰς ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον διὰ

³ Bleek, Einl. p. 92 note: and Stuart, *Introd.* § 12.

⁴ Stuart however is quite in error in supposing *συνεπιμαρτυροῦσης τῆς γραφῆς*, c. 23, p. 260, to apply to our Epistle. Those words are used of O. T. passages, which he, as well as our Epistle, quotes verbatim from the LXX. See Tholuck, *Hebr. edn.* 3, p. 2, note.

⁵ See this, and the inference from it, treated more fully below, § vi. 2.

Again, in his Ep. to Africanus, c. 9, vol. i. p. 19, in the course of removing the doubt of his friend as to the authenticity of the history of Susanna, he mentions the traditional death of Isaiah, which he says is ὑπὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς μαρτυρούμενα, ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν φανερῶν (canonical) βιβλίων γεγραμμένα (meaning, not that the Epistle was not one of these books, but that the account of Isaiah's martyrdom is not in any canonical book of the O. T.). Then he adds—

ἀλλ' εἰκὸς τινα θλιβόμενον ἀπὸ τῆς εἰς ταῦτα ἀποδείξεως συγχρησάσθαι τῷ βουλήματι τῶν ἀθετούντων τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς οὐ Παύλῳ γεγραμμένην· πρὸς δὲ ἄλλων λόγων κατ' ἰδίαν χρῆζομεν εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ εἶναι Παύλου τὴν ἐπιστολὴν.

It would have been of some interest to know who these *τινες* were, and whether their ἀθέτησις arose from the absence of ancient tradition as to the Pauline authorship, or from critical conclusions of their own, arrived at from study of the Epistle itself. But of this Origen says nothing.

19. The principal testimony of his own is contained in two fragments of his lost Homilies on this Epistle, preserved by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25 :—

περὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς ἐν ταῖς εἰς αὐτὴν ὁμιλίαις ταῦτα διαλαμβάνει·

“ὅτι ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει, ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς δὲ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνει φράσεων διαφορὰς ὁμολογῆσαι ἂν. πάλιν τε αὖ ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων, καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφέσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ.”

τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων·

“ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἶποιμ' ἂν ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὥσπερ εἰ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. εἰ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι. τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπὸ τινων μὲν λεγόντων ὅτι Κλήμης ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν, ὑπὸ τινων δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις.”

We learn from these remarkable fragments several interesting particulars : among which may be mentioned—

First, Origen's own opinion as to the Epistle, deduced from grounds Ἑβραίους ὅτῳ γεγραμμένος (Heb. xi. 37)· τὸ γὰρ ἐπίστησαν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐαν ἀναφέρεται.

which he regards as being clear to all who are on the one hand accustomed to judge of style, and, on the other, versed in the apostolic writings; viz. that its Author in its present form is not St. Paul, but some one who has embodied in his own style and form the thoughts of that Apostle. One thing however he leaves in uncertainty; whether we are to regard such disciple of St. Paul, or the Apostle himself, as speaking in the first person throughout the Epistle.

20. Secondly, *the fact that some churches, or church, regarded the Epistle as the work of St. Paul.* But here again the expression is somewhat vague. The εἰ τις ἐκκλησία may be an uncertain indication of several churches, or it may be a pointed allusion to one. If the latter, which from αὕτη following is the more probable, the church would probably be the Alexandrian, by what we have already seen of the testimonies of Pantænus and Clement. The words αὕτη εὐδοκμεῖτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ must be taken as meaning, "I have no wish to deprive it of this its peculiar advantage:" and the ground, οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι, must be, his own conviction, that the νοήματα of the Epistle proceeded originally from the Apostle. Who the ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες were, it is impossible for us to say. Possibly, if we confine our view to one church, no more than Pantænus and Clement, and their disciples. One thing is very plain; that they cannot have been men whose παράδοσις satisfied Origen himself, or he would not have spoken as he has. Be they who they might, one thing is plain; that their παράδοσις is spoken of by him as οὐκ εἰκὴ, not as resting on external matter of fact, but as finding justification in the internal character of the Epistle; and that it did not extend to the fact of St. Paul having written the Epistle, but only to its being, in some sense, his.

21. Thirdly, *that the authorship of the Epistle was regarded by Origen as utterly unknown.* Thus only can we interpret the words, τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ ἀληθὲς θεὸς οἶδεν. For that it is in vain to attempt to understand the word ὁ γράψας of the mere scribe, in the sense of Rom. xvi. 22 (as Olshausen and Delitzsch), is shewn by its use in the same sentence, Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις⁸.

⁸ The answer given to this decisive objection by Delitzsch (Introd. p. xvii) is, in fact, incorrect. He says, "It is in vain to adduce ὁ γράψας τ. εὐαγ. κ. τ. πράξ., for there also Luke was working up material not his own, but ready to his hands." But even granting this, which is not all true, e.g. of Acts xx.—end, and some other portions, it does not shew that the word is used in an emphatic sense of 'compiler,' but only in its common sense of 'writer,' any peculiar circumstances of writing not being in consideration. Moreover there is here another consideration. The sentence in which these words occur is not subordinate to the former one, in which he expressed his own conjecture that some one had written down the thoughts of the Apostle: but by the οὖν which begins it is co-ordinated with that previous sentence, and resumes again the whole subject.

22. This passage further testifies respecting *external tradition*, as it had come down to Origen himself. He speaks of ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία: clearly meaning these words of *historical tradition*, and thereby by implication excluding from that category the *παράδοσις* of the Pauline authorship. And this historical tradition gave two views: one that Clement of Rome was the Writer; the other, that St. Luke was the Writer.

23. And this last circumstance is of importance, as being our only clue out of a difficulty which Bleek has felt, but has not attempted to remove. We find ourselves otherwise in this ambiguity with regard to the origin of one or the other hypothesis. If the Pauline authorship was the original historical tradition, the difficulties presented by the Epistle itself were sure to have called it in doubt, and suggested the other: if on the other hand the name of any disciple of St. Paul was delivered down by historical tradition as the writer, the apostolicity and Pauline character of the thoughts, coupled with the desire to find a great name for an anonymous Epistle, was sure to have produced, and when produced would easily find acceptance for, the idea that St. Paul was the author. But the fact that Origen speaks of ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, not as *for*, but as *against* the Pauline hypothesis, seems to shew that the former of these alternatives was really the case.

24. As far then as we have at present advanced, we seem to have gathered the following as the probable result, as to the practice and state of opinion in the Alexandrine church:—

(a) That it was customary to speak of and quote from the Epistle as the work of St. Paul.

(b) That this was done by writers of discernment, and familiarity with the apostolic writings, not because they thought the style and actual writing to be St. Paul's, but as seeing that from the nature of the thoughts and matter, the Epistle was worthy of and characteristic of that Apostle; thus feeling that it was not without reason that those before them had delivered the Epistle down to them as St. Paul's.

(c) That we no where find trace of historical tradition asserting the Pauline authorship: but on the contrary, we find it expressly quoted on the other side⁹.

25. We now pass to other portions of the church: and next, to *pro-consular Africa*. Here we find, in the beginning of the third century, the testimony of TERTULLIAN, expressly ascribing the Epistle to Barnabas. The passage occurs De Pudicitia, c. 20, vol. ii. p. 102, where, when he has shewn from the writings of the Apostles themselves the necessity "de ecclesia eradicandi omne sacrilegium pudicitiae sine ulla restitutionis mentione," he proceeds—

⁹ On the phenomenon of the *diversity* of traditions, see below, par. 36 ff.

“Volo tamen ex redundantia alicujus etiam comitis Apostolorum testimonium superinducere, idoneum confirmandi de proximo jure disciplinam magistrorum. Extat enim et Barnabæ titulus ad Hebræos, adeo satis auctoritatis viri, ut quem Paulus juxta se constituerit in abstinentiæ tenore (1 Cor. ix. 6). Et utique receptior apud ecclesias Epistola Barnabæ illo apocrypho pastore mœchorum (the Pastor of Hermas). Monens itaque discipulos, ‘omissis omnibus initiis’ &c. (citing Heb. vi. 4—8). Hoc qui ab Apostolis didicit et cum Apostolis docuit, nunquam mœcho et fornicatori secundam pœnitentiam promissam ab Apostolis norat.”

26. From the way in which the Epistle is here simply cited as the work of Barnabas, we clearly see that this was no mere opinion of Tertullian's own, but at all events the accepted view of that portion of the church. He does not hint at any doubt on the matter. But here again we are at a loss, from what source to derive this view. Either, supposing Barnabas really the author, genuine historical tradition may have been its source,—or lacking such tradition, some in the African church may originally have inferred this from the nature of the contents of the Epistle; and the view may subsequently have become general there. One thing however the testimony shews beyond all doubt: that the idea of a Pauline authorship was wholly unknown to Tertullian, and to those for whom he wrote.

27. If it were necessary further to confirm evidence so decisive, we might do so by citing his charge against Marcion, of falsifying the number of the Epistles of St. Paul (Adver. Marc. v. 21, vol. ii. p. 524):—

“Miror tamen, quum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quod ad Timotheum duas et unam ad Titum, de ecclesiastico statu compositas, recusaverit. Affectavit, opinor, etiam numerum Epistolarum interpolare.”

Now seeing that Marcion held *ten* Epistles only of St. Paul, it would appear by combining this with the former testimony, that the Epistle to the Hebrews was not here reckoned among them.

28. Among the witnesses belonging to the end of the second and beginning of the third century, none is of more weight than IRENÆUS, a Greek of Asia Minor by birth, and Bishop of Lyons in Gaul, and thus representing the testimony of the church in both countries. In his great work against Heresies, he makes frequent use of the Epistles of St. Paul, expressly quoting twelve of them. There is no citation from the Epistle to Philemon, which may well be from its brevity, and its personal character. But no where in this work has he cited or referred to the Epistle to the Hebrews at all, although it would have been exceedingly apposite for his purpose, as against the Gnostics of his time. Eusebius, H. E. v. 26, says—

καὶ (φέρεται Εἰρηναίου) βιβλίον τι διαλέξεων διαφόρων (called by Jerome (Catalog. Script. Eccles., vol. ii. p. 873), “liber variorum tractatum”), ἐν ᾧ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς καὶ τῆς λεγομένης Σοφίας Σολομῶντος μνημονεύει, ῥητά τινα ἐξ αὐτῶν παραθέμενος.

From this it would seem that Eusebius was unable to find any citations of the Epistle in other works of Irenæus known to him. And he does not even here say that Irenæus mentioned St. Paul as the author of the Epistle.

29. Indeed we have a testimony which goes to assert that this Father distinctly denied the Pauline authorship. Photius (Bibl. Cod. 232, vol. iii. (Migne) p. 291 *b*) cites a passage from Stephen Gobar, a tritheist of the sixth century, in which he says ὅτι Ἰππόλυτος καὶ Εἰρηναῖος τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου οὐκ ἐκείνου εἶναι φασιν. The same is indeed asserted of Hippolytus by Photius himself (Cod. 121, p. 94 *a* : λέγει δὲ ἄλλα τέ τινα τῆς ἀκριβείας λειπόμενα, καὶ ὅτι ἡ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴ οὐκ ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀποστόλου Παύλου) : but it is strange, if Irenæus had asserted it, that Eusebius should have made no mention of the fact, adducing as he does the citation of the Epistle by him. At the same time, Gobar's language is far too precise to be referred to the mere fact that Irenæus does not cite the Epistle as St. Paul's, as some have endeavoured to refer it¹ : and it is to be remembered, that Eusebius does not pretend to have read or seen all the works of Irenæus then extant ; his words are (H. E. v. 25), καὶ τὰ μὲν εἰς ἡμετέραν ἐλθόντα γινώσκω τῶν Εἰρηναίου τοσαῦτα. Bleek puts the alternative well, according as we accept, or do not accept, the assertion of Gobar. If we accept it, it would shew that Irenæus had found some where prevalent the idea that St. Paul was the author ; otherwise he would not have taken the pains to contradict such an idea. If we do not accept it as any more than a negative report, meaning that Irenæus no where cites the Epistle as St. Paul's, then at all events, considering that he constantly cites St. Paul's Epistles as his, we shall have the presumption, that he neither accepted, nor knew of, any such idea as the Pauline authorship².

30. If we now pass to the church of Rome, we find, belonging to the period of which we have been treating, the testimony of the presbyter CAIUS. Of him Eusebius relates (H. E. vi. 20)-

ἦλθε δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς καὶ Γάϊον, λογιωτάτου ἀνδρός, διάλογος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ Ζεφυρίνον πρὸς Πρόκλον, τῆς κατὰ Φρύγας αἵρέσεως (Mon-

¹ e. g. Storr, § 11 ff.

² On the spuriousness of the celebrated fragment in which Irenæus is supposed to cite Heb. xiii. 15 as St. Paul's, see Bleek, note, Ap. 118. If it be genuine, then it must be from some work of Irenæus unknown alike to Eusebius and Gobar. The fragment will be found p. 1253, ed. Migne, and with Pfaff's very copious notes, in Stieren's Irenæus, i. pp. 854-887 ; and the whole controversy respecting it is reprinted, for any one who has leisure to read it, in Stieren, vol. ii. pp. 361-528.

tanism) ὑπερμαχοῦντα, κεκινημένους, ἐν ᾧ τῶν δι' ἐναντίας τὴν περὶ τὸ συντάττειν καινὰς γραφὰς προπέτειάν τε καὶ τόλμαν ἐπιστομίζων, τῶν τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἀποστόλου δεκατριῶν μόνον ἐπιστολῶν μνημονεύει, τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ εἰς δεῦρο παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν οὐ νομίζεται τοῦ ἀποστόλου τυγχάνειν³.

These words, μὴ συναριθμήσας ταῖς λοιπαῖς, can lead only to one of two inferences : that Caius, not numbering the Epistle among those of St. Paul, either placed it by itself, or did not mention it at all. In either case, he must be regarded as speaking, not his own private judgment merely, but that of the church to which he belonged, in which, as we further learn, the same judgment yet lingered more than a century after.

31. Another testimony is that of the fragment respecting the canon of the N. T. first published by Muratori, and known by his name, generally ascribed to the end of the second or the beginning of the third century (Routh, Reliq. Sacr. i. pp. 394 ff.). In this fragment it is stated, that St. Paul wrote Epistles to seven churches ; and his thirteen Epistles are enumerated, in a peculiar order : but that to the Hebrews is not named, unless it be intended by the second mentioned in the following sentence : “Fertur etiam ad Laudecenses, alia ad Alexandrinos Pauli nomine ficta ad hæresem Marcionis : et alia plura quæ in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest : fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.” But this is very improbable : though some have imagined an allusion in the last clause to the Vatican LXX text of the passage cited Heb. xii. 15.

32. As far then as we have advanced, the following seems to be our result. *No where, except in the Alexandrine church, does there seem to have existed any idea that the Epistle was St. Paul's.* Throughout the whole Western church, it is either left unenumerated among his writings, or expressly excluded from them. That it is wholly futile to attempt, as Hug and Storr have done, to refer this to any influence of the Montanist or Marcionite disputes, has been well and simply shewn by Bleek. The idea of the catholic teachers of the whole Western church disparaging and excluding an apostolical book, because one passage of it (ch. vi. 4—6) seemed to favour the tenets of their adversaries, is too preposterous ever to have been suggested, except in the interests of a desperate cause : and the fact that Tertullian, himself a Montanist, cites Heb. vi. 4—6 on his side, but without ascribing it to St. Paul, is decisive against the notion that his adversaries so ascribed

³ Jerome, in his Catal. Script. Eccl. 59, vol. ii. p. 899, and Photius, Bibl. Cod. 48, p. 12 a, repeat this testimony, but, as Bleek has remarked, they both have evidently taken it from Eusebius. If so, the stronger language of Jerome, “decimam quartam, quæ fertur ad Hebræos, ejus non esse,” is only his own interpretation of the words of Eusebius, and is not to be taken in evidence.

it at any time : for he would have been sure in that case to have charged them with their desertion of such an opinion⁴.

33. And even in the Alexandrine church itself, as we have seen, there is no reliable trace of a historical tradition of the Pauline authorship. Every expression which seems to imply this, such e. g. as that much-adduced one of Origen, οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες παραδεδώκασι, when fairly examined, gives way under us. The traditional account (ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία), though inconsistent with itself, was entirely the other way⁵.

34. The fair account then of opinion in the latter end of the second century seems to be this : that *there was then, as now, great uncertainty regarding the authorship of our Epistle* ; that the general cast of the thoughts was recognized as Pauline, and that οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες, whatever that may imply, had not unreasonably (οὐκ εἰκὴ) handed it down as St. Paul's : but on what grounds, we are totally unable to say : for ecclesiastical tradition does not bear them out. In proconsular Africa it was ascribed to Barnabas : by the tradition which had come down to Origen and his fellows, to Luke or Clement ; while the Western church, even when represented by Irenæus, who was brought up in Asia, and even including the church of Rome the capital of the world, where all reports on such matters were sure to be ventilated, seems to have been altogether without any positive tradition or opinion on the matter.

35. Before advancing with the history, which has now become of secondary importance to us, I will state to what, in my own view, this result points, as regarding the formation of our own conclusion on the matter.

36. It simply leaves us, unfettered by any overpowering judgment of antiquity, to examine the Epistle for ourselves, and form our own opinion from its contents. Even were we to admit the opinion of a Pauline authorship to the rank of an early tradition, which it does not appear in the strict sense to have been, we should then have ancient ecclesiastical tradition broken into various lines, and inconsistent with itself : not requiring our assent to one or other of its numerous variations. Those who are prepared to follow it, and it alone, will have to make up their minds whether they will attach themselves to the catechetical school of

⁴ Hug supposes that Tertullian does not mention its being St. Paul's, because he wishes to argue with the Catholics 'ex concessio.' This is a curious specimen of the lengths of subtlety to which controversy will carry an ingenious mind.

⁵ It is curious to see how such writers as Stuart can treat plain Greek to serve their purpose : "He does not say that either ἱστορία παλαιά, or παράδοσις παλαιά, brings down this report : but simply ἡ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία, i. e. *report has come to us ; or it is reported ; there is a report* (ἡ) ; *report says*—that either Luke or Clemens wrote it."

Alexandria, and if so, whether to that portion of it (if such portion existed, which is not proved) which regarded the Epistle as purely and simply the work of St. Paul, or to that which, with Clement, regarded the present Epistle as a Greek version by St. Luke of a Hebrew original by St. Paul,—or to the West African church, which regarded it as written by Barnabas; or to the *ιστορία* mentioned by Origen, in its Clementine or its Lucan branch; or to the negative view of the churches of Europe.

37. For to one or other of these courses, and on these grounds, would the intelligent follower of tradition be confined. It would be in vain for him to allege, as a motive for his opinion, the *subsequent* universal prevalence of one or other of these views, unless he could at the same time shew that that prevalence was owing to the overpowering force of an authentic tradition, some where or other existing. That the whole church of Rome believed the Pauline authorship in subsequent centuries, would be no compensation for the total absence of such belief at that time when, if there were any such authentic tradition any where, it must have prevailed in that church. That the same was uniformly asserted and acted on by the writers of the Alexandrine church in later ages, does not tend to throw any light on the vague uncertainty which hangs over the first appearances of the opinion, wherever it is spoken of and its grounds alleged by such earlier teachers as Clement and Origen.

38. And these considerations are much strengthened, when we take into account what strong reasons there were why the opinion of the Pauline authorship, when once advanced by men of authority in teaching, should gain general acceptance. We see this tendency already prevailing in the writings of Clement of Alexandria and Origen; who, notwithstanding the sentences which have been quoted from them, yet throughout their writings acquiesce for the most part in a conventional habit of citing the Epistle as the work of St. Paul. And as time passed on, a belief which so conveniently set at rest all doubts about an important anonymous canonical writing, spread (and all the more as the character of the times became less and less critical and enquiring) over the whole extent of the church.

39. It will be well to interpose two cautions, especially for young students. It has been very much the practice with the maintainers of the Pauline authorship to deal largely in sweeping assertions regarding early ecclesiastical tradition. They have not unfrequently alleged on their side the habit of citation of Clement and Origen, as shewing their belief respecting the Epistle, uncorrected by those passages which shew what that belief really was. Let not students then be borne away by these strong assertions, but let them carefully and intelligently examine for themselves.

40. Our second caution is one regarding the intelligent use of ancient testimony. Hitherto, we have been endeavouring to trace up to their first origin the beliefs respecting the Epistle. Whence did they first arise? Where do we find them prevailing in the earliest times, and there, why? Now this is the only method of enquiry on the subject which is or can be decisive, as far as external evidence is concerned. In following down the stream of time, materials for this enquiry soon fail us. And it has been the practice of some of the fautors of the Pauline authorship, to amass long 'catenæ' of names and testimonies, from later ages, of men who simply *swelled the ranks of conformity to the opinion when it once became prevalent*. Let students distrust all such accumulations as evidence. They are valuable as shewing the growth and prevalence of the opinion, but in no other light. No accretions to the river in its course can alter the situation and character of the fountain-head.

41. We proceed now with the history of opinion, which, as before remarked, is become very much the history of the spread of the belief of a Pauline authorship.

At *Alexandria*, as we might have expected, the conventional habit of quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's gradually prevailed over critical suspicion and early tradition.

42. DIONYSIUS, president of the catechetical school, and afterwards Bishop of Alexandria, in the middle of the third century, cites Heb. x. 34^e expressly as the words of St. Paul. PETER, bishop (cir. 300), who suffered under Diocletian, cites Heb. xi. 32 as St. Paul's (τοῦ ἀποστόλου⁷).

HIERAX or Hieracas, of Leontopolis, who lived about the same time, and who, although the founder of a heresy, appears not to have severed himself from the church, is repeatedly adduced by Epiphanius as citing the Epistle as τοῦ ἀποστόλου: and the same Epiphanius says of the Melchisedekites (see on ch. vii. 3), that they attempted to support their view ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους τοῦ Παύλου ἐπιστολῆς.

ALEXANDER, bishop cir. 312, in Theodoret, H. E. i. 5, says in an Epistle to Alexander, Bishop of Constantinople—

σύμφωνα γοῦν τούτοις βοᾷ καὶ ὁ μεγαλοφρονάτος Παῦλος, φάσκων περὶ αὐτοῦ "Ὅν ἔθηκε κληρονόμον πάντων, δι' οὗ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν.

ANTONIUS, the celebrated promoter of the monastic life in Egypt, in one of his seven epistles to various monasteries⁸, which remain to us in a Latin version, says—

⁶ In his Epistle to Fabius, Bp. of Antioch (Eus. H. E. vi. 41), ἐξέκλινον δὲ καὶ ὑπανεχάρουν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ κ. τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὁμοίως ἐκείνοις οἷς κ. Παῦλος ἐμαρτύρησε μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξαντο.

⁷ Routh, Reliq. Sacr. iv. p. 34, ὡς λέγει ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἐπιλίποι δ' ἂν ἡμᾶς διηγούμενος ὁ χρόνος.

⁸ See Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl. 88, vol. ii. p. 925.

“De quibus Paulus ait, Quia non perceperunt repromissiones propter nos (Heb. xi. 13, 39, 40).”

43. But the most weighty witness for the view of the Alexandrine church at this time is **ATHANASIUS**, in the middle of the fourth century. In his *Epistola Festalis*, vol. ii. p. 767, he enumerates τὰ κανονιζόμενα κ. παραδοθέντα πιστευθέντα τε θεῖα εἶναι βιβλία, among which he names fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, and among them our Epistle, without alluding to any doubt on the subject. And in his other writings passim he cites the Epistle as St. Paul's (see many examples in Bleek, p. 136).

44. Belonging to nearly the same time in the same church are the anonymous **SYNOPSIS Sacræ Scripturæ**,—**ORSIUS** or **Oriesis**, whose *Doctrina de Institutione Monachorum* remains in a Latin version by Jerome,—**MARCUS DIADOCHUS**, whose discourse against the Arians we still possess,—in all of which the Epistle is either expressly or implicitly cited as the work of St. Paul.

45. It would be to little purpose to multiply names, in a church which by this time had universally and undoubtingly received the Pauline authorship. Bleek has adduced with copious citations, **DIDYMUS** (the teacher of Jerome and Rufinus),—**MARCUS EREMITA** (cir. 400),—**THEOPHILUS** of **ALEXANDRIA** (cir. 400),—**ISIDORE** of **PELUSIUM** (+450),—**CYRIL** of **ALEXANDRIA** (+444): concerning which last it is to be observed, that though Nestorius had adduced passages from the Epistle on his side, as being St. Paul's, Cyril, in refuting them, does not make the slightest reference to the formerly existing doubt as to the authorship.

46. And so it continued in this church in subsequent times: the only remarkable exception being found in **EUTHALIUS** (cir. 460), who, though he regards the Epistle as of Pauline origin, and reckons fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, yet adduces the old doubts concerning it, and believes it to be a translation made by Clement of Rome from a Hebrew original by the Apostle. The passage, which is a very interesting one, will be found in Migne's *Patr. Gr.* vol. 85, p. 776, and is cited at length by Bleek. I give an abridgment of it:—

ἡ δὲ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπ. δοκεῖ μὲν οὐκ εἶναι Παύλου διὰ τε τὸν χαρακτῆρα, κ. τὸ μὴ προγράφειν, ὡς ἐν ἀπίσταις ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς, καὶ τὸ λέγειν (ch. ii. 3, 4) . . . τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἡλλάχθαι τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐπ., φανερὰ ἡ αἰτία· πρὸς γὰρ Ἑβραίους τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ γραφείσα ὥστερον μεθερμηνευθῆναι λέγεται, ὡς μὲν τινες, ὑπὸ Λουκᾶ, ὡς δὲ οἱ πολλοί, ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος· τοῦ γὰρ καὶ σώζει τὸν χαρακτῆρα.

Then he gives the usual reason for the want of a superscription, viz. that St. Paul was not the Apostle of the Jews, but of the Gentiles, citing Gal. ii. 9, 10: and proceeds, μαρτυρεῖται δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἡ ἐπιστολὴ εἶναι Παύλου, τῷ γράφειν—ch. x. 34, in which the reading τοῖς

δεσμοῖς μου is his point: καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν—ch. xiii. 18, 19: καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λέγειν—ch. xiii. 23, in which he interprets ἀπολελυμένον, *sent forth eis diakonían*, which he says no one could do but St. Paul: and then, τοῦτον τάχιον προσδοκῶν, τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ἔθος πολλαχοῦ, σὺν αὐτῷ παρουσίαν ἐπαγγέλλεται.

This testimony is valuable, as shewing that in the midst of the prevalence of the now accepted opinion, a spirit of intelligent criticism still survived.

47. If we now turn to *other parts of the Eastern church*, we find the same acceptation of the Pauline authorship from the middle of the third century onwards. Bleek gives citations from METHODIUS, Bishop of Olympus in Lycia, cir. 290 (which seem to me more decisive as to recognition of the Epistle than he thinks them): from PAUL of SAMOSATA, Bishop of Antioch in 264: from JACOB, Bishop of NISIBIS, cir. 325: from EPHREM SYRUS (+378).

48. A separate notice is required of the testimony of EUSEBIUS of Cæsarea, the well-known church historian. In very many passages throughout his works, and more especially in his commentary on the Psalms, he cites the Epistle, and always as the work of St. Paul, or of ὁ ἀπόστολος, or ὁ ἅγιος ἀπ., or ὁ θεὸς ἀπ. In his Eccl. History also he reckons it among the Epistles of St. Paul; e. g. H. E. ii. 17, διηγήσεις . . . τῶν πάλαι προφητῶν ἐρμηνευτικάς, ὁποίας ἢ τε πρὸς Ἑβραίους καὶ ἄλλαι πλείους τοῦ Παύλου περιέχουσιν ἐπιστολαί. In the chapter (iii. 25) which treats especially of the canon of the N. T., while there is no express mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is evident, by comparing his words there and in another place, that he reckons it as confessedly one of the writings of St. Paul. For there he says, speaking of those N. T. books which are ὁμολογούμενα, "*received by all*"—

καὶ δὲ τακτέον ἐν πρώτοις τὴν ἁγίαν τῶν εὐαγγελίων τετρακτύν· οἷς ἔπεται ἡ τῶν πράξεων τῶν ἀποστόλων γραφή· μετὰ δὲ ταύτην τὰς Παύλου καταλεκτέον γραφὰς κ.τ.λ.

And in iii. 3, τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες.

Still it would appear that Eusebius himself believed the Epistle to have been written in Hebrew by St. Paul and translated. In H. E. iii. 38, a passage part of which has been above cited (par. 8), he says—

Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης ἐγγραφῶς ὠμυληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλήμεντα τοῦτον αὐτὸν ἐρμηνεύσαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφήν· ὁ καὶ μᾶλλον εἶη ἂν ἀληθές, τῷ τὸν ὁμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτῆρα τὴν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολήν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἐκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι.

If such was his view, however, he was hardly consistent with himself: for in his comm. on Ps. ii. 7, vol. v. p. 88, he seems to assume that the Epistle was written in Greek by the Apostle himself:—

ὁ μὲν τοίγε Ἑβραῖος ἐλέγετο κύριον εἶναι τῆς λέξεως ἔτεκον, ὅπερ καὶ Ἀκύλας πεποιήκεν· ὁ δὲ ἀπόστολος νομομαθῆς ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους (i. 5) τῇ τῶν οὐχ ἐχρήσατο :

an inconsistency which betrays either carelessness, or change of opinion.

49. Marks of the same inconsistency further appear in another place (H. E. vi. 13), where he numbers our Epistle among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι γραφαί, saying of the writings of Clement of Alexandria, κέχρηται δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων γραφῶν μαρτυρίαις, τῆς τε λεγομένης Σολομῶντος σοφίας, καὶ τῆς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Σιράχ, καὶ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολῆς, τῆς τε Βαρνάβα καὶ Κλήμεντος καὶ Ἰούδα. It has been suggested that the inconsistency may be removed by accepting this last as a mere matter of fact, meaning, as in H. E. iii. 3, ὅτι γε μὴν τινες ἡθετήκασιν τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὥς μὴ Παύλου οὔσαν αὐτὴν ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν : cf. also H. E. vi. 20, end.

50. As we pass downwards, I shall mention but cursorily those writers who uniformly quote the Epistle as St. Paul's ; pausing only to notice any trace of a different opinion, or any testimony worth express citation. The full testimonies will be found in Bleek, and most of them in Lardner, vol. ii.

51. Of the class first mentioned in the foregoing paragraph, are Cyril of Jerusalem (+ 386) ; Gregory of Nazianzum (+ 389) ; Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus (+ 402) ; Basil the Great, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (+ 379) ; his brother Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa (cir. 370) ; Titus of Bostra (+ cir. 371) ; Chrysostom (+ 407) ; Theodore of Mopsuestia (+ cir. 428) ; Theodore, Bishop of Cyrus in Cilicia (+ 457).

52. In the works of this latter Father we find it asserted that the Epistle was written from Rome. Also we find the Arians charged with setting it aside as spurious :—

θαυμαστὸν οὐδὲν δρῶσιν οἱ τὴν Ἀρειανικὴν εἰσδεξάμενοι νόσον κατὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν λυττῶντες γραμμάτων καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιστολὴν τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποκρίνοντες καὶ νόθον ταύτην ἀποκαλοῦντες (Proœm. ad Hebr. init. vol. iii. p. 541).

The same accusation is found—in the Dialogue on the Trinity, ascribed sometimes to Athanasius, sometimes to Theodore: where the orthodox interlocutor makes the rather startling assertion, ἀφ' οὗ κατηγγέλη τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ χριστοῦ Παύλου εἶναι πεπίστευται ἢ ἐπιστολή :—and in Epiphanius, Hær. lxi. 14, p. 738, where at the same time he charges them with misusing Heb. iii. 2, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, for the purposes of their error. (See the passages at length in Bleek.) From this, and from the Epistle of Arius to Alexander, where he professes his faith and cites Heb. i. 2 (Epiph. ubi supra, § 7, p. 733), it is plain that

the Arians did not reject the Epistle altogether. Nay, they hardly denied its Pauline authenticity; for in that case we should have Athanasius in his polemics against them, and Alexander, defending this authenticity, whereas they always take it for granted. Moreover in the disputation of Augustine with the Arian Gothic Bishop Maximinus, we find the latter twice quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's⁹. So that whatever may have been done by individual Arians, it is clear that as a party they did not reject either the Epistle itself or its Pauline authorship.

53. Correspondent with the spread of the acceptance of the Epistle as St. Paul's, was its reception, in the mss., into the number of his Epistles. It was so received in the character of a recent accession, variously ranked: either at the end of those addressed to churches, or at the end of all. Epiphanius (Hær. xlii. vol. i. p. 373), at the end of the fourth century, says, speaking of the Epistle to Philemon—

οὕτως γὰρ παρὰ τῷ Μαρκίῳ κεῖται (viz. ninth, between Col. and Phil.) παρὰ δὲ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ ἐσχάτῃ κεῖται ἐν τισὶ δὲ ἀντιγράφοις τρισκαίδεκάτῃ πρὸ τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους τεσσαρεςκαίδεκάτης τέτακται· ἄλλα δὲ ἀντίγραφα ἔχει τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους δεκάτην, πρὸ τῶν δύο τῶν πρὸς Τιμόθεον, καὶ Τίτον καὶ Φιλήμονα.

The Epistle holds the place first here mentioned, viz. *last of all*, in the Iambi ad Seleucum, supposed by some to be the work of Gregory of Nazianzum, but more probably that of his contemporary Amphiloehius, Bishop of Iconium (see Bleek, p. 156, note 187): but the latter place in the arrangement of Athanasius (Bl. p. 135, note 143), of the Synopsis Sacræ Scripturæ (wrongly ascribed to Athanasius, but belonging to the Alexandrian school, Bl. p. 137. 7), of the Council of Laodiceæ (Bl. p. 154): of Theodoret and Euthalius: of our uncial mss. A, B, C, II, N, and cursive 16, 17, 22, 23, 46, 47, 57, 71, 73, al.; and of the Memphitic version.

54. The motives for these differing arrangements were obvious. Some placed it last, as an addition to the Epistles of St. Paul; others, to give it more its proper rank, put it before the Epistles to individuals. But had it been originally among St. Paul's Epistles, there can be no doubt that it would have taken its place according to its importance, which is the principle of arrangement of the undoubted Pauline Epistles in the canon.

55. A trace of a peculiar arrangement is found in B, the Vatican Codex. In that ms., all the fourteen Epistles of St. Paul form one con-

⁹ Augustini collat. cum Maximino, 4, Aug. Opp. viii. p. 469 (725 Migne): *Maximin*. "Quod Christus est in dextera Dei, quod interpellat pro nobis, sic etiam in alio loco ipse prosequitur Paulus dicens (Col. iii. 1). Sic ad Hebræos ipse scribens ait: 'Purificatione peccatorum facta' &c. (Heb. i. 3):" and ib. 9, p. 471 (728): *Maximin*. "Dicit enim sic Paulus ad Hebræos: 'Non enim in manufactis templis intravit Christus' &c. (Heb. ix. 24)."

tinued whole, numbered throughout by sections. But the Epistle to the Hebrews, which, as has been observed, stands after 2 Thess., does not correspond, in the numeration of its sections, with its present place in the order. It evidently once followed the Epistle to the Galatians, that Epistle ending with § 59, Heb. beginning with § 60,—and Eph. (the latter part of Heb. being deficient) with § 70. This would seem to shew that the ms. from which B was copied, or at all events which was at some previous time copied for its text, had Heb. after Gal.; which would indicate a still stronger persuasion that it was St. Paul's¹. In the Sahidic version only does it appear in that place which it would naturally hold according to its importance: i. e. between 2 Cor. and Gal. But from the fact of no existing Greek manuscript having it in this place, we must ascribe the phænomenon to the caprice of the framer of the version.

56. Returning to the Western church, we find that it was some time after the beginning of the third century before the Epistle was generally recognized as St. Paul's; and that even when this became the case, it was not equally used and cited with the rest of his Epistles.

About the middle of the third century flourished in the church of Rome NOVATIAN, the author of the celebrated schism which went by his name. We have works of his² full of Scripture citations, and on subjects which would have been admirably elucidated by this Epistle. Yet no where has he quoted or alluded to it. That he would not have had any feeling adverse to it, is pretty clear; for no passage in the N. T. could give such apparent countenance to his severer view “*de lapsis*,” as Heb. vi. 4—6. Yet, judging by the *Tractatus ad Novatianum Hæreticum*³, he never cited it for his purpose. Nor does that treatise, full as it is of Scripture citations, adduce one from our Epistle.

57. Contemporary with Novatian, we have, in the West African church, CYPRIAN, Bishop of Carthage (+ 258). In all his writings, he never cites, or even alludes to, our Epistle; which he would certainly have done for the same reason as Novatian would have done it, had he recognized it as the work of St. Paul; the whole of whose Epistles he cites, with the exception of that to Philemon. In all probability, Tertullian's view (“*Da magistrum*”) was also his, that it was written by Barnabas (see above, par. 25).

¹ It is one of the most grievous and inexcusable faults in Mai's edition of the Codex Vaticanus, that these numbers, forming such a valuable record of ancient arrangement, have been wantonly tampered with, “*ne sectionum numerationem absurde perturbatam exhiberemus*.” See note at end of Thessalonians, p. 429 of the English reprint.

² *De Trinitate*, and *De Cibis Judaicis*: printed in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. iii. pp. 885—964, and in Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* iii. pp. 287—323. On the latter of them, see Neander, *Kirchengesch.* pt. iii. p. 1166; on the former, Cave, *Hist. Lit. Ann.* 251.

³ Migne, *Patr. Lat.* iii. pp. 1205—1218: Gallandi, *Bibl. Patr.* iii. pp. 371—376. The author is unknown.

58. A little later we have a witness from another part of the Latin church, VICTORINUS, Bishop of Pettau on the Drave, in Pannonia (+ cir. 303). He asserts in the most explicit manner, both in his fragment *De Fabrica Mundi* and in his commentary on the Apocalypse, that St. Paul wrote only to seven churches; and in the latter he enumerates the churches:—

“In toto orbe septem ecclesias omnes esse, et septem nominatas unam esse catholicam, Paulus docuit primo: quod ut servaret ipse, et ipsum septem ecclesiarum non excessit numerum: sed scripsit ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philipenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses: postea singularibus personis scripsit, ne excederet numerum septem ecclesiarum⁴.”

We may add to this, that the Epistle to the Hebrews is never quoted in this Commentary.

59. About the middle of the fourth century, we find the practice beginning in the Latin church, of quoting the Epistle as St. Paul's: but at first only here and there, and not as if the opinion were the prevailing one. Bleek traces the adoption of this view by the Latins to their closer intercourse with the Greeks about this time owing to the Arian controversy, which occasioned several of the Western theologians to spend some time in the East, where the Epistle was cited, at first by both parties, and always by the Catholics, as undoubtedly St. Paul's. Add to this the study of the Greek exegetical writers, and especially of Origen, and we shall have adduced enough reasons to account for the gradual spread of the idea of the Pauline authorship over the West.

60. A fitting example of both these influences is found in HILARY, Bishop of Poitiers (+ 368), who seems to have been the first who thus regarded the Epistle. He quotes it indeed but seldom, in comparison with other parts of Scripture, and especially with St. Paul's Epistles; but when he does, it is decisively and without doubt, as the work of the Apostle. These citations are found in his treatise *De Trinitate*, which he wrote in his exile in Phrygia, and in his Commentary on the Psalms, “in quo opere,” says Jerome (*Catal.* 100, vol. ii. p. 933), “imitatus Origenem, nonnulla etiam de suo addidit.”

61. LUCIFER of Cagliari (+ 371) also cites the Epistle as St. Paul's, but once only, *De non conveniendo cum Hær.* c. 11, pp. 782 f. (Migne): though he frequently cites Scripture, and especially St. Paul's Epistles. And it is observable of him, that he was exiled by the Emperor Constantius, and spent some time in Palestine and the Thebaid.

62. Fabius Marius VICTORINUS belongs to these same times. He

⁴ On the almost certain genuineness of this Commentary, see Bleek, p. 179, note 229: on which it may be said, that even if it should be held to be of *later* date, it would thereby only become a more remarkable testimony in this matter.

was born in Africa, and passed the greater part of his days as a rhetorician at Rome : being baptized as a Christian late in life. Most of his remaining works are against the Arians : and in them he cites our Epistle two or three times, and as St. Paul's ; still, it has been observed (by Bleek), not with such emphasis as the other books of Scripture, but more as a mere passing reference. He is said by Jerome (Catal. 101, p. 935) to have written "*Commentarii in Apostolum*," i. e. on the Pauline Epistles : yet it would appear, from what Cassiodorus implies in the sixth century⁵, that *up to his time no Latin writer had commented on the Epistle*, that he did not include it among them.

63. Other Latin writers there are of this time, who make no use of our Epistle, though it would have well served their purpose in their writings. Such are—PHÆBADIUS, Bishop of Agen, in S.W. Gaul (+ aft. 392) ; ZENO, Bishop of Verona (cir. 360) ; PACIANUS, Bishop of Barcelona (cir. 370) ; HILARY the Deacon, generally supposed to be the author of the Comm. on St. Paul's Epistles found among the works of Ambrose (cir. 370)⁶ ; OPTATUS, Bishop of Milevi (cir. 364—375), who wrote *De Schismate Donatistarum*. All these quote frequently from other parts of the N. T. and from St. Paul's Epistles.

64. On the other hand, AMBROSE, Bishop of Milan (+ 397), combating strongly the Arians of his time, and making diligent use of the writings of Origen, Didymus, and Basil, often uses and quotes the Epistle, and always as the work of St. Paul. (See copious citations in Bleek.) In one celebrated passage in his treatise *De Pœnitentia* (ii. 2 (6, 7), vol. iii. p. 417), where he is impugning the allegation by the Novatians of Heb. vi. 4 ff., he defends the passage from misunderstanding ; confesses its apparent inconsistency with St. Paul's conduct to the sinner at Corinth ; does not think of questioning the apostolical authority of the passage, but asks, "*Numquid Paulus adversus factum suum prædicare potuit ?*" and gives two solutions of the apparent discrepancy.

65. We have an important testimony concerning our Epistle from PHILASTRIUS, Bishop of Brescia (+ cir. 387), who while he cites the Epistle as unhesitatingly as his friend Ambrose, in his treatise *De Hæresibus* (§ 89, Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. xii. p. 1200), says—

"*Hæresis quorundam de epistola Pauli ad Hebræos. Sunt alii quoque, qui epistolam Pauli ad Hebræos non adserunt esse ipsius, sed dicunt aut Barnabæ esse apostoli, aut Clementis de urbe Roma episcopi. Alii autem Lucæ evangelistæ aiunt epistolam etiam ad*

⁵ Divin. Litt. c. 8 (vol. ii. p. 543), cited in Bleek.

⁶ The Epistle is once cited in the comm., but so that it is distinguished from the writings of St. Paul. Speaking of St. Paul, he says (on 2 Tim. i. 3), "*Sic enim aliquando persecutus est ecclesiam ut Dei amore hoc ageret, non malevolentia. Nam simili modo et in epistola ad Hebræos scriptum est: quia Levi qui decimas accepit, decimas dedit Melchisedech*" &c. See Bleek, p. 139.

Laodicenses scriptam⁷. Et quia addiderunt in ea quædam non bene sentientes, inde non legitur in ecclesia : et, si legitur a quibusdam, non tamen in ecclesia legitur populo, nisi tredecim epistolæ ipsius, et ad Hebræos interdum. Et in ea quia rhetorice scripsit sermone plausibili, inde non putant ejusdem apostoli. Et quia et *factum Christum* dixit in ea (ch. iii. 2), inde non legitur. De pœnitentia autem (ch. vi. 4 ff.), propter Novatianos æque.”

Then he proceeds to give orthodox explanations of both places.

He has also another remarkable passage, Hær. 88, p. 1199 :—

“Propter quod statutum est ab apostolis et eorum successoribus, non aliud legi debere in ecclesia catholica, nisi legem et prophetas et evangelia et actus apostolorum et Pauli *tredecim* epistolas, et septem alias, Petri duas, Joannis tres, Judæ unam et unam Jacobi, quæ septem actibus apostolorum conjunctæ sunt. Scripturæ autem absconditæ, id est, apocrypha, etsi legi debent morum causa a perfectis, non ab omnibus legi debent, quia non intelligentes multa addiderunt et tulerunt quæ voluerunt hæretici.”

These testimonies of Philastrius are curious, and hardly consistent with one another, nor with his own usual practice of citing the Epistle as St. Paul's. They seem to lead us to an inference agreeing with that to which our previous enquiries led, viz. that though some controversial writers in the Latin church at the end of the fourth century were beginning to cite the Epistle as St. Paul's, it was not at that time so recognized in that church generally, nor publicly read : or if read, but seldom.

66. This reluctance on the part of the Latin church to receive and recognize the Epistle was doubtless continued and increased by the use made of some passages in it by the Novatian schismatics. We have seen already, in par. 64, that Ambrose adduces this fact : and Bleek brings several instances of it from other writers. But as time advanced, the intrinsic value of the Epistle itself, and the example of writers of the Greek church, gained for it almost universal reception, and reputation of Pauline authorship in the West. Thus GAUDENTIUS, successor of Philastrius in the see of Brescia in 387, to which he was summoned from travelling in Cappadocia,—and FAUSTINUS, who followed in this, as in other things, the practice of Lucifer of Cagliari,—cite the Epistle without hesitation as St. Paul's. So in general does RUFINUS (+ cir. 411), having spent a long time in Egypt, and

⁷ This curious sentence can hardly mean, as Bleek, that they believed the Epistle to the Heb. to be St. Luke's, as also that apocryphal one which is written to the Laodiceans ; but that they believed the Epistle to the Heb. to be St. Luke's, and that it was also written to the Laod., i. e. was the Epistle alluded to under that designation by St. Paul in Col. iv. 16. What follows is very obscure, but does not seem to me to support this rendering of Bleek's.

being familiar with the writings of Origen. He gives "Pauli apostoli epistolæ quatuordecim" among the writings "quæ patres intra canonem concluderunt⁸:" and in his writings generally cites the Epistle as Pauline without hesitation⁹.

67. I shall close this historical sketch with a fuller notice of the important testimonies of JEROME and AUGUSTINE, and a brief summary of those who followed them.

68. JEROME (+ 420) spent a great portion of his life in Egypt, Palestine, and other parts of the East; was well acquainted with the writings of Origen; and personally knew such men as Gregory of Nazianzum, Didymus, Epiphanius, and the other Greek theologians of his time. It might therefore have been expected, that he would, as we have seen other Latin writers do, have adopted the Greek practice, and have unhesitatingly cited and spoken of this Epistle as the work of St. Paul. This however is by no means the case. On the whole his usual practice is, to cite the words of the Epistle, and ascribe them to St. Paul¹: and in his work *De Nominibus Hebraicis* (vol. iii. pp. 4 ff. ed. Migne), where he interprets the Hebrew words which occur in Scripture, in the order of the books where they are found, he introduces the Epistle as St. Paul's (p. 113), after 2 Thessalonians.

69. But the exceptions to this practice of unhesitating citation are many and important: and wherever he gives any account of the Epistle, he is far from concealing the doubts which prevailed respecting it. I shall give some of the most remarkable passages.

In the *Catalogus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, chap. 5, under Paulus (vol. ii. pp. 837, 839), he says—

"Scripsit autem novem ad septem ecclesias epistolas, ad Romanos unam, ad Corinthios duas, ad Galatas unam, ad Ephesios unam, ad Philippenses unam, ad Colossenses unam, ad Thessalonicensenses duas: præterea ad discipulos suos, Timotheo duas, Tito unam, Philemoni unam. Epistola autem quæ fertur ad Hebræos non ejus creditur propter stili sermonisque distantiam, sed vel Barnabæ juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucæ evangelistæ juxta quosdam, vel Clementis, Romanæ postea ecclesiæ episcopi, quem aiunt sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone: vel certe, quia Paulus scribebat ad Hebræos et propter invidiam sui apud eos

⁸ In his *Expositio Symboli Apostolici*, 37, p. 100 (Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. xxi.), published also in Jerome's works, ed. Paris, 1693, vol. ix. p. 70 (vol. iv. p. 62 in the Frankfort ed. of 1684).

⁹ The passage quoted by Bleek from the *Invectiva in Hieronymum*, "*Nescio quid tale et in alia epistola, si quis tamen eam receperit*" &c., is nothing but a citation by him from Jerome's commentary on Eph.: see it at length below, par. 72.

¹ See numerous instances in Bleek, p. 202 f., note. I only cite those which are apposite to the question before us.

nominis titulum in principio salutationis amputaverat. Scripserat autem ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraice, id est suo eloquio disertissime, ut ea quæ eloquenter scripta fuerant in Hebræo eloquentius verterentur in Græcum: et hanc causam esse, quod a cæteris Pauli epistolis discrepare videatur."

70. In this passage, while he relates the doubts and hypotheses, his own leaning seems to be, to believe that the fact of St. Paul having written in Hebrew, and having omitted a salutation owing to his unpopularity among the Jews, would be enough to account for the phænomena of the Epistle.

71. But in other places, he gives other reasons for the difficulties of the Epistle and for the doubts respecting it. Thus in his Comm. on Gal. i. 1 (vol. vii. p. 374), he says—

"... Unde et nos possumus intelligere, Joannem quoque baptistam et apostolum appellandum, siquidem ait Scriptura 'Fuit homo missus a Deo cui nomen erat Johannes:' et in epistola ad Hebræos propterea Paulum solita consuetudine nec nomen suum nec apostoli vocabulum præposuisse, quia de Christo erat dicturus, '*habentes ergo principem sacerdotem et apostolum confessionis nostræ Jesum* (Heb. iii. 1; iv. 14):' nec fuisse congruum ut ubi Christus apostolus dicendus erat, ibi etiam Paulus apostolus poneretur²."

Again, on Isa. vi. 9, 10 (vol. iv. p. 97)—

"Pauli quoque idcirco ad Hebræos epistola contradicitur, quod ad Hebræos scribens utatur testimoniis quæ in Hebraicis voluminibus non habentur."

72. In the prologue to his Comm. on Titus, he severely blames the Marcionites and other heretics for excluding arbitrarily certain Epistles from the number of the Apostolic writings, instancing the Pastoral Epistles and this to the Hebrews. He then proceeds (vol. vii. pp. 685 f.)—

"Et si quidem redderent causas cur eas apostoli non putarent, tentaremus aliquid respondere et forsitan aliquid satisfacere lectori. Nunc vero cum hæretica auctoritate pronuncient et dicant Illa epistola Pauli est, hæc non est, ea auctoritate refelli se pro veritate intelligant, qua ipsi non erubescant falsa simulare."

Still that this strong language does not prove him to have been satisfied as to the Pauline authorship, is shewn by two passages in his commentary on this same Epistle to Titus (vol. vii. p. 695):—

"Et hoc diligentius observate, quomodo unius civitatis presbyteros vocans postea eosdem episcopos dixerit. *Si quis vult recipere eam epistolam quæ sub nomine Pauli ad Hebræos scripta est*, et ibi æqualiter inter plures ecclesiæ cura dividitur. Siquidem ad plebem scribit '*Parate principibus vestris*' &c. (Heb. xiii. 17)."

² Compare Pantænus above, par. 11.

And (vol. vii. p. 714)—

“Relege ad *Hebræos epistolam Pauli, sive cujuscumque alterius eam esse putas, quia jam inter ecclesiasticas est recepta*; totum illum catalogum fidei enumera, in quo scriptum est ‘*Fide majus sacrificium Abel a Cain obtulit Deo*’ &c. (Heb. xi. 4—8).”

And again in his Comm. on Ezek. xxviii. (vol. v. p. 335)—

“Et Paulus apostolus loquitur, *siquis tamen ad Hebræos epistolam suscipit, ‘Accessistis ad Sion montem’* &c. (Heb. xii. 22).”

And on Eph. ii. (vol. vii. p. 583), having quoted 1 Cor. he says—

“Nescio quid tale et in alia epistola, *si quis tamen eam recipit, prudentibus quibusque lectoribus Paulus subindicat, dicens, ‘Hi omnes testimonium accipientes fidei’* &c. (Heb. xi. 39).”

73. The following expressions regarding the Epistle, testifying to the same doubt, occur in his writings:—

Epistle 73 (125), ad Evangelium (Evagrium), § 4 (vol. i. p. 442), “Epistola ad Hebræos, quam omnes Græci recipiunt, et nonnulli Latinorum:” Comm. on Matt. xxvi. (vol. vii. p. 212), “Paulus in epistola sua quæ scribitur ad Hebræos, licet de ea multi Latinorum dubitent:” Catal. 59 (vol. ii. p. 899), “sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli apostoli non habetur:” Comm. in Isa. vi. (vol. iv. p. 91), “quam Latina consuetudo non recipit:” ib. in c. viii. (vol. iv. p. 125), “licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas scripturas non recipiat:” in Zach. viii. 1—3 (vol. vi. p. 838), “Paulus, si tamen in suscipienda epistola Græcorum auctoritatem Latina lingua non respuit, sacrata oratione disputans ait” &c.

74. A passage requiring more express notice is found in his Epistle to Dardanus, § 3 (vol. i. p. 970), where after citing testimonies from Heb. xi. xii., he proceeds—

“Nec me fugit quod perfidia Judæorum hæc testimonia non suscipiat, quæ utique veteris Testamenti auctoritate firmata sunt. Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, non solum ab ecclesiis Orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Græci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabæ vel Clementis arbitrentur: et nihil interesse cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri sit, et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quod si eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt: et tamen nos utraque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent (quippe qui et gentilium literarum raro utantur exemplis) sed quasi canonicis.”

75. There are some points in this important testimony, which seem to want elucidation. Jerome asserts, for example, that by *all preceding Greek writers the Epistle had been received as St. Paul's*: and yet immediately after, he says that most (of them, for so only can "*plerique*" naturally be interpreted) think it to be Barnabas's or Clement's³: and think it to be of no consequence (whose it is), seeing that it is the production of a "*vir ecclesiasticus*," and is every day read in the churches. Now though these expressions are not very perspicuous, it is not difficult to see what is meant by them. A general conventional reception ("*susceptio*") of the Epistle as St. Paul's prevailed among the Greeks. To this their writers (without exception according to Jerome: but that is a loose assertion, as the preceding pages will shew) conformed, still in most cases entertaining their own views as to Barnabas or Clement having written the Epistle, and thinking it of little moment, seeing that confessedly it was the work of a "*vir ecclesiasticus*," and was stamped with the authority of public reading in the churches. The expression "*vir ecclesiasticus*" seems to be in contrast to "*homo hæreticus*"⁴.

76. The evidence here however on one point is clear enough: and shews that in Jerome's day, i. e. in the beginning of the fifth century, the custom of the Latins did not receive the Epistle to the Hebrews among the canonical Scriptures.

77. Jerome's own view, as far as it can be gathered from this passage, is, that while he wishes to look on the Epistle as decidedly canonical, he does not venture to say who the author was, and believes the question to be immaterial: for we cannot but suppose him, from the very form of the clause "*et nihil interesse*" &c., to be giving to this view his own approbation.

78. And consistent with this are many citations of the Epistle scattered up and down among his works: as, e. g.—

Comm. on Isa. lvii., vol. iv. p. 677—

"Mons . . . de quo ad Hebræos loquitur qui scribit epistolam" &c.
Comm. on Amos viii., vol. vi. p. 339—

"Quod quicunque est ille qui ad Hebræos scripsit epistolam disserens ait" &c.

Comm. on Jer. xxxi. 31, vol. iv. p. 1072—

³ By no possible ingenuity can these words be made to mean, as Dr. Davidson interprets them, that "the Greeks ascribed the style and language of it to Barnabas or Clement, though the ideas and sentiments were Paul's." The genitives, "Pauli," and "Barnabæ vel Clementis," are strictly correspondent and correlative. In the same sense as they "*suscipiebant*" the Epistle as being the one, in that sense they "*arbitrabantur*" that it was the other; and in no other sense.

⁴ A similar use of *ἐκκλησιαστικός* occurs in Euseb. H. E. iii. 25, where see Heinen's notes.

"Hoc testimonio apostolus Paulus, sive quis alius scripsit epistolam, usus est ad Hebræos" &c.⁵

And intimations conveyed in other places, besides that above cited from the Catalogus (par. 69) :—

Ep. 53 (103), ad Paulinum, § 8, vol. i. p. 280—

"Paulus apostolus ad septem scribit ecclesias (octava enim ad Hebræos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur)" &c.

Comm. on Zachar. vol. vi. p. 854 f.—

"Et in Esaia legimus, 'Apprehendent septem mulieres' &c. Quæ igitur septem ibi mulieres appellantur, id est ecclesiæ, quarum numerus et in Paulo apostolo continetur (ad septem enim scribit ecclesias, ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses), et in Joannis apocalypsi in medio septem candelabrarum, id est, ecclesiarum, Ephesiorum &c., varietate et auro purissimo Dominus cinctus ingreditur : nunc in propheta Zacharia decem nominantur" &c.

79. And as Bleek has very satisfactorily shewn, no difference in time can be established between these testimonies of his, which should prove that he once doubted the Pauline authorship and was afterwards convinced, or vice versâ. For passages inconsistent with one another occur in one and the same work, e. g. in the Comm. on Isaiah, in which, notwithstanding the testimonies above adduced from it, he repeatedly cites the Epistle as the work of St. Paul⁶. And these Commentaries on the Prophets were among his later works.

80. We may safely then gather from that which has been said, what Jerome's view on the whole really was. He commonly, and when not speaking with deliberation, followed the usual practice of citing the Epistle as St. Paul's. But he very frequently guards himself by an expression of uncertainty : and sometimes distinctly states the doubt which prevailed on the subject. That his own mind was not clear on it, is plain from many of the above-cited passages. In fact, though quoted on the side of the Pauline authorship, the testimony of Jerome is quite as much against as in favour of it. Even in his time, after so long a prevalence of the conventional habit of quoting it as St. Paul's, he feels himself constrained, in a great proportion of the cases where he cites it, to cast doubt on the opinion, that it was written by the Apostle.

81. The testimony of AUGUSTINE (+ 430) is, on the whole, of the same kind. It was his lot to take part in several synods in which the canon of the N. T. came into question. And it is observable,

⁵ See also on Isa. lvii. vol. iv. p. 700 ; l. ib. p. 583 ; xxiv. ib. p. 338 ; viii. ib. p. 125 ; vii. p. 108 ; &c.

⁶ Cf. on ch. lvi. vol. iv. p. 659 ; on ch. xlv. ib. p. 543 ; on ch. viii. ib. p. 125 ; on ch. vii. ib. p. 108 ; on ch. vi. p. 91 ; &c.

thatwhile in two of these, one held at Hippo in 393, when he was yet a presbyter, the other the 3rd council of Carthage in 398, we read of—

“Pauli apostoli epistolæ tredecim : ejusdem ad Hebræos una,”—clearly shewing that it was not without some difficulty that the Epistle gained a place among the writings of the Apostle,—in the 5th council of Carthage, held in 419, where Augustine also took a part, we read—

“epistolarum Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim.”

So that during this interval of 25 years, men had become more accustomed to hear of the Epistle as St. Paul's, and at last admitted it into the number of his writings without any distinction⁷.

82. We might hence have supposed that Augustine, who was not only present at these councils, but took a leading part in framing their canons, would be found citing the Epistle every where without doubt as St. Paul's. But this is by no means the case. Bleek has diligently collected many passages in which the unsettled state of his own opinion on the question appears. In one remarkable passage, *De Doctrina Christiana*, ii. 8 (12), vol. iii. pt. i. p. 40 (Migne), where he says of his reader—

“In canonicis autem scripturis ecclesiarum catholicarum quamplurium auctoritatem sequatur, inter quas sane illæ sint quæ apostolicas sedes habere et epistolas accipere mernerunt. Tenebit igitur hunc modum in scripturis canonicis, ut eas quæ ab omnibus accipiuntur ecclesiis catholicis, præponat eis quas quidam non accipiunt : in eis vero quæ non accipiuntur ab omnibus, præponat eas quas plures graviioresque accipiunt, eis, quas pauciores minorisque auctoritatis ecclesiæ tenent,”—

having said this, he proceeds to enumerate the canonical books of the O. and N. T. (“totus autem canon scripturarum, in quo istam considerationem versandam dicimus, his libris continetur” &c.), giving fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, among which he places the Epistle to the Hebrews *last* : which, as we have seen, was not its usual place at that time.

83. Plainer testimonies of the same uncertainty are found in other parts of his writings : e. g. *De Peccatorum Meritis et Remissione*, i. c. 27 (50), vol. x. pt. i. p. 137—

“Ad Hebræos quoque epistola, quamquam nonnullis incerta sit, tamen quoniam legi, quosdam . . . eam quibusdam opinionibus suis testem adhibere voluisse, magisque me movet auctoritas ecclesiarum orientalium, quæ hanc quoque in canonicis habent, quanta pro nobis testimonia contineat, advertendum est.”

⁷ See the canons of the respective councils in Bleek, pp. 217, 218 ; and in Mansi, *Concil. Collect.* vol. iii. pp. 891, 924 ; vol. iv. p. 430.

Inchoata Expositio Epistolæ ad Romanos (written in A.D. 394), § 11, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 2095—

“Excepta epistola quam ad Hebræos scripsit, ubi principium saluatorium de industria dicitur omisisse, ne Judæi, qui adversus eum pugnaciter oblatrabant, nomine ejus offensi vel inimico animo legerent, vel omnino legere non curarent quod ad eorum salutem scripserat: unde nonnulli eam in canonem scripturarum recipere timuerunt. Sed quoquo modo se habeat ista quæstio, excepta hac epistola, omnes quæ nulla dubitante ecclesia Pauli apostoli esse firmanur, talem continent salutationem” &c.

De Civitate Dei, xvi. 22, vol. vii. p. 500—

“In epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quam plures apostoli Pauli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant.”

De Fide, Spe et Caritate (A.D. 421), c. 8 (2), vol. vi. p. 235—

“In epistola ad Hebr., qua teste usi sunt illustres catholicæ regulæ defensores.”

84. Sometimes indeed he cites our Epistle simply with the formulæ “Audisti exhortantem apostolum,” Serm. lv. 5, vol. v. p. 376: “Audi quod dicit apostolus,” Serm. lxxxii. 8 (11), p. 511: see also Serm. clix. 1, p. 868; clxxvii. 11, p. 960: Expos. Verb. ad Rom. § 19, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 2102: sometimes with such words as these, “quos reprehendit scriptura dicens,” Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. § 12, vol. iv. pt. ii. p. 1712: “Aperuit Scriptura, ubi legitur,” Contra Maxim. Ar. ii. 25, vol. viii. p. 803. But much more frequently he cites either merely “epistola ad Hebræos” (In Ps. cxviii. Serm. xvii. § 2, vol. iv. pt. ii.: De Trinit. iii. 11 (22), vol. viii. ib. xiii. 1 (3), xiv. 1; Serm. lxxxii. § 15), or “epistola quæ scribitur ad Hebræos” (In Joan. Tract. lxxix. § 1, vol. iii. pt. ii.), or “epistola quæ est ad Hebræos” (In Joan. Tract. xcv. § 2: Contra Serm. Arian. c. 5, vol. viii.: De Trinit. xii. 13 (20); xv. 19 (34)), or “epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos” (De Genesi ad Litt. x. 9, vol. x. pt. i.: In Ps. cxviii. Serm. xvi. c. 6: De Fide et Opp. c. 11 (17), vol. vi.: De Civit. Dei x. 5). It is certainly a legitimate inference from these modes of quotation, that they arose from a feeling of uncertainty as to the authorship. It would be inconceivable, as Bleek remarks, that Augustine should have used the words “in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Romanos, ad Galatas” &c.

85. It is of some interest to trace the change of view in the Romish church, which seems to have taken place about this time. In the synod of Hippo, before referred to (par. 81), and in the 3rd council of Carthage (ib.), it was determined to consult “the church over the sea” for confirmation of the canon of Scripture as then settled: “de confirmando isto canone transmarina ecclesia consulatur.” And what was meant by this, is more fully explained by a similar resolution of the 5th council of Carthage (ib.): “Hoc etiam fratri et consacerdoti nostro, sancto Boni-

facio urbis Romanæ episcopo, vel aliis earum partium episcopis pro confirmando isto canone innotescat, quia et a patribus ita accepimus legendum.” Whether these references were ever made, we have no means of knowing: but we possess a document of the same age, which seems to shew that, had they been made, they would have resulted in the confirmation of the canonical place of the Epistle. Pope Innocent I. in his letter to Exsuperius, Bishop of Toulouse (A.D. 405 ff.), enumerates the books of the N. T. thus: “Evangeliarum libri quatuor, Pauli apostoli epistolæ quatuordecim, epistolæ Joannis tres” &c.⁸

86. Yet it seems not to have been the practice of the writers of the Roman church at this time to cite the Epistle frequently or authoritatively. That there are no references to it in Innocent’s own writings, and in those of his successors Zosimus (417—419) and Bonifacius (419—422), may be accidental: but it can hardly be so, that we have none in those of his predecessor Siricius, who often quotes Scripture: in those of Cælestine I. (422—432), some of whose Epistles are regarding the Nestorian controversy: in the genuine writings of Leo the Great (440—461).

87. Bleek adduces several contemporary Latin writers in other parts of the world, who make no mention of nor citation from our Epistle. Such are Orosius (cir. 415), Marius Mercator, Evagrius (cir. 430), Sedulius. Paulinus of Nola (+ 431) cites it once, and as St. Paul’s⁹. After the middle of the fifth century, the practice became more usual and familiar. We find it in Salvianus (+ aft. 495), Vigilius of Tapsus (cir. 484), Victor of Vite, Fulgentius of Ruspe (+ 533), his scholar Fulgentius Ferrandus (+ cir. 550), Facundus of Hermiane (cir. 548), &c.: and in the list of canonical books drawn up in 494 by a council of seventy bishops under Pope Gelasius, where we have “epistolæ Pauli apostoli numero quatuordecim, ad Romanos epistola una, ad Philemonem epistola una, ad Hebræos epistola una.”

88. In the middle of the sixth century we find Pope Vigilius, who took a conspicuous part in the controversy on the *three chapters*, in his answer to Theodore of Mopsuestia, impugning the reading *χωρίς θεοῦ* instead of *ἁπῆρι θεοῦ*, Heb. ii. 9 (see in loc. in the Commentary), without in any way calling in question the authority or authenticity of the Epistle.

89. To the same time (cir. 556) belongs the work of Cassiodorus, *De Divinis Lectionibus*; who, while he speaks of various Latin commenta-

⁸ Galland. Biblioth. viii. pp. 563 ff. Bl. p. 230.

⁹ Bleek hardly does this citation justice in saying, that it does not appear certainly by it that Paulinus held the Epistle to be the work of the same Apostle as that to the Ephesians. Witness his words, Ep. l. (xliii.) 18, p. 296, “Itidem apostolus spiritualiter exponens arma cælestia . . . gladium spiritus dicit verbum Dei (Eph. vi. 17); de quo ad Hebræos ait, ‘*Vivus est sermo Dei*’ &c. (Heb. iv. 12).” Surely this is explicit enough.

ries on the Pauline and Catholic Epistles, knew apparently of none on that to the Hebrews, and consequently got Mutianus to make the Latin version of Chrysostom's homilies on it, "*ne epistolarum ordo continuus indecoro termino subito rumpetur.*"

90. Gregory the Great (590—605) treats our Epistle simply as St. Paul's, and in his *Moral. in Job xxxv.* 20 (†8), p. 1166 vol. ii. (Migne), lays a stress on the circumstance that the Church received as the Apostle's fourteen canonical Epistles only, though fifteen were written by him: the fifteenth being probably the Epistle to the Laodiceans.

91. The testimonies of Isidore of Hispala (Seville: + 636) are remarkable. Citing the Epistle usually without further remark as St. Paul's, and stating the number of his Epistles as fourteen, he yet makes the number of churches to which the Apostle wrote, *seven*, and enumerates them, including the Hebrews, not observing that he thus makes them eight (*Proœmiorum in O. et N. T.* § 92, vol. v. p. 215):—

"Paulus apostolus quatuordecim epistolis prædicationis suæ perstrinxit stylum. Ex quibus aliquas propter typum septiformis ecclesiæ septem scripsit ecclesiis, conservans potius nec excedens modum sacramenti, propter septiformem Sancti Spiritus efficaciam. Scripsit autem ad Romanos, ad Corinthios, ad Galatas, ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, ad Colossenses, ad Thessalonicenses, ad Hebræos: reliquas vero postmodum singularibus edidit personis, ut rursus ipsum illum septenarium numerum ad sacramentum unitatis converteret."

Again, *Etymol. vi.* 2. 44 f., vol. iii. p. 248, in enumerating the writings of St. Paul, he says—

"Paulus apostolus suas scripsit epistolas quatuordecim, ex quibus novem septem ecclesiis scripsit, reliquas discipulis suis Timotheo, Tito, et Philemoni. Ad Hebræos autem epistola plerisque Latinis ejus esse incerta est propter dissonantiam sermonis, eandemque alii Barnabam conscripsisse, alii a Clemente scriptam fuisse suspicantur."

And almost in the same words, *De Officiis i.* 12. 11, vol. vi. p. 376.

92. After this time the assertors of an independent opinion, or even reporters of the former view of the Latin church, are no longer found, being overborne by the now prevalent view of the Pauline authorship. Thomas Aquinas indeed (+ 1274) mentions the former doubts, with a view to answer them: and gives reasons for no superscription or address appearing in the Epistle.

And thus matters remained in the church of Rome until the beginning of the sixteenth century: the view of the Pauline authorship universally obtaining: and indeed all enquiry into the criticism of the Scriptures being lulled to rest.

93. But before we enter on the remaining portion of our historical

enquiry, it will be well to gather the evidence furnished by the Græco-Latin mss., as we have above (par. 53) that by the Greek mss.

The Codex Claromontanus (D, of cent. vi.: see Proleg. to Vol. II. ch. v. § i.) contains indeed the Epistle, but in a later hand: and after the Epistle to Philemon we have an enumeration of the lines in the O. and N. T., which does not contain the Epistle to the Hebrews: thus shewing, whatever account is to be given of it, that the Epistle did not originally form part of the Codex.

The Codex Boernerianus (G, cent. ix.: see *ibid.*) does not contain our Epistle.

The Codex Augiensis (F, of cent. ix.: see *ibid.*) does not contain the Epistle in Greek, but in Latin only.

These evidences are the more remarkable, as they all belong to a period when the Pauline authorship had long become the generally received opinion in the Latin church.

94. We now pass on at once to the opening of the sixteenth century: at which time of the revival of independent thought, not only among those who became connected with the Reformation, but also among Roman-Catholic writers themselves, we find the ancient doubts concerning the Pauline authorship revived, and new life and reality infused into them.

95. Bleek mentions first among these LUDOVICUS VIVES, the Spanish theologian, who in his *Commentary on Aug. de Civit. Dei*, on the words "in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos," says, "Significat, incertum esse auctorem:" and on the words, "in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quam plures apostoli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant," says, "Hieronymus, Origenes, Augustinus et alii veterum de hoc ambigunt: ante ætatem Hieronymi a Latinis ea epistola recepta non erat inter sacras."

96. A more remarkable testimony is that of CARDINAL CAJETAN, as cited by Erasmus¹—

"Thomas Bionensis Cardinalis Cajetanus adhuc vivens, cum alibi, tum in libello contra Lutheranos de Eucharistia, sine Pauli nomine citat hanc epistolam: uno loco subjicit, *quod juxta genuinum sensum tractat auctor illius epistolæ*. Si non dubitabat de auctore, quid opus erat illa periphrasi?"

Bellarmino (*De Controvers. Fid. Christ.* p. 54) cites Cajetan as objecting to the idea that St. Paul wrote the Epistle, ch. ix. 4, as inconsistent with 1 Kings viii. 9, and saying, "Igitur aut mentitur Paulus, aut hujus epistolæ auctor non est²."

¹ In his *Declarat.* xxxiii. ad *Censuras Facult. Theol. Paris*: Opp. *Erasm.* Leyd. vol. ix. fol. 166.

² These testimonies are cited from a commentary on the Epistle; *Epp. Paulin. ad Græc. verit. castig. et juxta sensum literal. enarr.* Venet. 1531, fol. My own lot has been that of Bleek: Cajetan's *Schriften selbst habe ich nicht nachsehen können*.

97. ERASMUS gives it as his decided opinion that the Epistle is not written by St. Paul : and alleges at length the principal arguments on which it is founded. The passage is a long one, but very important, and I shall quote it entire. It occurs at the end of his Annotations on the Epistle, Opp. vol. vi. foll. 1023-4 :—

“Optime Lector, nihilo minoris velim esse tibi hanc epistolam quod a multis dubitatum sit Pauli esset an alterius. Certe cujus-cunque est, multis nominibus digna est quæ legatur a Christianis. Et ut a stilo Pauli, quod ad phrasin attinet, longe lateque discrepat : ita ad spiritum ac pectus Paulinum vehementer accedit. Verum ut non potest doceri certis argumentis cujus sit, quod nullius habeat inscriptionem : ita compluribus indiciis colligi potest, si non certis, certe probabilibus, ab alio quopiam quam a Paulo scriptam fuisse. Primum quod sola omnium Pauli nomen non præferat, tametsi non me fugit, hoc utcunque dilui ab Hieronymo, sed ita ut magis retundat adversarii telum, quam adstruat quod defendit : ‘Si ideo,’ inquit, ‘Pauli non est quod Pauli nomen non præferat, igitur nullius erit, cum nullius præferat titulum.’ Sed audi ex adverso. Si ideo quisque liber hujus aut illius credi debet quod ejus titulum præferat, igitur et evangelium Petri apocryphum Petro tribui debet, quod præferat Petri nomen. Deinde quod tot annis, nempe usque ad ætatem Hieronymi, non recepta fuerit a Latinis, quemadmodum ipse testatur in epistolis suis. Ad hanc conjecturam facit quod Ambrosius, cum omnes Paulinas epistolas sit interpretatus, in hanc unam nihil scripserit. Præterea quod enarrans Esaïæ caput vi. recensuit Hieronymus, quod in hoc quædam testimonia citentur ex veteri Testamento, quæ non reperiantur in Hebræorum voluminibus, de quibus nonnihil attigimus hujus epistolæ cap. xii. Adde huc, quod quum nemo Scripturarum testimonia disertius aptiusque citet quam Paulus, tamen locum ex Psalmo viii. refert in contrarium sensum, illinc colligens Christum dejectum, quum totus Psalmus attollat dignitatem humanæ conditionis. Ut ne dicam interim, inesse locos aliquot, qui quorundam Hæreticorum dogmatibus prima fronte patrocinari videantur : velut illa, quod velum separans sancta sanctorum interpretatur cælum : ac multo magis, quod palam adimere videatur spem a baptismo relapsis in peccatum, idque non uno in loco : cum Paulus et eum receperit in communionem sanctorum, qui dormierat cum uxore patris. Adde huc, quod divus Hieronymus cum aliis aliquot locis ita citat hujus epistolæ testimonia, ut de auctore videatur ambigere : tunc edisserens caput Hieremiæ xxxi., ‘Hoc,’ inquit, ‘testimonio Paulus apostolus, sive quis alius scripsit epistolam, usus est ad Hebræos.’ Rursum in Esaïæ capite l., ‘Dicitur et in epistola quæ fertur ad Hebræos : aliisque locis pene innumeris, alicubi negans referre

cujus sit, modo salubria doceat.' Item capite vi., 'Unde et Paulus apostolus in epistola ad Hebræos, quam Latina consuetudo non recipit.' Rursus enarrans Esaïæ caput viii. citans hujus epistolæ testimonium dicit, 'In epistola quæ ad Hebræos inscribitur docet, licet eam Latina consuetudo inter canonicas Scripturas non recipiat.' Item enarrans Matthæi caput xxvi., 'Licet,' inquit, 'de ea Latinorum multi dubitent.' Item in Zachariæ caput viii. citans addit, 'Si tamen in suscipienda epistola Græcorum auctoritatem Latina lingua non respuit.' Item in epistola ad Paulinum, 'Octava enim ad Hebræos a plerisque extra numerum ponitur.' Idem in Catalogo refert Gajum in hac fuisse sententia, ut tredecim duntaxat epistolas adscriberet Paulo, quæ est ad Hebræos negaret illius esse. Deinde subjicit suo nomine Hieronymus, 'Sed et apud Romanos usque hodie quasi Pauli non habetur.' Consimilem ad modum Origenes, Homilia xxvi. in Matthæum, cum adducat hujus epistolæ testimonium, non audet tamen ab adversario flagitare, ut Pauli videatur, ac remittit pene ut sit eo loco, quo liber qui inscribitur, Secreta Esaïæ. Et Augustinus citaturus hujus epistolæ testimonium, De Civitate Dei libro xvi. capite xxii., præfatur hunc in modum: 'De quo, in epistola quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos, quam plures apostoli Pauli esse dicunt, quidam vero negant, multa et magna conscripta sunt.' Quin idem alias frequenter adducens hujus epistolæ testimonium, 'Scriptum est,' inquit, 'in epistola ad Hebræos,' omisso Pauli nomine: 'Sic intellectum est in epistola ad Hebræos:' et, 'De illo etiam in epistola legitur, quæ inscribitur ad Hebræos.' Hæc atque hujusmodi cum plus centies occurrant, nusquam, quod sane meminerim, citat Pauli nomine, cum in cæteris citationibus Pauli titulum libenter sit solitus addere. Ambrosius licet in hanc unam non ediderit Commentarios, tamen ejus testimoniis non infrequenter utitur, et videtur eam Paulo tribuere. Quin Origenes apud Eusebium testatur a plerisque dubitatum, an hæc epistola esset germana Pauli, præsertim ob stili dissonantiam, quanquam ipse Paulo fortiter asserit: locus est Ecclesiasticæ Historiæ libro vi. capite xvii. Rursus ejusdem libri capite xv. narrat, apud Latinos hanc epistolam non fuisse tributam Paulo apostolo. Restat jam argumentum illud, quo non aliud certius, stilus ipse, et orationis character, qui nihil habet affinitatis cum phrasi Paulina. Nam quod afferunt hic quidam, Paulum ipsum Hebraice scripsisse, cæterum Lucam argumentum epistolæ, quam memoria tenebat, suis explicuisse verbis, quantum valeat, viderint alii. Neque enim in verbis solum aut figuris discrimen est, sed omnibus notis dissidet. Et ut Paulus Græce scribens multum ex idiomate sermonis Hebræici retulit, ita et in hac, quam ut volunt isti scripsit Hebraice, nonnulla sermonis illius vestigia residerent.

Quid quod ne Lucas quidem ipse in actis apostolorum, hoc est in argumento, quod facile recipit orationis ornamenta, parum abest ab hujus epistolæ eloquentia. Equidem haud interponam hoc loco meam sententiam. Cæterum admodum probabile est quod subindicavit divus Hieronymus in Catalogo Scriptorum Illustrum, Clementem, Romanum Pontificem a Petro quartum, auctorem hujus epistolæ fuisse. Clementis enim meminit Paulus, et hic Timothei facit mentionem. Sed præstat, opinor, ipsa Hieronymi verba super hac re adscribere: ‘Scripsit,’ inquit, ‘nempe Clemens sub persona Romanæ ecclesiæ ad ecclesiam Corinthiorum valde utilem epistolam, quæ et in nonnullis locis publice legitur, quæ mihi videtur characteri epistolæ, quæ sub Pauli nomine ad Hebræos fertur convenire. Sed et multis de eadem epistola non solum sensibus, sed juxta verborum quoque ordinem abutitur. Omnino grandis in utraque similitudo est.’ Hactenus divus Hieronymus, satis civiliter indicans prudenti doctoque lectori, quid ipse suspicetur. Idem in epistola ad Dardanum testatur hanc a Latinis non fuisse receptam sed a plerisque Græcis scriptoribus hactenus receptam, ut crederent esse viri ecclesiastici, Pauli tamen esse negarent: sed Barnabæ potius aut Clementi tribuerent, aut juxta nonnullos Lucæ, quod idem diligenter annotavit Hieronymus in Pauli Catalogo. Ex his dilucidum est, ætate Hieronymi Romanam ecclesiam nondum recepisse auctoritatem hujus epistolæ: et Græcos qui recipiebant judicasse non esse Pauli: denique Hieronymus ad Dardanum negat referre cujus sit, quum sit ecclesiastici viri. Et tamen hodie sunt qui plusquam hæreticum esse putant si quis dubitet de auctore epistolæ, non ob aliud, nisi quod in templis additur Pauli titulus. Si ecclesia certo definit esse Pauli, captivo libens intellectum meum in obsequium fidei: quod ad sensum meum attinet, non videtur illius esse, ob causas quas hic reticuisse præstiterit. Et si certo scirem non esse Pauli, res indigna est digladiatione. Nec hac de re tantum verborum facerem, nisi quidam ex re nihili tantos excitarent tumultus.”

Other passages to the same effect are cited in Bleek.

98. LUTHER spoke still more plainly. In his introduction to his version of the Epistle, he maintains that it cannot be St. Paul's, nor indeed the writing of any Apostle: appealing to such passages as ch. ii. 3; vi. 4 ff.; x. 26 ff.; xii. 17. But whose it is, he does not there pretend to say, further than that it comes from some scholar of the Apostles, well versed in the Scriptures. And with this view his manner of citation is generally consistent. His well-known conjecture, that the Writer of the Epistle was Apollos, is expressed in his Commentary on Genesis xlviii. 20: “Auctor epistolæ ad Hebræos, quisquis est, sive Paulus, sive, ut ego arbitror, Apollo, eruditissime

allegat hunc locum." In his Epistel a. Christent. Hebr. i. 1 ff. the following occurs:—

Das ist eine starke, mächtige und hohe Epistel, die da hoch herfähret und treibet den hohen Artikel des Glaubens von der Gottheit Christi, und ist ein glaubwürdiger Wahn, sie sei nicht St. Pauli, darum daß sie eine geschmücktere Rede führet, denn St. Paulus an andern Orten gepflegt. Etliche meinen sie sei St. Lucä, etliche St. Apollo, welchen St. Lucas rühmet, wie er in der Schrift mächtig sei gewesen wider die Juden, Apgs. xviii. 24. Es ist ja wahr, daß keine Epistel mit solcher Gewalt die Schrift führet, als diese, daß ein trefflicher apostolischer Mann gewesen ist, er sei auch wer er wolle.

99. Here he seems to imply that others had already conjectured Apollos to be the author. But this does not appear to be so: and he may, as Bleek imagines, be merely referring to opinions of learned men of his own day, who had either suggested, or adopted his own view.

100. CALVIN'S opinion was equally unfavourable to the Pauline authorship. While in his Institutes he ordinarily cites the Epistle as the words of "the Apostle," and defends its apostolicity in the argument to his commentary ("Ego vero eam inter apostolicas sine controversia amplector, nec dubito, Satanæ artificio fuisse quondam factum, ut illi auctoritatem quidam detraherent"), yet he sometimes cites the "autor epistolæ ad Hebræos;" and when he comes to the question itself, declares his view very plainly:—

"Quis porro eam composuerit, non magnopere curandum est. Putarunt alii Paulum esse, alii Lucam, alii Barnabam, alii Clementem.—Scio Chrysostomi tempore passim inter Paulinos a Græcis fuisse receptum: sed Latini aliter senserunt, maxime qui propiores fuerunt apostolorum temporibus. Ego ut Paulum agnoscam autorem, adduci nequeo. Nam qui dicunt, nomen fuisse de industria suppressum, quod odiosum esset Judæis, nihil afferunt. Cur enim mentionem fecisset Timothei, si ita esset? hoc enim indicio se probebat. Sed ipsa docendi ratio et stilus alium quam Paulum esse satis testantur: et scriptor unum se ex apostolorum discipulis profitetur c. 2, quod est a Paulina consuetudine longe alienum."

And similarly on ch. ii. 3 itself:—

"Hic locus indicio est, epistolam a Paulo non fuisse compositam. Neque enim tam humiliter loqui solet, ut se unum fateatur ex apostolorum discipulis: neque id ambitione, sed quia improbi ejusmodi prætextu tantundem detrahare ejus doctrinæ moliebantur. Apparet igitur non esse Paulum, qui ex auditu se habere evangelium scribit, non autem ex revelatione."

See also his comment on ch. xii. 13.

101. Very similar are the comments of BEZA, at least in his earlier

editions : for all the passages quoted by Bleek, from his introduction, on ch. ii. 3 and xiii. 26, as being in his own edition of Beza 1582, and from Spanheim, as not extant in that edition, are, in the edition of 1590, which I use, expunged, and other comments, favourable to the Pauline origin, substituted for them.

102. And this change of opinion in Beza only coincided with influences which both in the Romish and in the Protestant churches soon repressed the progress of intelligent criticism and free expression of opinion. Cardinal Cajetan was severely handled by Ambrosius Catharinus, who accused him of the same doubts in relation to this Epistle as those entertained by Julian respecting the Gospel of St. Matthew : Erasmus was attacked by the theologians of the Sorbonne in a censure which concludes thus³: "*Mira autem arrogantia atque pertinacia est hujus scriptoris, quod, ubi tot catholici doctores, pontifices, concilia declarant, hanc epistolam esse Pauli, et idem universalis ecclesiæ usus ac consensus comprobant, hic scriptor adhuc dubitat tanquam toto orbe prudentior.*" And finally the council of Trent, in 1546, closed up the question for Romanists by declaring, "*Testamenti Novi . . . quatuordecim epistolæ Pauli apostoli, ad Romanos &c. . . ad Hebræos.*" So that the best divines of that church have since then had only that way open to them of expressing an intelligent judgment, which holds the matter of the Epistle to be St. Paul's, but the style and arrangement that of some other person : so Bellarmine, *De Controversiis*, Paris, 1613, fol. pp. 51 f. : so Estius, in his introduction to the Epistle, which is well worth reading, as a remarkable instance of his ability and candour :—

"*Cum aliis omnino dicendum arbitramur, subjectum sive materiam totius epistolæ, simul et ordinem a Paulo fuisse subministratum, sed compositionem et ornatum esse cujusdam alterius, cujus opera Paulus utendum putaverit, sive Clemens Romanus is fuerit, sive Lucas individuus apostoli comes et laborum socius, quod magis est verisimile.*"

At the end of the same chapter of his introduction he enquires at length, "*an sit fidei, Paulum esse auctorem : an hæreticum sit, aliter sentire.*" And he concludes, "*temerarium esse, si quis epistolam ad Hebræos negaret esse Pauli apostoli, sed hæreticum ob id solum pronuntiare non ausim :*" giving as his own opinion, "*Neque vero dubitamus an Paulus apostolus materiam scribendæ hujus epistolæ suppeditaverit, ordinemque præscripserit, sed an ipse sit auctor scriptionis seu compositionis.*"

103. In the Protestant churches we find, as might be expected, a longer prevalence of free judgment on the matter. It will be seen by

³ Erasm. Opp. Lugd. Bat. 1706, vol. ix. fol. 865.

the copious citations in Bleek (pp. 254 ff.), that Melancthon remained ever consistent in quoting the Epistle simply as “*epistola ad Hebræos* :” that the Magdeburg Centuriators distinctly denied the Pauline origin (“*His et similibus rationibus mota prudens vetustas, quæ omnia ad ἀναλογίαν fidei examinare solita est, de epistola ad Hebræos jure dubitasse videtur*”) : that Brenz, in the *Confessio Wirtembergica*, distinguishes in his citations this Epistle from those of St. Paul.

104. At the same time we find inconsistency on the point in Brenz himself : in the Commentary on the Epistle written by his son, the Pauline authorship is maintained : also by Flacius Illyricus (1557) on a priori grounds. In the Concordien-Formel, the Epistle is cited in the original German without any name, whereas in the Latin version we have “*apostolus ait*,” and the like. And this latter view continued to gain ground. It is maintained by Gerhard (1641) and Calov. (1676) : and since the middle of the seventeenth century has been the prevailing view in the Lutheran church.

105. In the Calvinistic or Reformed Church, the same view became prevalent even earlier. Of its various confessions, the *Gallican*, it is true, sets the Epistle at the end of those of St. Paul, thus : . . . “*ad Titum una, ad Philemonem una : epistola ad Hebræos, Jacobi epistola* :” but the Belgic, Helvetic, and Bohemian Confessions cite and treat it as St. Paul’s.

106. The exceptions to this prevailing view were found in certain Arminian divines, who, without impugning the authority of the Epistle, did not bind themselves to a belief of its Pauline origin. Such were Grotius, who inclines to the belief that it was written by St. Luke : Le Clerc, who holds Apollos to have been the Author : Limborch, who holds it to have been written “*ab aliquo e Pauli comitibus, et quidem conscio Paulo, . . . atque e doctrina Pauli haustum* :” and among the Socinians, Schlichting, who says of it—

“*Licet Paulum ipsum autorem non habuerit, ex ejus tamen, ut sic dicam, officina prodierit, h. e. ab aliquo ex ejus sociis et comitibus fortassis etiam Pauli instinctu ac, ut ita dicam, spiritu scripta fuerit.*”

107. There was also a growing disposition, both in the Romish and in the reformed churches, to erect into an article of faith the Pauline origin, and to deal severely with those who presumed to doubt it. Many learned men, especially among Protestants, appeared as its defenders : among whom we may especially notice Spanheim (the younger, 1659), Braun and D’Outrein in Holland, our own Owen (1667), Mill (1707), Hallet (the younger, 1727), Carpzov (1750), Sykes (1755), J. C. Wolf (1734), and Andr. Cramer (1757), to whom Bleek adjudges the first place among the upholders of the Pauline authorship.

108. Since the middle of the last century, the ancient doubts have revived in Germany ; and in the progress of more extended and accurate critical enquiry, have now become almost universal. The first that carefully treated the matter with this view was Semler (1763), in his edition of Baumgarten's Commentary on the Epistle. Then followed Michaelis, in the later editions of his Introduction : in the earlier, he had assumed the Pauline authorship. The same doubts were repeated and enforced by Ziegler, J. E. C. Schmidt (1804), Eichhorn (1812), Bertholdt (1819), David Schulz (who carried the contrast which he endeavours to establish between the Writer of this Epistle and St. Paul to an unreasonable length, and thereby rather hindered than helped that side of the argument), Seyfferth (who sets himself to demonstrate from the Epistle itself, that it cannot have been written by St. Paul, but has no hypothesis respecting the Writer), Böhme (who holds Silvanus to have been the Writer, from similarities which he traces between our Epistle and 1 Peter, the Greek of which he holds also to have proceeded from him), De Wette (who inclines to Apollos as the author, but sees an improbability in his ever having been in so close a relation to the Jewish Christians of Palestine), Tholuck (whose very valuable and candid enquiry in his last edition results in a leaning towards Apollos as the Writer), Bleek (whose view is mainly the same), Wieseler (who supports Barnabas as the probable Writer), Lünemann (who strongly upholds Apollos), Ebrard (who holds St. Paul to have been the Author, St. Luke the Writer), Delitzsch (who holds St. Luke to have been the Writer).

109. The principal modern upholders of the purely Pauline authorship in Germany have been Bengel (+ 1752), Storr (1789), and recently Hofmann.

110. In our own country, the belief of the direct Pauline origin, though much shaken at the Reformation⁴, has recovered its ground far more extensively. The unwillingness to disturb settled opinion on the one hand, and it may be the disposition of our countrymen to take up opinions in furtherance of strong party bias, and their consequent inaptitude for candid critical research on the other, have mainly contributed to this result. Most of our recent Theologians and Commentators are to be found on this side. Among these may be mentioned Whitby, Macknight, Doddridge, Lardner, Stuart (American), Forster (Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews), and Bishop Wordsworth, in the third vol. of his Greek Testament ; also Conybeare and Howson (Life of St. Paul), but doubtingly, and Davidson (Introd. to N. T.), who holds that St. Luke co-operated with the Apostle in making the Epistle what it now appears.

111. I am obliged, before passing to the internal grounds on which

⁴ See the opinions of several of the Reformers below, § vi. 17 ff.

the question is to be treated, to lay down again the position in which we are left by the preceding sketch of the history of opinion.

112. It is manifest that with testimony so divided, *antiquity cannot claim to close up the enquiry*: nor can either side allege its voice as decisive. In the very earliest times, we find the Epistle received by some as St. Paul's: in the same times, we find it ascribed by others, and those men of full as much weight, to various other authors.

113. I briefly thus restate what has already been insisted on in paragraphs 35—40, because the time has not yet entirely passed by, when writers on the subject regard our speculations concerning the probable author of the Epistle as limited by these broken fragments of the rumours of antiquity: when a zealous and diligent writer among ourselves allows himself to treat with levity and contempt the opinion that Apollos wrote it, simply on the ground that he is a claimant "altogether unnoticed by Christian antiquity⁵." What we require is this: that we of this age should be allowed to do just that which the ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες did in their age,—examine the Epistle simply and freely for and by itself, and form our conclusion accordingly, as to its Author, readers, and date: having respect indeed to ancient tradition, where we can find it, but not, where it is so broken, and inconsistent with itself, bound by any one of its assertions, or limited in our conclusions by its extent.

114. I now proceed to the latter and more important portion of our enquiry: whether the internal phenomena of the Epistle itself point to St. Paul as its Author and Writer,—or Author without being the Writer,—and if they do not either of these, whom, as an Author, their general character may be regarded as indicating.

115. But as this portion is most important, so has it been most diligently and ingeniously followed out by disputants on both sides. And it is not my intention to enter here on the often-fought battle of comparisons of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, and tabular statements of words and phrases. The reader will find these given at great length and with much fairness in Davidson, who holds the balance evenly between previous disputants. And if he wishes to go still further into so wide a field of discussion, he may consult Mr. Forster's large volume, which is equally fertile in materials for both conclusions, often without the writer being conscious that it is so⁶.

116. The various items of evidence on this head will be presented to

⁵ See Forster's Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Dedication, p. ix.

⁶ As e.g. when he alleges, which he often does, the same thought expressed by different words, or different cognate forms of the same root, in Hebrews and the Pauline Epistles, as indicating *identity* of authorship. The conclusion of most examiners of evidence would be in the opposite direction.

my reader in the references throughout the Epistle. He will there see, as indeed from the tables in any of the writers on the subject,—how like, and yet how unlike, the style of our Epistle is to that of the great Apostle: how completely the researches of such books as Mr. Forster's have succeeded in proving the likeness, how completely at the same time they have failed to remove one iota of the unlikeness: so that the more we read and are borne along with their reasonings, the closer the connexion becomes, in faith and in feeling, of the writer of the Epistle with St. Paul, but the more absolutely incompatible the personal identity: the more we perceive all that region of style and diction to have been in common between them, which men living together, talking together, praying together, teaching together, would naturally range in; but all that region wherein individual peculiarity is wont to put itself forth, to have been entirely distinct.

117. I need only mention, as an indication to the student how to arrive at such convictions for himself, the different tinge given to the same or similar thoughts; the wholly differing rhythm of sentences wherein perhaps many words occur in common; the differing spirit of citation (to say nothing of the varying *modus citandi*); the totally distinct mode of arguing; the rhetorical accumulation; the equilibrium, even in the midst of fervid declamation, of periods and clauses; the use of different inferential and connecting particles. All of these great and undeniable variations may be easily indeed frittered down by an appearance of exceptions ranged in tables; but still are indelibly impressed on the mind of every intelligent student of the Epistle, and as has been observed, are unanswerable, just in proportion as the points of similarity are detailed and insisted on⁷.

118. It is again of course easy enough to meet such considerations in either of two ways; the former of which recommends itself to the mind which fears to enquire from motives of reverence, the latter to the superficial and indolent.

119. It may be said, that the Holy Spirit of God, by whose inspiration holy men have written these books of the New Testament, may bring it about, that the same person may write variously at different times, even be that variety out of the limits of human experience; that the same man, for instance, should have written the Epistle to the Romans and the First Epistle of St. John. In answer to which we may safely say, that what the Holy Spirit *may* or *can* do, is not for us to speculate upon: in this His proceeding of inspiration, He has given us abundant and undeniable examples of what He *has done*; and by such examples are we to be guided, in all questions as to the analogy of His proceedings in more doubtful cases. As matter of fact, the style

⁷ See this carried out further below, § v. 9, 10.

and diction of St. Paul differ as much from those of St. John as can well be conceived. When therefore we find in the sacred writings phænomena of difference apparently incompatible with personal identity in their authors, we are not to be precluded from reasoning from them to the non-identity of such authors, by any vague assertions of the omnipotence of the Almighty Spirit.

120. Again it may be strongly urged, that the same person, writing at different times, and to different persons, may employ very various modes of diction and argument. Nothing can be truer than this : but the application of it to the question of identity of authorship is matter of penetration and appreciation. Details of diversity which may be convincing to one man, may be wholly inappreciable, from various reasons, by another. As regards the matter before us, it may suffice to say, that the incompatibility of styles was felt in the earliest days by Greeks themselves, as the preceding testimonies from Clement of Alexandria and Origen may serve to shew. Further than this we can say nothing which will be allowed as of any weight by those who unfortunately fail to appreciate the difference. We can only repeat our assurance, that the more acumen and scholarship are brought to bear on the enquiry, aided by a fairly judging and unbiassed mind, the more such incompatibility will be felt : and say, in the words of Origen cited above, par. 19, *ὅτι ὁ χαρακτήρ τῆς λέξεως . . . οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, . . . πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφοράς ὁμολογῆσαι ἂν.*

121. I now proceed to consider the principal notices in the Epistle itself, which have been either justly or unjustly adduced, as making for or against the Pauline authorship.

122. In ch. xiii. 23, we read, *γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐν τάχῳ ἐρχεται, ὁψομαι ὑμᾶς.* This notice has been cited with equal confidence on both sides. The natural inference from it, apart altogether from the controversy, would be, that the Writer of the Epistle was in some other place than Timotheus, who had been recently set free from an imprisonment (for this and no other is the meaning of the participle), and that he was awaiting Timotheus's arrival : on which, if it took place soon, he hoped to visit the Hebrews in his company.

123. It is manifest, that such a situation would fit very well some point of time after St. Paul's liberation from his first Roman imprisonment. Supposing that he was dismissed before Timotheus, and, having left Rome, expecting him to follow, had just received the news of his liberation, the words in the text would very well and naturally express this. It is true, we read of no such imprisonment of Timotheus : and this fact seems to remove the date of the occurrence out of the limits of the chronology of the Pauline Epistles. But if the command of the

Apostle in 2 Tim. iv. 9 was obeyed, and Timotheus, on arriving, shared his imprisonment, the situation here alluded to may have occurred not long after.

124. On the other hand, the notice would equally well fit some companion of St. Paul, either St. Luke, or Silvanus, or Apollos, writing after the Apostle's death. All these would speak of Timotheus as ὁ ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν.

125. On the whole then, this passage carries no weight on either side. I own that the ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς has a tinge of authority about it, which hardly seems to fit either of the above-mentioned persons. But this impression may be fallacious: and it is only one of those cases where, in a matter so doubtful as the authorship of this Epistle, we are swayed hither and thither by words and expressions, which perhaps after all have no right to be so seriously taken.

126. Similar remarks might be made on the notice of ch. xiii. 25, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας, as carrying no weight either way. As regards its meaning, it is indeed surprising that Bleek should maintain, that it *excludes* the supposition of the writer being in Italy, in the face of the classical and N. T. usage of the prepositions of origin,—ὁ ἐκ Πελοποννήσου πόλεμος,—Λάζαρος ὁ ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, and the like. The preposition may doubtless be taken as used with reference to those who were to receive the salutation: it may be the salutation, not the persons, which the preposition brings away from Italy. It may be as if I were to write to a friend, 'I have the best wishes for you from Canterbury:' which, although it would not be the most usual way of expressing my meaning, and *might* be said if I were elsewhere, yet would be far from excluding the supposition that I was myself writing from that city⁸.

127. If the words then do not forbid the idea that the Writer was in Italy, I do not see how they can be used for or against the Pauline authorship. As observed before, the Apostle may have been somewhere in that country waiting for Timotheus, when liberated, to join him. And we may say the same with equal probability of any of St. Paul's companions to whom the Epistle has been ascribed. The only evidence which can be gathered from the words, as being exceedingly unlike any thing occurring in the manifold formulæ of salutation in St. Paul's Epistles, is of a slighter, but to my mind of a more decisive kind.

128. The evidence supposed to be derivable from ch. x. 34 (rec.), καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου συνεπαθήσατε, vanishes with the adoption of the reading τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε, in which almost all the critical editors concur.

⁸ That N. T. usage renders the other meaning *more probable*, does not belong to the argument here in the text, but is maintained below, in § ii. 28.

129. The notice ch. xiii. 7, *μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ.*, will more properly come under consideration when we are treating of the probable readers, and of the date of the Epistle⁹. I may say thus much in anticipation, that it can hardly be fairly interpreted consistently with the known traditions of the death of St. Paul, and at the same time with the hypothesis of his authorship.

130. The well-known passage, ch. ii. 3, requires more consideration. It stands thus :—

πῶς ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τηλικαύτης ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας, ἥτις ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη;

The difficulty, that St. Paul should thus include himself among those who had received the gospel only at second hand, whereas in Gal. i. 12 he says of it, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, has been felt both in ancient and modern times. Euthalius, Œcumenius, and Theophylact, Luther, Calvin, and all the moderns have alleged it, either to press or to explain the difficulty. I must own that, in spite of all which has been so ingeniously said by way of explanation by the advocates of the Pauline authorship, the words appear to me quite irreconcilable with that hypothesis.

131. To pass by the ancient explanations, which will hardly be adopted in our own day¹,—the most prevalent modern one has been, that the Apostle here adopts the figure *συγκατάβασις*, or *communicatio*, by which a writer or speaker identifies himself with his readers or hearers, even though, as matter of actual fact, that identification is not borne out strictly. Such “*communication*” is most commonly found in hortatory passages, but is not confined to them. A writer may, for the purpose of his argument, and to carry persuasion, place himself on a level with his readers in respect of matters of history, just as well as of moral considerations. The real question for us is, whether this is a case in which such a figure would be likely to be employed.

132. And to this the answer must be, it seems to me, unhesitatingly in the negative. That an Apostle, who ever claimed to have received the gospel not from men but from the Lord himself,—who was care-

⁹ See below, § ii. 29, 30; § iii. 2.

¹ Œc.: *τινες δὲ οἱ ἀκούσαντες; οἱ θεσπέσιοι δηλονότι μαθηταί· ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίῃ, οὐ λέγει καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἀκηκοέναι παρὰ χριστοῦ, καίτοι ἤκουσεν.*

Thl.: *πῶς οὖν ἀλλαχοῦ οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων φησὶν ἀκούσαι; διότι ἐκεῖ μὲν μέγα καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἦν τὸ κατεπεῖγον αὐτὸν συστήσαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ μαθητῆς· διεβάλλετο γὰρ ὡς μὴ τοῦ κυρίου ἀκούσας· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκινδύνευε τὸ αὐτοῦ κήρυγμα παρὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἀπιστηθῆναι. νῦν δὲ οὐ τοσαύτη χρεία τούτου· οὔτε γὰρ Ἑβραίοις ἐκήρυξεν, οὔτε διεβάλλετο πρὸς τούτους ὡς ἀνθρώπων μαθητῆς, καὶ οὐχὶ χριστοῦ. ἢ ὅτι καὶ ἐν ταῦθα ἐπάγων· “συνεπιμαρτυροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ σημείοις καὶ τέρασι,” δέκνυσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ παρέλαβε ταῦτα.*

ful to state that when he met the chief Apostles in council they added nothing to him,—should at all, and especially in writing (as the hypothesis generally assumes) to the very church where the influence of those other Apostles was at its highest, place himself on a level with their disciples as to the reception of the gospel from them,—is a supposition so wholly improbable, that I cannot explain its having been held by so many men of discernment, except on the supposition that their bias towards the Pauline authorship has blinded them to the well-known character and habit of the Apostle.

133. And to reply to this, that he thus speaks of himself when his Apostolical authority is called in question, as it was in the Galatian church, and partially also in the Corinthian, but does not so where no such slight had been put upon his office, is simply to advance that which is not the fact : for he does the same in an emphatic manner in Eph. iii. 2, 3, *εἶγε ἠκούσατε τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς δοθείσης μοι εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὅτι κατὰ ἀποκάλυψιν ἐγνωρίσθη μοι τὸ μυστήριον κ.τ.λ.* : in which Epistle, to whomsoever addressed, there exist no traces of any rivalry to his own authority being in his view.

134. Certain other passages have been adduced as bearing out the idea of *συγκατάβασις* here. But none of them, when fairly considered, really does so. For to take them one by one :—

In Eph. ii. 3 : Col. i. 12, 13 : Titus iii. 3, there is no such figure, but the Apostle is simply stating the matter of fact, and counts himself to have been one of those spoken of.

In 1 Cor. xi. 31, 32, he is asserting that which is true of all Christians equally ; himself as liable to fall into sin and thus to need chastisement, being included.

In 1 Thess. iv. 17,—where see note,—there is no such figure, for the Apostle is merely giving expression to the expectation that he himself should be among them who should be alive in the flesh at the coming of our Lord.

In Jude, ver. 17, there is no such figure. St. Jude, in writing thus, is giving us plain proof that he himself was not one of the Apostles.

135. Much stress has been laid, and duly, on the entire absence of personal notices of the Writer, as affecting the question of the Pauline authorship. This is so inconsistent with the otherwise invariable practice of St. Paul, that some very strong reason must be supposed, which should influence him in this case to depart from that practice. Such reason has been variously assigned. And first, with reference to the omission of any superscription or opening greeting. It has been supposed that he would not begin by designating himself as an Apostle, because the Lord Himself was the Apostle (ch. iii. 1) of the Jewish people (so Pantænus, above, par. 11). Or, because the Jewish Christians in Palestine were unwilling to recognize him as such, only as an

Apostle to the Gentiles (so Theodoret, Proœm. Ep. ad Hebr.: and al.). But to this it might be answered, Why then not superscribe himself δούλος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ or the like, as in Phil. i. 1 and Philem. 1, or simply Παῦλος, as in 1 and 2 Thess.? But a further reply has been given, and very widely accepted: that being in disfavour among the Jews, he did not prefix his name, for fear of exciting a prejudice against his Epistle, and so perhaps preventing the reading of it altogether. (So Clement of Alexandria, above, par. 14. So also Chrys. (Homil. iii. p. 371), καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τῆς Παύλου σοφίας· ἵνα γὰρ μὴ μετὰσχη τοῦ μίσους τὰ γράμματα, καθάπερ προσωπεῖω τινὶ τῇ τοῦ δνόματος ἀφαιρέσει κρύψας ἑαυτόν, οὕτως αὐτοῖς λανθανόντως τὸ τῆς παραινέσεως ἐπιτίθησι φάρμακον· ὅταν γὰρ πρὸς τινα ἀηδῶς ἔχωμεν, κὰν ὑγιές τι λέγῃ, οὐ προθύμως οὐδὲ μεθ' ἡδονῆς δεχόμεθα τὰ λεγόμενα· ὅπερ οὖν, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τότε συμβῇ, ἀφέλῃ τὴν ἰδίαν προσηγορίαν τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ὥστε μηδὲν τοῦτο γενέσθαι κώλυμα τῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἀκροάσει· οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄπιστοι μόνον Ἰουδαῖοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πιστεύσαντες αὐτοὶ ἐμίσουν αὐτόν καὶ ἀπεστρέφοντο.) But this cannot have been the purpose of the Author throughout, as is sufficiently shewn by such notices as those of ch. xiii. 18, 19, 23, which would have been entirely without meaning, had the readers not been aware, who was writing to them. Yet, it is said, these notices do not occur till the end of the Epistle, when the important part of it has already been read through. Are we then to suppose that St. Paul seriously did in this case, that which he ironically puts as an hypothesis in 2 Cor. xii. 16, *ὑπάρχων πανοῦργος, δόλω ὑμᾶς ἔλαβον*? And if he did it, how imperfectly and clumsily! Could he not as easily have removed *all* traces of his own hand in the Epistle, as those at the beginning only? And how are we to suppose that the Epistle came to the church to which it was addressed? Did he put it in at a window, or over a wall? Must it not have come by the hand of some friend or companion? Must it not have been given into the hand of some *ἡγούμενος*? How happened it that the question was never asked, From whom does this come? or if asked, how could it be answered but in one way? And when thus answered, how could it fail but the Epistle would thenceforth be known as that of St. Paul?

136. It may be said that these last enquiries would prove too much: that they would equally apply, whoever wrote the Epistle: and that the name of the Author was, on the view which they imply, equally sure to have been attached to it. But we may well answer, that this, however plausible, is not so in reality. It does not follow, because the name of the great Apostle was sure to be generally attached to it if he really wrote it, that every other name was equally sure. Many of his disciples and companions, eminent as they were, bore no authority to be compared with his. This is true even of St. Luke and Barnabas: much more of Titus, Silas, and Clement. And if one of these had been the

acknowledged author, there being no notices in the Epistle itself whereby he might be with certainty recognized after the first circumstances of its sending were forgotten, how probable, that a writing, committed to the keeping of a particular church, should have been retained indeed as a sacred deposit by them, but, in the midst of persecutions and troubles, have lost the merely traditional designation which never had become inseparable from it. In the one case, the name of St. Paul would commend the Epistle, and so would take the first, and an inalienable place: in the other, the weight and preciousness of the Epistle would survive the name of its Writer, which would not of itself have been its commendation. The like might have happened to the Gospel, or Acts, of St. Luke, but for the fact, that in this case not one particular church, but the whole Christian world, was the guardian of the deposit, and of the tradition attached to it.

137. Another solution has been suggested by Steudel: that the book has more the character of a treatise than of an Epistle, and therefore was not begun in epistolary form: some letter being probably sent with it, or the customary personal messages being orally delivered. But the postulate may be safely denied. Our Epistle is veritably an Epistle: addressed to readers of whom certain facts were specially true, containing exhortations founded on those facts, and notices arising out of the relation of the writer to his readers; which last sufficiently shew, that no other Epistle could have accompanied it, nor indeed any considerable trusting to the oral supplementing of its notices.

138. Yet another solution has been given by Hug and Spanheim: that in an oratorical style like that of the opening of this Epistle, it was not probable that a superscription would precede. True: but what, when conceded, does this indicate? Is it not just as good an argument to shew that one who never begins his Epistles thus, is not the Writer, as to account for his beginning thus, supposing him the Writer? The reason for our Epistle beginning as it does, is unquestionably, the character of the whole, containing few personal notices of the relation of the Writer to his readers. But granted, as we have sufficiently shewn, that it was not the object of the Author to remain unknown to his readers, I ask any one capable of forming an unbiassed judgment, is it possible that were St. Paul that author, and any conceivable Hebrew church those readers, no more notices should be found, not perhaps of his apostleship, but of the revelations of the Lord to him, of his pure intent and love towards them? Any one who can suppose this, appears to me, I own,—however it may savour of presumption to say so,—deficient in appreciation of the phænomena of our Epistle, and still more of the character of the great Apostle himself.

139. In Bleek's Introduction to his Commentary, on which, in the main features, this part of my Prolegomena is founded, several inte-

resting considerations are here adduced as bearing on the question of the authorship, arising out of the manner in which various points which arise are dealt with, as compared with the manner usual with St. Paul. Such considerations are valuable, and come powerfully in aid of a conclusion otherwise forced upon us: but when that conclusion is not acquiesced in, they are easily diluted away by its opponents. They are rather confirmatory than conclusive: and have certainly not had justice done them by the supporters of the Pauline hypothesis; who, as they seem to themselves to have answered one after another of them, represent each in succession as the main ground on which the anti-pauline view is rested.

140. I would refer my English readers for the discussion of these points to Dr. Davidson's Introduction to the N. T., vol. iii., where they are for the most part treated fairly, though hardly with due appreciation of their necessarily subordinate place in the argument. The idea which a reader, otherwise uninformed, would derive from Dr. Davidson's paragraphs, is that those who allege these considerations make them at least co-ordinate with others, of which they in reality only come in aid.

141. The same may be said of the whole mass of evidence resting on modes of citation, ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, style of periods, and the like. It abounds on the one hand with striking coincidences, on the other with striking discrepancies: each of these has been made much of by the ardent fautors of each side,—while the more impartial Commentators have weighed both together. The general conclusion in my own mind derived from these is, that the author of this Epistle cannot have been the same with the author of the Pauline Epistles. The coincidences are for the most part those which belong to men of the same general cast of thought on the great matters in hand: the discrepancies are in turns of expression, use of different particles, different rhythm, different compounds of cognate words, a mode of citation not independent but rather divergent,—and a thousand minor matters which it is easy for those to laugh to scorn who are incapable of estimating their combined evidence, but which when combined render the hypothesis of one and the same author entirely untenable.

142. To the phenomena of citation in our Epistle I shall have occasion to advert very soon, when dealing with the enquiry who the author really was. (See below, parr. 149, 152, 158, 180.) The reader will find them treated at great length in Bleek, Davidson, and Forster.

143. Before advancing to clear the way for that enquiry by other considerations, I will beg the reader to look back with me once more over the *course and bearing of the external evidence as regards the Pauline hypothesis*.

144. The recognition of the Epistle as Pauline begins about the
48]

middle of the second century, and, in one portion only of the church—the Alexandrine. Did this rest on an original historical tradition? We have seen reason to conclude the negative. Was it an inference from the subject and contents of the Epistle, which, when once made, gained more and more acceptance, from the very nature of the case? This, on all grounds, is more probable. Had an ancient tradition connected the name of St. Paul with it, we should find that name so connected not in one portion only, but in every part of the church. This however we do not find. We have no trace of its early recognition as Pauline elsewhere than in Alexandria. And even there, the earliest testimonies imply that there was doubt on the subject. Elsewhere, various opinions prevailed. Tertullian gives us Barnabas: Origen mentions two views, pointing to St. Luke and to Clement of Rome. None of these claim our acceptance as grounded on authentic historical tradition. But each of them has as much right to be heard and considered, as the Alexandrine. And the more, because that was so easy a deduction from the contents of the Epistle, and so sure to be embraced generally, whereas they had no such source, and could have no such advantage.

145. But there was one view of our Epistle, which never laboured under the uncertainty and insufficient reception which may be charged against the others: viz. that entertained by the church of Rome. It is true, its testimony is only negative: it amounts barely to this—"the Epistle is not St. Paul's." But this evidence it gives "semper, ubique, ab omnibus." And its testimony is of a date and kind which far outweighs the Alexandrine, or any other. Clement of Rome, the disciple of the Apostles, refers frequently and copiously to our Epistle, not indeed by name, but so plainly and unmistakeably that no one can well deny it. He evidently knew the Epistle well and used it much and approvingly. Now, had he recognized it as written by St. Paul,—he might not indeed have *cited* it as such, seeing that unacknowledged centos of N. T. expressions are very common with him,—but is it conceivable that he should altogether have concealed such his recognition from the church over which he presided? Is it not *certain*, that had Clement received it as the work of St. Paul, we should have found that tradition dominant and firmly fixed in the Roman church? But that church is just the one, where we find no trace of such a tradition: a fact wholly irreconcilable with such recognition by Clement. And if Clement did not so recognize it, are we not thereby brought very much nearer the source itself, than by any reported opinion in the church of Alexandria?

146. I shall have occasion again to return to this consideration: I introduce it here to shew, that in freely proposing to ourselves the enquiry, 'Who wrote the Epistle?' as to be answered entirely

from the Epistle itself, we are not setting aside, but are strictly following, the earliest and weightiest historical testimonies respecting it, and the inferences to be deduced from them. And if any name seems to satisfy the requirements of the Epistle itself, those who in modern times suggested that name, and those who see reason to adopt it, are not to be held up to derision, as has been done by Mr. Forster, merely because that name was not suggested by any among the ancients. The question is as open now as it was in the second century. They had no reliable tradition: we have none. If an author is to be found, αὐτὸ δείξει.

147. With these remarks, I come now to the enquiries, (1) What data does the Epistle furnish for determining the Author? and (2) In what one person do those characteristics meet?

148. (1. α) *The WRITER of the Epistle is also the AUTHOR.* It is of course possible, that St. Paul may have imparted his thoughts to the Hebrew church by means of another. This may have been done in one of two ways: either by actual translation, or by transfusion of thought and argument: setting aside altogether the wholly unlikely hypothesis, that the Epistle was drawn up and sent as St. Paul's by some other, without his knowledge and consent.

149. But first, the Epistle IS NOT A TRANSLATION. The citations throughout, with one exception (noticed below, § ii. par. 35 note), are from the LXX, and are of such a kind, that the peculiarities of the LXX version are not unfrequently interwoven into the argument, and made to contribute towards the result: which would be impossible, had the Epistle existed primarily in Hebrew. Besides, the prevalence of alliterations and paronomasiæ, and the Greek rhythm, to which so many rhetorical passages owe their force, would of themselves compel us to this conclusion².

150. And secondly, there are insuperable difficulties in the way of the hypothesis of any such secondary authorship as has very commonly been assumed, from the time of Origen downwards. Against this militate in their full strength all the considerations derived from those differences of style and diction, which in this Epistle are inseparably interwoven into the argument: against this the whole arrangement and argumentation of the Epistle, which are very different from those of St. Paul, shewing an independence and originality which could hardly have been found in the work of one who wrote down the thoughts of another: against this also the few personal notices which occur, and which manifestly belong to the Author of the Epistle. Supposing St. Paul to be speaking by another in all other places, how are we to make the transition in these? The notices which on the hypothesis of

² See this treated more fully below, § v. parr. 1—8.

pure Pauline authorship, seemed difficult of explanation, appear to me absolutely to defy it, if the secondary authorship be supposed.

151. (β) *The Author of the Epistle was a Jew.* This, as far as I know, has never been doubted. The degree of intimate acquaintance shewn with the ceremonial law might perhaps have been acquired by a Gentile convert: but the manner in which he addresses his readers, evidently themselves Jews, is such as to forbid the supposition that he was himself a Gentile. Probability is entirely against such an address being used: and also entirely against the Epistle finding acceptance, if it had been used.

152. (γ) He was, however, *not a pure Jew*, speaking and quoting Hebrew: but a HELLENIST: a Jew brought up in Greek habits of thought, and in the constant use of the LXX version. His citations are from that version, and he grounds his argument, or places his reason for citing, on the words and expressions of the LXX, even where no corresponding terms are found in the Hebrew text.

153. (δ) *He was one intimately acquainted with the way of thought, and writings of St. Paul.* I need not stay here to prove this. The elaborate tables which have been drawn up to prove the Pauline authorship are here very valuable to us, as we found them before in shewing the differences between the two writers. Dr. Davidson, Mr. Forster, or Bleek, in his perhaps more pertinent selections from the mass, will in a few minutes establish this to the satisfaction of any intelligent reader. That our Author has more especially used one portion of the writings of the great Apostle, and why, will come under our notice in a following section.

154. (ε) And, considering the probable date of the Epistle, which I shall by anticipation assume to have been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, such a degree of acquaintance with the thoughts and writings of St. Paul could hardly, at such a time, have been the result of mere reading, but must have been derived from *intimate acquaintance*, as a companion and fellow-labourer, *with the great Apostle himself*. The same inference is confirmed by finding that our author was nearly connected with Timotheus, the son in the faith, and constant companion of St. Paul.

155. (ζ) It is moreover necessary to assume, that the Author of our Epistle was *deeply imbued with the thoughts and phraseology of the Alexandrian school*. The coincidences in thought and language between passages of this Epistle and the writings of Philo, are such as no one in his senses can believe to be fortuitous. These will for the most part be found noticed in the references, and the Commentary: those who wish to see them collected together, may consult Bleek, vol. i. pp. 398—402 note, where other sources of information on the subject are also pointed out, especially Carpzov, Exercit. Sacr. in S. Pauli Epist. ad

Heb. ex Philone Judæo (Amst. 1750). The reader may also refer to Loesner's more accessible work.

156. These coincidences may have arisen from one of two reasons : either merely from the Author being acquainted with the writings of Philo, or from his having been educated in the same theological school with that philosopher, and so having acquired similar ways of thought and expression. The latter of these alternatives is on all grounds, and mainly from the nature of the coincidences themselves, the more probable. By birth or by training, he was an Alexandrian; not necessarily the former, for there were other great schools of Alexandrian learning besides the central one in that city, one of the most celebrated of which was at Tarsus, the birth-place of the Apostle Paul. So that this consideration will not of itself fix the authorship on that companion of St. Paul whom we know to have been an Alexandrine by birth.

157. (γ) The author was *not an Apostle*, nor in the strictest sense a contemporary of the Apostles, so that he should have seen and heard our Lord for himself. He belongs to the second rank, in point of time, of apostolic men,—to those who heard from eye and ear-witnesses. This will follow from the consideration of the passage ch. ii. 3, in par. 130—132 above.

158. (θ) We may add to the above data some, which although less secure, yet seem to be matters of sound inference from the Epistle itself. Of such a character are, e. g. that the author was *not a dweller in or near Jerusalem*, or he would have taken his descriptions rather from the then standing Jewish temple, than from the ordinances in the text of the LXX :—that he was a person of considerable *note and influence with those to whom he wrote*, as may be inferred from the whole spirit and tone of his address to them : that he stood in some position of *previous connexion with his readers*, as appears from the ἀποκαταστάθῃ ἡμῶν, ch. xiii. 19: that he *lived and wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem*

159. (2.) It will be impossible to apply the whole of these data to the enquiry respecting individual men, without assuming, with regard to the last two mentioned at least, the result of the two following sections, 'For what readers the Epistle was written,' and 'The place and time of writing.' I shall therefore suspend the consideration of those Tests till the results shall have been arrived at³, and meantime apply the others to such persons as are given us by history to choose from.

160. These are the following : Barnabas, Luke, Clement, Mark, Titus, Apollos, Silvanus, Aquila. These are all the companions of St. Paul, who were of note enough to have written such an Epistle :

³ See below, § ii. 36, and § iii. 4.

with the exception of Timotheus, who is excluded from the list, by being mentioned in the Epistle (ch. xiii. 23) as a different person from the Author.

161. Of these, *TITUS* is excluded by the fact mentioned Gal. ii. 3,—that he was a Greek, and not circumcised even at the time when he accompanied St. Paul in his third journey to Jerusalem, Acts xv. 2, 3 ff.

162. It is doubtful, whether a like consideration does not exclude *ST. LUKE* from the authorship of our Epistle. Certainly the first appearance of Col. iv. 10—14 numbers him among those who were not of the circumcision. Were this so, it would be impossible to allot him more than a subordinate share in the composition. This has been felt, and the hypothesis which takes him to have been the writer has been shaped accordingly. Thus we have seen above Clement of Alexandria held him to have translated the Epistle into Greek⁴: and the idea that he wrote it under the superintendence of St. Paul, incorporating the thoughts of the great Apostle, has been of late revived and defended with considerable skill, by Delitzsch. And such, more or less modified, has been the opinion of many, both ancients and moderns: of Luculentius (cited in Delitzsch, p. 701, from Mai's *Scriptorum Veterum Nova Collectio* ix. p. 251), Primasius (cent. vi.), Haymo (+853), Rhabanus Maurus (cir. 847): and of Grotius, Crell, Stein, Köhler, Hug, Ebrard: several of the latter holding the independent authorship of St. Luke, which Delitzsch also concedes to have been possible.

163. And certainly, could we explain away the inference apparently unavoidable from Col. iv. 14, such a supposition would seem to have some support from the Epistle itself. The students of the following commentary will very frequently be struck by the verbal and idiomatic coincidences with the style of St. Luke. The argument, as resting on them, has been continually taken up and pushed forward by Delitzsch, and comes on his reader frequently with a force which at the time it is not easy to withstand.

164. Yet, it must be acknowledged, the hypothesis, though so frequently and so strongly supported by apparent coincidences, does not thoroughly approve itself to the critical mind. We cannot feel convinced that St. Luke did really write our Epistle. The whole tone of the individual mind, as far as it appears in the Gospel and Acts, is so essentially different from the spirit of the Writer here, that verbal and idiomatic coincidences do not carry us over the difficulty of supposing the two to be written by one and the same. There is nothing in St. Luke of the rhetorical balance, nothing of the accumulated and

⁴ See par. 14.

stately period⁵, nothing of the deep tinge, which would be visible even in narrative, of the threatening of judgment. Within the limits of the same heavenly inspiration prompting both, St. Luke is rather the careful and kindly depicter of the blessings of the covenant, our Writer rather the messenger from God to the wavering, giving them the blessing and the curse to choose between: St. Luke is rather the polished Christian civilian, our Writer the fervid and prophetic rhetorician. The places of the two are different: and it would shake our confidence in the consistency of human characteristics under the influence of the Holy Spirit, were we to believe Luke, the beloved Physician and Evangelist, to have become so changed, in the foundations and essentials of personal identity, as to have written this Epistle to the Hebrews.

165. If the preceding considerations have any weight, we must regard the coincidences above mentioned as the result of common education and manner of speech, and of common derivation of doctrine from the same personal source. St. Luke had derived his style from the same Alexandrine scholastic training, his doctrine from the same father in the faith, as the Writer of our Epistle.

166. It appears never to have been advanced as a serious hypothesis, that ST. MARK is the Writer of our Epistle. There are no points of coincidence between it and his Gospel, which would lead us to think so. He does not appear, after St. Paul's second missionary journey, ever to have been closely joined for any considerable time in travel or in missionary work with that Apostle: and again, he seems to have been a born Jerusalem Jew (Acts xii. 12: see Prolegg. Vol. I. ch. iii. § i.), which, by what has been before said, would exclude him.

167. The fact that SILVANUS, or Silas, belonged to the church at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22), would seem to exclude him also. In other points, our tests are satisfied by him. He was the constant companion of St. Paul: was imprisoned with him at Philippi (Acts xvi. 19 ff.), while Timotheus remained at large: is ever named by the Apostle before Timotheus (Acts xvii. 14, 15; xviii. 5: 2 Cor. i. 19: 1 Thess. i. 1: 2 Thess. i. 1): and afterwards is found in close connexion with St. Peter also (1 Pet. v. 12). It must be acknowledged, that as far as mere negative reasons are concerned, with only the one exception above named, there seems no cause why Silvanus may not have written our Epistle. But every thing approaching to a positive reason is altogether wanting. We know absolutely nothing of the man, his learning, his particular training, or the likelihood that he should have

⁵ This remark especially applies to that portion of St. Luke's writings which would be sure by the merely superficial observer to be cited as furnishing an answer to it: viz. the prologue of his Gospel. No two styles can be more distinct, than that of this preface, and of any equally elaborated passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

given us such an Epistle as we now possess. His claim is (with that one reservation) unexceptionable : but it must retire before that of any who is recommended by positive considerations ⁶.

168. A far stronger array of names and claims is made out for CLEMENT OF ROME, one of the *συγγεγοί* of St. Paul in Phil. iv. 3. We have seen above (par. 19), that his name was one brought down to Origen by the *φθάσασα εἰς ἡμᾶς ἱστορία*, together with that of St. Luke : we have found him mentioned as held by some to be the *translator*, e. g. by Euthalius (par. 46), Eusebius (par. 48) : the author, by Philastrius (par. 65), Jerome (par. 69), al. This latter has in modern times been the opinion of Erasmus (par. 97), and of Calvin (par. 100).

169. We cannot pronounce with any certainty whether Clement was a Jew by birth or not. The probability is against such a supposition. The advocates of this theory however rest his claim mainly on the fact that many expressions and passages of our Epistle occur in the (undoubtedly genuine) Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians ⁷.

170. But to this it has been satisfactorily replied by Bleek and others, that such passages have much more the air of citations, than that of repetitions of the same thought and diction by their original author, and that they in fact in no wise differ from the many other reproductions of passages of the N. T., especially of St. Paul's Epistles, in the same letter of Clement. Bleek has besides directed attention to the great dissimilarity of the two writings, as indicating different authors. Clement's Epistle has nothing of the Alexandrine character, nothing of the speculative spirit, of that to the Hebrews. His style is pure and correct, but wants altogether the march of periods, and rhetorical rhythm, of our Epistle. Another objection is, that had Clement written it, there could hardly have failed some trace of a tradition to that effect in the church of Rome ; which, as we have seen, is not found.

171. The idea that BARNABAS was the author of our Epistle seems to have been prevalent in the African church, seeing that Tertullian quotes him as such without any doubt or explanation (above, par. 25). But it was unknown to Origen, and to Eusebius : and Jerome, in his Catalog. c. 5, vol. ii. p. 838, says "*vel Barnabæ juxta Tertullianum, vel Lucæ Evangelistæ juxta quosdam, vel Clementis*" &c. : so that it is

⁶ Mynster and Böhme, from different points of view, have held to Silvanus : the former, assuming that our Epistle was sent with that to the Galatians, and to the same churches : the latter, fancying a great resemblance between our Epistle and the first of St. Peter, and holding it to have been written under the superintendence of that Apostle : a supposition, I need not say, entirely untenable.

⁷ Compare e. g. Clem. c. 17, with Heb. xi. 37 : c. 36, with Heb. vi. 4 ; i. 3, 4, 7, 5 : c. 12, with Heb. xi. 31 : c. 45, with Heb. xi. 32—37 : c. 19, with Heb. xii. 1, 2 ; &c. And see Lardner, vol. i. p. 84 ff.

probable that he recognized the notion as Tertullian's only. And we may fairly assume that Philastrius (par. 65) and others refer to the same source, and that this view is destitute of any other external support than that which it gets from the passage of Tertullian^a.

172. It must then, in common with the rest, stand or fall on internal grounds. And in thus judging of it, we have two alternatives before us. Either the extant Epistle of Barnabas is genuine, or it is not. In the former case, the question is soon decided. So different are the styles and characters of the two Epistles, so different also the view which they take of the Jewish rites and ordinances, that it is quite impossible to imagine them the work of the same writer. The Epistle of Barnabas maintains that the ceremonial commands were even at first uttered not in a literal but in a spiritual sense (cf. Ep. Barn. c. 9, p. 749 f., ed. Migne, and al. fr.): finds childish allusions, e. g. in Greek numerals, to spiritual truths (c. 9, p. 752: λέγει γάρ καὶ περιέτεμεν Ἀβρ. ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ ἄνδρας δέκα κ. ὀκτὼ κ. τριακοσίους. τίς οὖν ἡ δοθεῖσα τούτῳ γινῶσις; μάθετε τοὺς δεκαοκτὼ πρώτους, εἶτα τοὺς τριακοσίους. τὸ δὲ δέκα κ. ὀκτώ, ἰ δέκα, ἡ ὀκτώ. ἔχεις Ἰησοῦν. ὅτι δὲ σταυρὸς ἐν τῷ τ ἐμῇ ἐχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ τοὺς τριακοσίους): is in its whole diction and character spiritless, and flat, and pointless. If any one imagines that the same writer could have indited both, then we are clearly out of the limits of ordinary reasoning and considerations of probability.

173. But we may take the other and more probable alternative: that the so-called Epistle of Barnabas is apocryphal. Judging then of Barnabas from what we know in the Acts, many particulars certainly seem to combine in favour of him. He was a Levite, not of Judæa, but of Cyprus (Acts iv. 36): he was intimately connected with St. Paul during the early part of the missionary journeys of that Apostle (Acts ix. 27; xv. 41), and in common with him was entrusted with the first ministry to the Gentiles (Acts xi. 22ff.; xv. 12 &c.: Gal. ii. 9 &c.): he was called by the Apostles *υἱὸς παρακλήσεως* (Acts iv. 36), which last word we have seen reason to interpret 'exhortation.'

174. These particulars are made the most of by Wieseler (*Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, pp. 504 ff.), as supporting what he considers the only certain tradition on the subject. But as we have seen this tradition itself fail, so neither will these stand under stricter examination. For Barnabas, though by birth a Cyprian, yet dwelt apparently at Jerusalem (Acts ix. 27; xi. 22): and there, by the context of the narrative, must the field have been situated, which he sold to put its price into the common stock. As a Levite, he must have been thoroughly acquainted with the usages of the Jerusalem temple, which, as before observed, our Writer does not appear to have been. It is

^a It has been upheld in modern times by J. E. Chr. Schmidt, Twisten, Ullmann, Thiersch, Wieseler. On the last of these, see below, par. 174.

quite out of the question to suppose, as Wieseler does, that Barnabas, a Levite who had dwelt at Jerusalem, would, during a subsequent ministration in Egypt, have cited the usages of the temple at Leontopolis rather than those at Jerusalem. If such usages have been cited, it must be by an Egyptian Jew to whom Jerusalem was not familiar.

175. Perhaps too much has been made, on the other side, of the manifest inferiority of Barnabas to Paul in eloquence⁹, and of the fact that as the history goes on in the Acts, the order becomes reversed, and from "Barnabas and Saul" or "Paul" (ch. xi. 30; xii. 25; xiii. 2, 7) we have "Paul and Barnabas" (ch. xiii. 43, 46, 50; xv. 2 bis, 22, 35, with only occasional intermixture of the old order, ch. xiv. 14; xv. 12, 25): Barnabas gradually becoming eclipsed by the eminence of his far greater colleague. For (1) it is very possible that eloquence of the pen, such as that in our Epistle, might not have been wanting to one who was very inferior to St. Paul in eloquence of the tongue: and (2) it was most natural, that in a history written by a companion of St. Paul, and devoted, in its latter portion at least, to the Acts of St. Paul, the name of the great Apostle should gradually assume that pre-eminence to which on other grounds it was unquestionably entitled.

176. It would appear then, that against the authorship by Barnabas there can only be urged in fairness the one objection arising from his residence at Jerusalem: which, on the hypothesis of the Epistle being addressed to the church at Jerusalem, would be a circumstance in his favour with reference to such expressions as the ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν, ch. xiii. 19, and the acquaintance with the readers implied throughout the Epistle. On the whole, it must be confessed, that this view comes nearest to satisfying the conditions of authorship of any that have as yet been treated; and should only be set aside, if one approaching nearer still can be found.

177. It remains that we enquire into the claims of the two remaining apostolic persons on our list, AQUILA and APOLLOS. The former of these, a Jew of Pontus by birth, was once, with his wife Priscilla, resident in Rome, but was found by St. Paul at Corinth on his first arrival there (Acts xviii. 2), having been compelled to quit the capital by a decree of Claudius. It is uncertain whether at that time he was a Christian; but if not, he soon after became one by the companionship of the Apostle, who took up his abode, and wrought at their common trade of tent-making, with Aquila and Priscilla. After this, Aquila became a zealous forwarder of the gospel. We find him (Acts xviii. 18) accompanying St. Paul to Ephesus, and in his company there when he wrote 1 Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi. 19): again at Rome when the

⁹ See Bleek, Einl. p. 419 f.

Epistle to the Romans was written (Rom. xvi. 3): at Ephesus again when 2 Tim. was written (2 Tim. iv. 19).

178. From these places it appears, that Aquila was a person of considerable importance among the brethren: that the church used to assemble in his house: that he and his wife Priscilla had exposed their lives for the gospel's sake. And from Acts xviii. 26 we find, that they were also well able to carry on the work of teaching, even with such a pupil as Apollos, who was mighty in the Scriptures.

179. It must be owned that these circumstances would constitute a fair *prima facie* case for Aquila, were it not for certain indications that he himself was rather the ready and zealous patron, than the teacher; and that this latter work, or a great share in it, seems to have belonged to his wife, Prisca or Priscilla. She is ever named with him, even Acts xviii. 26, where the instruction of Apollos is described: and not unfrequently, her name precedes his (Acts xviii. 18: Rom. xvi. 3: 2 Tim. iv. 19): an arrangement so contrary to the custom of antiquity, that some very sufficient reason must have existed for it. At all events, the grounds on which an hypothesis of Aquila's authorship of our Epistle would rest, must be purely of a negative kind, as far as personal capacity is concerned. And it does not appear that any, either in ancient or modern times, have fixed on him as its probable writer.

180. There is yet one name remaining, that of APOLLOS, in whom certainly more conditions meet than in any other man, both negative and positive, of the possible authorship of our Epistle. The language in which he is introduced in the Acts (xviii. 24) is very remarkable. He is there described as Ἰουδαῖός τις, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς τῷ γένει, ἀνὴρ λόγιος, δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς. Every word here seems fitted to point him out as the person of whom we are in search. He is a Jew, born in Alexandria: here we have at once two great postulates fulfilled: here we at once might account for the Alexandrian language of the Epistle, and for the uniform use of the LXX version, mainly (if this be so) in its Alexandrian form. He is an eloquent man (see note on λόγιος ad loc., Vol. II.), and mighty in the Scriptures. As we advance in the description, even minute coincidences seem to confirm our view that we are here at last on the right track. He is described as ἐπιστάμενος μόνον τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦ Ἰωάννου, but being more perfectly taught the way of the Lord by Aquila and Priscilla. No wonder then that a person so instituted should specify βαπτισμῶν διδασχὴ as one of the components in the θεμέλιον of the Christian life (Heb. vi. 2). It is described as his characteristic, that he ἤρξατο παρρησιάζεσθαι ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ: is it wonderful then that he, of all N. T. writers, should exhort μὴ ἀποβάλλετε τὴν παρρησίαν (Heb. x. 35), and declare to his readers that they were the house of Christ ἐὰν τὴν παρρησίαν . . . κατασχῶμεν (Heb. iii. 6)?

181. Nor, if we proceed to examine the further notices of him, does this first impression become weakened. In 1 Cor. i.—iv., we find him described by inference as most active and able, and only second to St. Paul himself in the church at Corinth. It would be difficult to select words which should more happily and exactly hit the relation of the Epistle to the Hebrews to the writings of St. Paul, than those of 1 Cor. iii. 6, ἐγὼ ἐφύτευσα, Ἀπολλῶς ἐπότισεν. And the eloquence and rhetorical richness of the style of Apollos seems to have been exactly that, wherein his teaching differed from that of the Apostle. It is impossible to help feeling that the frequent renunciations, on St. Paul's part, of words of excellency or human wisdom, have reference, partly, it may be, to some exaggeration of Apollos' manner of teaching by his disciples, but also to some infirmity, in this direction, of that teacher himself. Cf. especially 2 Cor. xi. 3.

182. It is just this difference in style and rhetorical character, which, in this case elevated and chastened by the informing and pervading Spirit, distinguishes the present Epistle to the Hebrews from those of the great Apostle himself. And, just as it was not easy to imagine either St. Luke, or Clement, or Barnabas, to have written such an Epistle, so now we feel, from all the characteristics given us of Apollos in the sacred narrative, that if he wrote at all, it would be an Epistle precisely of this kind, both in contents, and in style.

183. For as to the former of these, the contents and argument of the Epistle, we have a weighty indication furnished by the passage in the Acts : εὐτόνως γὰρ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις διακατηλέγχετο δημοσίᾳ, ἐπιδευκνὺς διὰ τῶν γραφῶν εἶναι τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν. What words could more accurately describe, if not the very teaching itself, yet the opening of a course of argument likely, when the occasion offered, to lead to the teaching, of our Epistle ?

184. Again, we seem to have found in Apollos just that degree of dependence on St. Paul which we require, combined with that degree of independence which the writer of our Epistle must have had. Instructed originally in the elements of the Christian faith by Aquila and Priscilla, he naturally received it in that form in which the great Apostle of the Gentiles especially loved to put it forth. His career however of Christian teaching began and was carried on at Corinth, without the personal superintendence of St. Paul ; his line of arguing with and convincing the Jews did not, as St. Paul's, proceed on the covenant of justification by faith made by God with Abraham, but took a different direction, that namely of the eternal High-priesthood of Jesus, and the all-sufficiency of His one Sacrifice. Faith indeed with him occupies a place fully as important as that assigned to it by St. Paul : he does not however dwell on it mainly as the instrument of our justification before God, but as the necessary condition of approach to Him, and of

persistence in our place as partakers of the heavenly calling¹. The teaching of this Epistle is not indeed in any particular inconsistent with, but neither is it dependent on, the teaching of St. Paul's Epistles.

185. We may advance yet further in our estimate of the probability of Apollos having written as we find the Author of this Epistle writing.

The whole spirit of the First Epistle to the Corinthians shews us, that there had sprung up in the Corinthian church a rivalry between the two modes of teaching; unaccompanied by, as it assuredly was not caused by, any rivalry between the teachers themselves, except in so far as was of necessity the case from the very variety of the manner of teaching. And while the one fact, of the rivalry between the teachings and their disciples, is undeniable, the other fact, that of absence of rivalry between the Teachers, is shewn in a very interesting manner. On the side of St. Paul, by his constant and honourable mention of Apollos as his second and helper: by Apollos, in the circumstance mentioned 1 Cor. xvi. 12, that St. Paul had exhorted him to accompany to Corinth the bearers of that Epistle, but that he could not prevail on him to go at that time: he only promised a future visit at some favourable opportunity. Here, if I mistake not, we see the generous confidence of the Apostle, wishing Apollos to go to Corinth and prove, in spite of what had there taken place, the unity of the two apostolic men in the faith: here too, which is important to our present subject, we have the self-denying modesty of Apollos, unwilling to incur even the chance of being set at the head of a party against the Apostle, or in any way to obtrude himself personally, where St. Paul had sown the seed, now that there had grown up, on the part of some in that Church, a spirit of invidious personal comparison between the two.

186. If we have interpreted aright this hint of the feeling of Apollos as regarded St. Paul; if, as we may well suppose in one ζέοντι τῷ πνεύματι, such a feeling was deeply implanted and continued to actuate him,—what more likely to have given rise to the semi-anonymous character of our present Epistle? He has no reason for strict concealment of himself, but he has a strong reason for not putting himself prominently forward. He does not open with announcing his name, or sending a blessing in his own person: but neither does he write through-

¹ The word δικαιῶν, which occurs twenty-eight times in the Epistles of St. Paul, is not once found in the Epistle to the Hebrews: and the citation from Hab. ii. 4, ὁ δίκαιός (μου) ἐκ πίστεως ῥησεται, though it forms the common starting-point for St. Paul, Rom. i. 17, and the Writer of our Epistle, ch. x. 38, leads them in totally different directions: St. Paul, to unfold the doctrine of *righteousness by faith*; our Writer, to celebrate the triumphs of the *life of faith*.

out as one who means to be unknown: and among the personal notices at the end, he makes no secret of circumstances and connexions, which would be unintelligible, unless the readers were going along with a writer personally known to them. And thus the two-sided phenomena of our Epistle, utterly inexplicable as they have ever been on the hypothesis of Pauline authorship or superintendence, would receive a satisfactory explanation.

187. It will be plainly out of place to object, that this explanation would only hold, on the hypothesis that our Epistle was addressed to the Jews at *Corinth*. The same spirit of modest self-abnegation would hardly, after such an indication of it, be wanting in Apollos, to whatever church he was writing. But I reserve it for the next section to enquire how far this view is confirmed or impugned by our conclusion as to the church to which the Epistle was, in all probability, originally addressed ².

188. The history of the hypothesis that Apollos was the author of our Epistle, has been given by implication, from the time of Luther, its apparent originator, above in parr. 98—108. It may be convenient to give here, in one conspectus, the principal names in its favour: Luther, Osiander, Le Clerc, Heumann (1711), Lorenz Müller (1717), Semler, Ziegler, Dindorf, Bleek, Tholuck, Credner, Reuss, the R.-Catholics Feilmoser and Lutterbeck (the latter with this modification, that he believes St. Paul to have written the 9 last verses, and the rest to have been composed by Apollos in union with St. Luke, Clement, and other companions of the Apostle),—De Wette, Lünemann.

189. The objection which is commonly set against these probabilities is, that we have no ecclesiastical tradition pointing to Apollos: that it is unreasonable to suppose that the church to which the Epistle was sent should altogether have lost all trace of the name of an author who must have been personally known to them. This has been strongly urged, and by some, e. g. Mr. Forster, regarded as a ground for attempting to laugh to scorn the hypothesis, as altogether unworthy of serious consideration ³.

190. But if any student has carefully followed the earlier paragraphs of this section, he will be fully prepared to meet such an objection, and will not be deterred from the humble search after truth by such scorn. He will remember how we shewed the failure of every attempt to establish a satisfactory footing for any view of the authorship as being the tradition of the church: and proved that, with regard to any research into the subject, we of this day approach it as those of old did in their day, with full liberty to judge from the data furnished by the Epistle itself.

² See below, § ii. par. 36.

³ Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, preface, pp. ix, x.

191. And he will also bear in mind, that the day is happily passing away with Biblical writers and students, when the strong language of those, who were safe in the shelter of a long-prescribed and approved opinion, could deter any from humble and faithful research into the various phænomena of God's word itself: when the confession of having found insoluble difficulties was supposed to indicate unsoundness of faith, and the recognition of discrepancies was regarded as affecting the belief of divine inspiration. We have at last in this country begun to learn, that Holy Scripture shrinks not from any tests, however severe, and requires not any artificial defences, however apparently expedient.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. That the book before us is an *Epistle*, not a homily or treatise, is too plain to require more than a passing assertion. Its personal and circumstantial notices are inseparable from it, and the language is throughout epistolary, as far as the nature of the subject would permit.

2. And it is almost equally plain, that it is an Epistle *addressed* to JUDÆO-CHRISTIANS. The attempt to dispute this⁴ must be regarded rather as a curiosity of literature, than as worthy of serious attention. The evidence of the whole Epistle goes to shew, that the readers had been Jews, and were in danger of apostatizing back into Judaism again. Not a syllable is found of allusions to their conversion from the alienation of heathenism, such as frequently occur in St. Paul's Epistles: but every where their original covenant state is assumed, and the fact of that covenant having been amplified and superseded by a better one is insisted on.

3. If then it was written to Judæo-Christians, on whom are we to think as its intended recipients?

4. *Was it addressed to the whole body of such converts throughout the world?* This view has found some few respectable names to defend it⁵. But it cannot be seriously entertained. The Epistle assumes throughout a local habitation, and a peculiar combination of circumstances, for those who are addressed: and concludes, not only with greetings from

⁴ Lünemann refers to Röth, "Epistolam vulgo ad Hebræos inscriptam non ad Hebr. i. e. Christianos genere Judæos, sed ad Christianos genere Gentiles et quidem ad Ephesios datum esse" (Francf. a. M. 1836).

⁵ So the Schol. in one of Matthæi's codices: γράφει . . . πᾶσι τοῖς ἐκ περιτομῆς πιστεύουσιν Ἑβραίοις: so Euthal., Œc., Braun, Baumgarten, Heinrichs, Schwegler, and our own Lightfoot, Harmony, i. p. 340.

οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, but with an expressed intention of the Writer to visit those addressed, in company with Timotheus ; which would be impossible on this œcumenical hypothesis.

5. If then we are to choose some one church, the first occurring to us is the *mother church at Jerusalem*, perhaps united with the daughter churches in Palestine. And this, in one form or other, has been the usual opinion: countenanced by many phænomena in the Epistle itself. At and near Jerusalem, it is urged, (α) would that attachment to the temple-worship be found which seems to be assumed on the part of the readers : there again (β) were the only examples of churches almost purely Judaic in their composition : there only (γ) would such allusions as that to going forth to suffer with Christ *ἐξω τῆς πόλεως* (ch. xiii. 12) be understood and appreciated.

6. But these arguments are by no means weighty, much less decisive. For (α) we do not find any signs in our Epistle that its readers were to be persons who had the temple-service before their eyes ; the Writer refers much more to his LXX, than to any existing practices : and men with their Bibles in their hands might well have been thus addressed, even if they had never witnessed the actual ceremonies themselves. Besides which, all Jews were supposed to be included in the temple-rites, wherever dwelling, and would doubtless be quite as familiar with them as there can be any reason here for assuming. And again, even granting the ground of the argument, its inference is not necessary, for there was another Jewish temple at Leontopolis in Egypt, wherein the Mosaic ordinances were observed.

7. With regard to (β), it may well be answered, that such an exclusively Jewish church, as would be found in Palestine only, is not required for the purposes of our Epistle. It is beyond question that the Epistle of St. James was written to Jewish Christian converts ; yet it is expressly addressed to the dispersion *outside* Palestine, who must every where have been mingled with their Gentile brethren. Besides, it has been well remarked⁶, that the Epistle itself leads to no such assumption of an exclusively Jewish church. It might have been sent to a church in which both Jews and Gentiles were mingled, *in mediam rem*, to find its own readers : and such an idea is countenanced by the *ἐξερχόμεθα κ.τ.λ.*, ch. xiii. 13, compared with the *μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν*, ch. x. 25. It has been well shewn by Riehm⁷, that our Writer's whole procedure as concerns Gentile Christians can only be accounted for by his regarding the Jewish people,—*τὸν λαόν*, or *τὸν λαὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*, ch. ii. 17 ; iv. 9 ; xiii. 12,—*σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ*, ch. ii. 16,

⁶ By Holzmann, on Schneckenburger über den Hebräerbrief, in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1859, part ii. ; an article to which I have been indebted for several suggestions on this part of my subject.

⁷ Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes, Ludwigsburg 1858, pp. 168—172.

—as the primary stock, into which all other men were to be engrafted for the purposes of salvation : as a theocratic rather than a physical development. For that the Lord Jesus tasted death *ὑπὲρ πάντων*, is as undeniably his doctrine.

8. The argument (γ) is evidently not decisive. Wherever there were Jews, priding themselves on their own nationality, and acquainted with the facts of our Lord's death, such an exhortation might be used. The type is derived from the usage of the tabernacle ; the antitype, from a known historical fact : the exhortation is, as explained by Theodoret (see note on ch. xiii. 13), to come forth out of the then legal polity of Judaism, content to bear the reproach accruing in consequence : all of which would be as applicable any where, as in Palestine, or at Jerusalem.

9. There seems then to be at least *no necessity* for adopting Jerusalem or Palestine as containing the readers to whom our Epistle was addressed. But on the other hand there are reasons against such an hypothesis, of more or less weight. These I will state, not in order of their importance, but as they most naturally occur.

10. The language and style of our Epistle, if it was addressed to Jews in Jerusalem or Palestine, is surely unaccountable. For, although Greek was commonly spoken in Palestine, yet on the one hand no writer who wished to obtain a favourable hearing with Jews there on matters regarding their own religion, would choose Greek as the medium of his communication (cf. Acts xxii. 2). And the Gospel of St. Matthew is no case in point : for whatever judgment we may form respecting the original language of our present Gospel, there can be no doubt that the apostolic oral teaching, on which our first three Gospels are founded, was originally extant in Aramaic : whereas it is impossible to suppose the Epistle to the Hebrews a translation, or originally extant in any other tongue than Greek. And, on the other hand, not only is our Epistle Greek, but it is such Greek, as necessarily presupposes some acquaintance with literature, some practice not merely in the colloquial, but in the scholastic Greek, of the day. And this surely was as far as possible from being the case with the churches of Jerusalem and Palestine.

11. A weighty pendant to the same objection is found in the unvarying use of the LXX version by our Writer, even, as in ch. i. 6 ; ii. 7 ; x. 5, where it differs from the Hebrew text. "How astonishing is this circumstance," says Wieseler (ii. p. 497), "if he was writing to inhabitants of Palestine, with whom the LXX had no authority !"

12. Another objection is, that it is not possible to conceive either of St. Paul himself or of any of his companions, that they should have stood in such a relation to the Jerusalem or Palestine churches, as we find subsisting between the Writer of our Epistle and his readers. To

suppose such a relation in the case of the Apostle himself, is to cut ourselves loose from all the revealed facts of his course, and suppose a totally new mind to have sprung up in Jerusalem towards him. And least of all his companions could such a relation have subsisted in the case of Apollos and Timotheus; at least for many years, far more than history will allow, after the speech of St. James in Acts xxi. 20.

13. Connected with this last difficulty would be the impossibility, on the hypothesis now in question, of giving any satisfactory meaning to the notice in ch. xiii. 24, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. If the Writer was, as often supposed, in Rome, how unnatural to specify the *Jews residing there* by this name! if in Italy, how unnatural again that he should send greeting from Christian Jews so widely scattered, thereby depriving the salutation of all reality! If again he was not in Rome nor in Italy, what reason can be suggested for his sending an especial salutation to Jews in Palestine from some present with him who happened to be from Italy? The former of these three suppositions is perhaps the least unlikely: but the least unlikely, how unlikely!

14. Again, the historical notices in our Epistle do not fit the hypothesis in question. The great notice of ch. ii. 3, would be strictly true of any church rather than that of Jerusalem, or those in Palestine generally. At any date that can reasonably be assigned for our Epistle (see below, § iii.), there must have been many living in those churches, who had heard the Lord for themselves. And though it may be said that they had, properly speaking, received the *tidings of salvation* from those that heard Him, yet such a body, among whom Jesus Himself had lived and moved in the flesh, would surely not be one of which to predicate the words in the text so simply and directly. Rather should we look for one of which they might be from the first and without controversy true.

15. Another historical notice is found ch. vi. 10, διακονήσαντες τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ διακονοῦντες, which would be less applicable to the churches of Jerusalem and Palestine, than to any others. For it was they who were the *objects*, not the subjects of this διακονία, throughout the ministry of St. Paul: and certainly from what we know of their history, their situation did not improve after that Apostle's death. This διακονία εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους was a duty enjoined by him on the churches of Galatia (1 Cor. xvi. 1: Rom. xv. 26), Macedonia, and Achaia, and doubtless by implication on other churches also (see Rom. xii. 13): the ἅγιοι being the *poor saints at Jerusalem*. And though, as Schneckenburger replies to this, some of the Jerusalem Christians may have been wealthy, and able to assist their poorer brethren, yet we must notice that the διακονία here is predicated not of some among them, but of

the church, as such, in general : which could not be said of the church in Jerusalem.

16. There are some notices, on which no stress can be laid either way, as for, or as against, the claim of the Jerusalem church. Such are, that found ch. xii. 4, which in the note there we have seen reason to apply rather to the figure there made use of, than to any concrete fact assignable in history : and that in ch. v. 12, which manifestly must not be taken to imply that no teachers had at that time proceeded from the particular church addressed, but that its members in general were behind what might have been expected of them in spiritual knowledge.

17. It may again be urged, that the absence, no less than the presence of historical allusions, makes against the hypothesis. If the Epistle were addressed to the church at Jerusalem, it seems strange that no allusion should be made in it to the fact that our Lord Himself had lived and taught among them in the flesh, had before their eyes suffered death on the Cross, had found among them the first witnesses of His Resurrection and Ascension⁸.

18. If then we cannot fit our Epistle to the very widely spread assumption that it was addressed to the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem and Palestine, we must obviously put to the test, in search of its original readers, the various other churches which came within the working of St. Paul and his companions. Of many of these, which have in turn become the subjects of hypotheses, it is hardly necessary to give more than a list. Wall believed the Epistle to have been written to the Hebrew Christians of Proconsular Asia, Macedonia, and Greece : Sir I. Newton, Bolten, and Bengel, to Jews who had left Jerusalem on account of the war, and were settled in Asia Minor : Credner, to those in Lycaonia : Storr, Mynster, and Rinck, to those in Galatia : Lyra and Ludwig, to those in Spain : Semler and Nösselt, to those in Thessalonica : Böhme, to those in Antioch : Stein, to those in Laodicea (see the citation from Philastrius in § i. 65, and note) : Rüdiger, to those in Antioch : Baumgarten-Crusius, to those at Ephesus and Colossæ.

19. Several of these set out with the assumption of a Pauline authorship : and none of them seems to fulfil satisfactorily any of the main conditions of our problem. If it was to any one of these bodies of Jews that the Epistle was addressed, we know so little about any one of them, that the holding of such an opinion on our part can only be founded on the vaguest and wildest conjecture. To use arguments against such hypotheses, would be to fight with mere shadows.

⁸ So Köstlin, in the *Theologischer Jahrbücher* for 1854, p. 371, cited in Holzmann's article before referred to, p. 295.

20. But there are *three churches* yet remaining which will require more detailed discussion : CORINTH, ALEXANDRIA, and ROME. The reason for including the former of these in this list, rather than in the other, is, that on the view that Apollos was the Writer, the church in which he so long and so effectively laboured seems to have a claim to be considered.

21. But the circumstances of the Jewish portion of the church at CORINTH were not such as to justify such an hypothesis. It does not appear to have been of sufficient importance in point of numbers : nor can the ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαίωθη of ch. ii. 3 have been asserted of them, seeing that they owed their conversion to the ministry of St. Paul.

22. ALEXANDRIA is maintained by Schmidt and Wieseler to have been the original destination of the Epistle. There, it is urged, were the greatest number of resident Jews, next to Jerusalem : there, at Leontopolis in Egypt, was another temple, with the arrangements of which the notices in our Epistle more nearly correspond than with those in Jerusalem⁹: from thence the Epistle appears first to have come forth to the knowledge of the church. Add to which, the canon of Muratori (see above, § i. 31) speaks of an Epistle “ad Alexandrinos,” which may probably designate our present Epistle. Besides all this, the Alexandrine character of the language, and treatment of subjects in the Epistle, and manner of citation, are urged, as pointing to Alexandrine readers.

23. And doubtless there is some weight in these considerations : enough, in the mere balance of probabilities, to cause us to place this hypothesis far before all others which have as yet been treated. Still there are some circumstances to be taken into account, which rather weaken its probability. One of these is that, various as are the notices of the Epistle from early Alexandrine writers, we find no hint of its having been addressed to their own church, no certain tradition concerning its author. Another arises from the absence of all positive history of the church there in apostolic times, by which we might try, and verify, the few historic notices occurring in the Epistle. Indeed as far as the more personal of those notices are concerned, the same objections lie against Alexandria, as have before been urged against Palestine : the difficulty of assigning a reason for the salutation from οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας, and of imagining, within the limits which must be set to the date of the Epistle, any such relation of Timotheus to the readers, as is supposed in ch. xiii. 23.

24. These objections would lead us, at all events, to pass on to the end of our list before we attempt to pronounce on the preponderance of

⁹ See this argued in detail in Wieseler, pp. 498 ff.

probability, and take into consideration the claims of ROME herself. These were in part put forward by Wetstein¹, and have more recently been urged in Holzmann's article on Schneckenburger in the *Studien u. Kritiken* for 1859, pt. 2, pp. 297 ff.

25. They may be briefly explained to be these: (1) The fact of the church at Rome being just such an one, in its origin and composition, as this Epistle seems to presuppose. It has been already seen (par. 7) that when, as we are compelled, we give up the idea of its having been addressed to a church exclusively consisting of Judæo-Christians, we necessarily are referred to one in which the Jewish believers formed a considerable portion, and that the primary stock and nucleus, of the church. Now this seems to have been the case at Rome, from the indications furnished us in the Epistle to the Romans. "The Jew first, and also the Gentile," is a note frequently struck in that Epistle: and the Church at Rome seems to be the only one of those with which St. Paul had been concerned, which would entirely answer to such a description.

26. (2) The great key to the present question, the historical notice ch. ii. 3, fits exceedingly well the circumstances of the church of Rome. That church had arisen, not from the preaching of any Apostle among them, but from a confluence of primitive believers, the first having arrived there probably not long after our Lord's Ascension: see Acts ii. 10. In Rom. i. 8, written in all probability in the year 58 A.D., St. Paul states, *ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ*: and in xvi. 19, *ἡ γὰρ ὑμῶν ὑπακοὴ εἰς πάντας ἀφίκετο*: the inferences from which, and their proper limitation, I have discussed in the Prolegomena to that Epistle, Vol. II. § ii. 2. γ. And in Rom. xvi. 7, we find a salutation to Andronicus and Junius, Jews (see note there) *οἰτνές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις, οἳ καὶ πρὸ ἐμοῦ γέγοναν ἐν χριστῷ*. So that here we have a church, the only one of all those with which St. Paul and his companions were concerned, of which it could be said, that the gospel *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων (τὸν κύριον) εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐβεβαιώθη*: the Apostle himself not having arrived there till long after such *βεβαίωσις* had taken place.

27. Again (3) it was in Rome, and Rome principally, that Judaistic Christianity took its further development and forms of error: it was there, not in Jerusalem and Palestine, that at this time the *διδαχαὶ ποικίλαι καὶ ξέναι*, against which the readers are warned, ch. xiii. 9, were springing up. "As soon as the gloom of the earliest history begins to

¹ N. T. vol. ii. p. 386 f.: "Si conjecturæ locus est, existimaverim potius ad Judæos qui Romæ degebant et Christo nomen dederant scriptam fuisse: quo admissio facile intelligimus qui factum, tum ut Paulus, qui Roma quidem sed non Italia excedere jussus erat, brevi se rediturum speraret, tum ut Itali Romanos salutarent, tum denique ut Clemens Romanus frequenter illa uteretur."

clear a little, we find face to face at Rome Valentinians and Marcionites, Praxeas and the Montanists (Proclus), Hegesippus and the Elcesaites, Justin, and Polycarp. Here it was that there arose in the second half of the second century the completest exposition of theosophic Judaism, the Clementines, the literary memorial of a manœuvre which had for its aim the absorption of the whole Roman Church into Judæo-Christianity². We have glimpses of the beginning of this state of Judaistic development even in St. Paul's lifetime, at two distinct periods ; when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans, cir. A.D. 58, cf. Rom. xiv. xv. to ver. 13,—and later, in that to the Philippians, cir. A.D. 63 (see Prolegg. Vol. III. § ii. 5) : cf. Phil. i. 14—17 : again in the bitterness conveyed in βλέπετε τὴν κατατομήν, and the following verses, Phil. iii. 2 ff.

28. It is also to be remarked (4) that the personal notices found in our Epistle agree remarkably well with the hypothesis that it was addressed to the church at Rome. The information respecting Timothy could not come amiss to those who had been addressed ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς Τιμόθεος ὁ συνεργός μου, Rom. xvi. 21 ; who had been accustomed to the companionship of Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος among them, Phil. i. 1 : Col. i. 1 : Philem. 1 : and the ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας of ch. xiii. 24 receives a far more likely interpretation than that conceded as possible above, § i. 126, if we believe the Writer to be addressing his Epistle from some place where were present with him Christians from Italy, who would be desirous of sending greeting to their brethren at home. If he was writing e. g. at Alexandria, or at Ephesus, or at Corinth, such a salutation would be very natural. And thus we should be giving to οἱ ἀπὸ its most usual N. T. meaning, of persons who *have come from* the place indicated : cf. οἱ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων, Matt. xv. 1 ; οἱ ἀπὸ Κιλικίας κ. Ἀσίας, Acts vi. 9 ; οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰόππης, ib. x. 23. Even Bleek, who holds our Epistle to have been addressed to the church in Palestine, takes this view, and assigns as its place of writing, Ephesus or Corinth. But then, what sense would it have, to send greeting to Palestine from οἱ ἀπὸ Ἰταλίας ?

29. Another set of important notices which this hypothesis will illustrate is found, where past persecution, and the death of eminent men in the church, are alluded to. These have ever presented, on the Palestine view, considerable difficulties. Any assignment of them to known historical occurrences would put them far too early for any probable date of our Epistle : and it has been felt that the deaths by martyrdom of St. Stephen, St. James the Great, and the like, were far from satisfying the τὴν ἔκβασις τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, which they were commanded to consider : and though the time during which the Epistle

² Holzmann, ut supra, p. 299.

must have reached Jerusalem was indeed one of great and unexampled trouble and disorganization, we know of no general persecution of Christians as such, since that which arose on account of Stephen, which was hardly likely to have been in the Writer's mind.

30. But on the Roman hypothesis, these passages are easily explained. About 49 or 50, Claudius "Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes, Roma expulit" (Sueton. Claud. c. 25). This time may well be alluded to by the ἀναμνησθε τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας of ch. x. 32; for under the blundering expression "*impulsore Chresto tumultuantes*" it is impossible not to recognize troubles sprung from the rising of the Jews against the Christian converts. Thus also will the τοῖς δεσμίοις συνεπαθήσατε receive a natural interpretation, as imprisonments and trials would necessarily have accompanied these "*assiduos tumultus*," before the final step of expulsion took place; and the τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε may be easily understood, either as a result of the tumults themselves, or of the expulsion, in which they had occasion to test their knowledge that they had for themselves κρείσσονα ὑπαρξίν καὶ μένουσαν.

31. It is true there are some particulars connected with this passage, which do not seem so well to fit that earlier time of trouble, as the Neronian persecution nearly fifteen years after. The only objection to taking that event as the one referred to, would be the expression τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, and the implication conveyed in ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες . . . ὑπεμείνατε: considering that we cannot go beyond the destruction of Jerusalem, at the latest eight years after, for the date of our Epistle. Still it is not impossible that both these expressions might be used. A time of great peril passed away might be thus alluded to, even at the distance of five or six years: and it might well be, that the majority of the Roman Jewish Christians had become converts during the immediately preceding imprisonment of St. Paul, and by his means.

32. On this supposition, still more light is thrown on this passage, and on the general tenor of the martyrology in the eleventh chapter. Thus the πολλὰ ἄθλησις παθημάτων is fully justified: thus, the οὐκ ἐκδεχόμενοι τε καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι, which finds almost an echo in the "*pereuntibus addita ludibria*" of Tacitus, Ann. xv. 44, and is so exactly in accord, when literally taken, with the cruel exposures and deaths in the circus. The δέσμοι and the ἀρπαγή too, on this supposition, would be matters of course. And I own, notwithstanding the objection stated above, that all this seems to fit the great Neronian persecution, and in the fullest sense, that only.

33. To that period also may we refer the notice in ch. xiii. 7, μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, ὧν ἀναθεωροῦντες τὴν ἑκβασιν τῆς ἀναστροφῆς μιμῆσθε τὴν πίστιν. It

may be indeed, that this refers simply to a natural death in the faith of Christ : but it is far more probable, from the *ἀναθεωροῦντες*, and the *μυεῖσθε τὴν πίστιν*, that it points to death by martyrdom ; *πίστις* having been so strongly illustrated in ch. xi., as bearing up under torments and death.

34. On this hypothesis, several other matters seem also to fall into place. The *γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν Τιμόθεον ἀπολελυμένον* may well refer to the termination of some imprisonment of Timotheus consequent upon the Neronian persecution, from which perhaps the death of the tyrant liberated him. Where this imprisonment took place, must be wholly uncertain. I shall speak of the conjectural probabilities of the place indicated by *ἐν τάχῳ ἐρχεται*, when I come to treat of the time and place of writing³.

35. The use evidently made in our Epistle of the Epistle to the Romans, above all other of St. Paul's⁴, will thus also be satisfactorily accounted for. Not only was the same church addressed, but the Writer had especially before him the matter and language of that Epistle, which was written in all probability from Corinth, the scene of the labours of Paul and Apollos.

36. The sort of semi-anonymous character of our Epistle, already treated of when we ascribed the authorship to Apollos, will also come in here, as singularly in accord with the circumstances of the case, and with the subsequent tradition as regards the Epistle, in case it was addressed to the church in Rome. Supposing, as we have gathered from the notices of Apollos in 1 Cor., that he modestly shrunk from being thought to put himself into rivalry with St. Paul, and that after the death of the Apostle he found it necessary to write such an Epistle as this to the Church in the metropolis, what more likely step would he take with regard to his own name and personality in it, than just that which we find has been taken : viz. so to conceal these, as to keep them from having any prominence, while by various minute personal notices he prevents the concealment from being complete ? And with regard to the relation evidently subsisting between the Writer and his readers, all we can say is that, in defect of positive knowledge on this head connecting Apollos with the church at Rome, it is evidently in the metropolis, of all places, where such a relation may most safely be

³ See below, § iii. 4.

⁴ This has been noticed by many ; and may be established by the student for himself by consulting those Commentators and writers, who have drawn up tables of verbal coincidence with a view of proving the Pauline authorship. There is reason for thinking that the peculiar form of the quotation *ἐμοὶ ἐκδίκησις, ἐγὼ ἀνταποδώσω* in ch. x. 30, agreeing neither with the Hebrew text of Deut. xxxii. 35, nor with the LXX there, is owing to its having been taken direct from Rom. xii. 19. And the whole form of exhortation in our ch. xiii. 1—6, reminds us forcibly of that in Rom. xii. 1—21. See also Rom. xiv. 17, as compared with Heb. xiii. 9, in § iv. 1, note.

assumed. There a teacher, whose native place was Alexandria, and who had travelled to Ephesus and Corinth, was pretty sure to have been : there many of his Christian friends would be found : there alone, in the absence of positive testimony, could we venture to place such a cycle of dwelling and teaching, as would justify the ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῶν of our ch. xiii. 19 : in the place whither was a general confluence of all, and where there is ample room for such a course after the decease of St. Paul.

37. And what more likely fate to befall the Epistle in this respect, than just that which did befall it in the Roman church : viz. that while in that church, and by a contemporary of Apollos, Clement, we find the first use made of our Epistle, and that the most familiar and copious use,—its words are never formally cited, nor is any author's name attached ? And was not this especially likely to be the case, as Clement was writing to the Corinthians, the very church where the danger had arisen of a rivalry between the fautors of the two teachers ?

38. And as time goes on, the evidence for this hypothesis seems to gather strength, in the nature of the traditions respecting the authorship of our Epistle. While in Africa and the East they are most various and inconsistent with one another, and the notion of a Pauline origin is soon suggested, and gains rapid acceptance, it is in the church of Rome alone, and among those influenced by her, that we find an ever steady and unvarying assertion, that it *was not written by St. Paul*. By whom it *was* written, none ventured to say. How weighty the reasons may have been, which induced silence on this point, we have now lost the power of appreciating. The fact only is important for us, that the few personal notices which occur in it were in course of time overborne, as indications of its author, by the prevalent anonymous character : and that the same church which possessed as its heritage the most illustrious of St. Paul's own Epistles, was ever unanimous in disclaiming, on the part of the Apostle of the Gentiles, the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

39. The result of the above enquiry may be shortly stated. As the current of popular opinion in the church has gradually set in towards the Pauline authorship, inferring that a document at first sight so Pauline must have proceeded from the Apostle himself : so has it also set in towards the church at Jerusalem as the original readers, inferring that the title πρὸς Ἑβραίους must be thus interpreted. But as in the one case, so in the other, the general popular opinion does not bear examination. As the phenomena of the Epistle do not bear out the idea of the Pauline authorship, so neither do they that of being addressed to the Palestine churches. And as in the other case there is *one man*, when we come to search and conjecture, pointed out as most

likely to have written the Epistle, so here, when we pursue the same process, there is *one place* pointed out, to which it seems most likely to have been addressed. At Rome, such a Church existed as is indicated in it: at Rome, above all other places, its personal and historical notices are satisfied: at Rome, we find it first used: at Rome only, is there an unanimous and unvarying negative tradition regarding its authorship. To Rome then, until stronger evidence is adduced, we believe it to have been originally written.

SECTION III.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. Almost all Commentators agree in believing that our Epistle was written *before the destruction of Jerusalem*. And rightly: for if that great break-up of the Jewish polity and religious worship had occurred, we may fairly infer that some mention of such an event would have been found in an argument, the scope of which is to shew the transitoriness of the Jewish priesthood and the Levitical ceremonies. It would be inconceivable, that such an Epistle should be addressed to Jews after their city and temple had ceased to exist.

2. This then being assumed, as our 'terminus ad quem,' i. e. A.D. 70, or at the latest assigned date, 72, it remains to seek for a 'terminus a quo.' Such would appear to me to be fixed by *the death of St. Paul*: but inasmuch as (1) this would not be recognized either by the advocates of the Pauline authorship, or by those who believe that the Epistle, though possibly written by another, was superintended by the Apostle, and seeing (2) that the date of that event itself is wholly uncertain, it will be necessary to look elsewhere for some indication. And the only traces of one will, I conceive, be found by combining several hints furnished by the Epistle. Such are, (α) that the *first generation*, of those who had seen and heard the Lord, was at all events nearly *passed away*: (β) that *the first leaders of the church had died*, probably under the persecution elsewhere alluded to: (γ) that *Timotheus had been imprisoned*, and was then *set free*, probably in connexion with that same persecution. If these notices are to be taken, as maintained above (§ ii. 31 ff.), to apply to the Neronian persecution, then the Epistle cannot have been written till some considerable time after that, in order to justify the expression ἀναμνησέσθε τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας of our ch. x. 32. Now that persecution broke out in 64, and lasted four years, i. e. till Nero's death in 68. And I may notice, that even those who are far from adopting the views here advocated as to the Author and readers of the Epistle, yet consider, that the liberation of Timotheus

may well have been connected with the cessation of the Neronian persecution.

3. If we follow these indications, we shall get the year 68 as our 'terminus a quo,' and the *time* of writing the Epistle will be 68—70, i. e. during the siege of Jerusalem by the armies of Titus, to which we may perhaps discern an allusion in ch. xiii. 14, οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ὧδε μένουσαν πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπιζήτοῦμεν.

4. With regard to the *place* of writing, we are almost entirely in the dark. Taking the usual N. T. sense, above maintained, for οἱ ἀπὸ Ἑταλίας,—‘persons whose home is in Italy, but who are now here,’—it *cannot have been written in Italy*. Nor is Apollos (for when we are left, as now, to the merest conjecture, it is necessary to shape our course by assuming our own hypothesis) likely, after what had happened, again to be found fixed at Corinth. Jerusalem, and indeed Palestine, would be precluded by the Jewish war then raging; Ephesus is possible, and would be a not unlikely resort of Timotheus after his liberation (ch. xiii. 23), as also of Apollos at any time (Acts xviii. 24): Alexandria, the native place of Apollos, is also possible, though the ἐὰν τάχιον ἔρχηται, applied to Timotheus, would not so easily fit it, as on his liberation he would be more likely to go to some parts with which he was familiar than to Alexandria where he was a stranger. In both these cities there may well have been οἱ ἀπὸ Ἑταλίας sojourning: and this very phrase seems to point to some place of considerable resort. On the whole then, I should incline to EPHESUS, as the most probable place of writing: but it must be remembered that on this head all is in the realm of the vaguest conjecture.

SECTION IV.

OCCASION, OBJECT OF WRITING, AND CONTENTS.

1. The occasion which prompted this Epistle evidently was, the enmity of the Jews to the gospel of Christ, which had brought a double danger on the church: on the one hand that of persecution, on the other that of apostasy. Between these lay another, that of mingling with a certain recognition of Jesus as the Christ, a leaning to Jewish practices and valuing of Jewish ordinances. But this latter does not so much appear in our Epistle, as in those others which were written by St. Paul to mixed churches; those to the Romans⁵, the Galatians, the

⁵ One remarkable trace we have of allusion to this form of error,—in its further development, as appears by the verdict of past experience which is appended, but otherwise singularly resembling a passage in the Epistle to the Romans (xiv. 17, οὐ

Colossians. The principal peril to which Jewish converts were exposed, especially after they had lost the guidance of the Apostles themselves in their various churches, was, that of falling back from the despised following of Jesus of Nazareth into the more compact and apparently safer system of their childhood, which moreover they saw tolerated as a *religio licita*, while their own was outcast and proscribed.

2. The object then of this Epistle is, to shew them the superiority of the gospel to the former covenant : and that mainly by exhibiting, from the Scriptures, and from the nature of the case, the superiority of Jesus Himself to both the messengers and the high-priests of that former covenant. This is the main argument of the Epistle, filled out and illustrated by various corollaries springing out of its different parts, and expanding in the directions of encouragement, warning, and illustration.

3. This argument is entered on at once without introduction in ch. i., where Christ's superiority to the angels, the mediators of the old covenant, is demonstrated from Scripture. Then, having interposed (ii. 1—4) a caution on the greater necessity of taking heed to the things which they had heard, the Writer shews (ii. 5—18) why He to whom, and not to the angels, the future world is subjected, yet was made lower than the angels : viz. that He might become our merciful and faithful High Priest, to deliver and to save us, Himself having undergone temptation like ourselves.

4. Having mentioned this title of Christ, he goes back, and prepares the way for its fuller treatment, by a comparison of Him with Moses (iii. 1—6), and a shewing that that antitypical rest of God, from which unbelief excludes, was not the rest of the seventh day, nor that of the possession of Canaan, but one yet reserved for the people of God (iii. 7—iv. 10), into which we must all the more strive to enter, because the word of our God is keen and searching in judgment, and nothing hidden from His sight, with whom we have to do (iv. 11—13).

5. He now resumes the main consideration of his great subject, the High-priesthood of Christ, with a hortatory note of passage (iv. 14—16). This subject he pursues through the whole middle portion of the Epistle (v. 1—x. 18), treating it in its various aspects and requirements. Of these we have (v. 1—10) the conditions of High-priesthood : (v. 11—vi. 20) a digression complaining, with reference to the difficult subject of the Melchisedek-priesthood, of their low state of spiritual attainment, warning them of the necessity of progress, but encouraging them by God's faithfulness : (vii. 1—x. 18) the

γάρ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις κ. πόσις, ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη κ. εἰρήνη κ. χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, in our ch. xiii. 9, καλὸν γὰρ χάριτι βεβαιοῦσθαι τὴν καρδίαν, οὐ βρώμασιν, ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν οἱ περιπατήσαντες.

priesthood of Christ after the order of Melchisedek, in its distinction from the Levitical priesthood (see the various steps set forth in the headings in the commentary), as perpetual,—as superior, in that Abraham acknowledged himself inferior to Melchisedek,—as having power of endless life,—as constituted with an oath,—as living for ever,—as without sin,—as belonging to the heavenly sanctuary, and to a covenant promised by God Himself:—as consisting in better ministrations, able to purify the conscience itself, and to put away sin by the one Sacrifice of the Son of God.

6. Having thus completed his main argument, he devotes the concluding portion (x. 19—xiii. 25) to a series of solemn exhortations to endurance in confidence and patience, and illustrations of that faith on which both must be founded. In x. 19—39, we have exhortation and warning deduced from the facts lately proved, our access to the heavenly place, and our having a great High-priest over the house of God: then by the Pauline citation *ὁ δίκαιός (μου) ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται*, a transition note is struck to ch. xi. which entirely consists in a panegyric of faith and a recounting of its triumphs: on a review of which the exhortation to run the race set before us, and endure chastisement, is again taken up, ch. xii. And the same hortatory strain is pursued to the end of the Epistle; the glorious privileges of the Christian covenant being held forth, and the awful peril of forfeiting them by apostasy;—and those graces, and active virtues, and that steadfastness in suffering shame, being enjoined, which are necessary to the following and imitation of Jesus Christ. The valedictory prayer (xiii. 20, 21), and one or two personal notices and greetings, conclude the whole.

SECTION V.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

1. Something has already been said, in the previous enquiry into the authorship of our Epistle, respecting the question of its original language⁶. There also the principal passages of the Fathers will be found which bear on this subject. They may be thus briefly summed up:—

2. The idea of a Hebrew original is found in Clement of Alexandria (cited above, § i. 14), in Eusebius (ib. 48), Jerome (Catalog. Script. Eccl. 5, vol. ii., p. 839, “Scripserat (Paulus) ut Hebræus Hebræis Hebraïce”). Theodoret (Argum. ad Hebr. fin. vol. iii. p. 544, *γέγραφε δὲ αὐτὴν τῇ Ἑβραίων φωνῇ ἐρμηνευθῆναι δὲ αὐτὴν φασιν ὑπὸ Κλήμεντος*), Euthalius

⁶ See above, § i. 119.

(above, § i. 46; Argum., τῇ σφῶν διαλέκτῳ γραφεῖσα), Primasius (Præfat., “Fertur apostolus hanc Hebræis missam Hebræo sermone . . . conscripsisse”), John Damascenus (Opp. Paris 1712, p. 258 (vol. ii. p. 997, ed. Migne), Παύλου αὐτὴν Ἑβραίοις τῇ Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ συντάξαντος), Œcumenius (Argum. 2), Theophylact (Comm. on ch. i.), in the schol. on ms. 31,—in Cosmas Indicopleustes,—in Rhabanus Maurus,—in Thomas Aquinas; in some modern writers, especially Hallet, in an enquiry into the author and language of the Epistle, appended to Peirce’s Commentary (1742), and to be found in Latin at the end of vol. iv. of Wolf’s *Curæ Philologicæ*,—and Michaelis.

3. Still such an apparently formidable array of ancient testimony is not to be taken as such, without some consideration. Clement’s assertion of a Hebrew original is not reproduced by his scholar Origen, but on the contrary a Greek original is presupposed by his very words (above, § i. 19). And this his divergence from Clement of Alexandria is not easy to explain, if he had regarded him as giving matter of history, and not rather a conjecture of his own. Indeed, the passage of Clement seems to bear this latter on the face of it: for it connects the similarity of style between this Epistle and the Acts with the notion of St. Luke being its translator. If we might venture to fill up the steps by which the inference came about, they would be nearly these: ‘The Epistle must be St. Paul’s. But St. Paul was a Hebrew, and was writing to Hebrews: how then do we find the Epistle in Greek, not unlike in style to that of the Acts of the Apostles? What, if the writer of the Greek of that book were also the writer of the Greek of this,—and St. Paul, as was to be supposed, wrote as a Hebrew to the Hebrews, *in Hebrew*, St. Luke translating into Greek?’

4. Again, Eusebius is not consistent in this matter with himself. In his Comm. on Ps. ii. 7, vol. v. p. 88 (cited above, § i. 48), he says—

ὁ μὲν τοιγε Ἑβραῖος ἐλέγετο κύριον εἶναι τῆς λέξεως ἔτεκον, ὅπερ καὶ Ἀκύλας πεποίηκεν· ὁ δὲ ἀπόστολος νομομαθὴς ὑπάρχων ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους (Heb. i. 5) τῇ τῶν ὁ ἐχρήσατο,

thus clearly implying that the Epistle was written in Greek. And such has been the opinion of almost all the moderns: of all, we may safely say, who have handled the subject impartially and intelligently. The reasons for this now generally received opinion are mainly found in the style of the Epistle, which is the most purely Greek of all the writings of the N. T.: so that it would be violating all probability to imagine it a translation from a language of entirely different rhetorical character. The construction of the periods is such, in distinction from the character, in this particular, of the Oriental languages, that if it is a translation, the whole argumentation of the original must have been broken up into its original elements of thought, and all its

connecting links recast; so that it would not be so much a translation, as a re-writing, of the Hebrew Epistle.

5. The paronomasiæ⁷ again, and the citations from the LXX being made in entire independence of the Hebrew text, form collectively a presumptive proof, the weight of which it is very difficult to evade, that the present Greek text is the original. Such peculiarities belong to thought running free and selecting its own words, not to the constrained reproduction of the thoughts of another in another tongue. Examine our English version in any of those numerous places where St. Paul has indulged in paronomasiæ, and no such will be found in the translation. And yet English is much nearer to Greek than Greek to any dialect of the Hebrew.

6. The same inference has been deduced from the appearance, e. g., of the two senses of *covenant* and *testament* for the word *διαθήκη*, ch. ix. 15 ff. al. This is well stated by Calvin in the argument to his Commentary:—

“Ut alios locos qui ex scriptura citantur, prætermittam: si Hebraice scripta fuisset epistola, nulla in nomine *testamenti* fuisset allusio, in qua scriptor immoratur. Non potuit, inquam, ex alio fonte hauriri quod de jure testamenti capite nono disputat, quam ex Græca voce. Nam *διαθήκη* ambiguum apud Græcos significationem habet: *berith* autem Hebræis nonnisi *fœdus* significat. Hæc una ratio sani judicii hominibus sufficiet ad probandum quod dixi, Græco sermone scriptam fuisse Epistolam⁸.”

7. Again, the Epistle abounds with Greek expressions which could only have been expressed in the Hebrew by a circumlocution, and can therefore not be regarded as translations from it. The validity of this argument has been acknowledged even by those who deny that of the previous ones. We may instance such expressions as *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* (ch. i. 1), *ἀπαύγασμα* (i. 3), *εὐπερίστατος* (xii. 1), *μετριοπαθεῖν* (v. 2), the repetition of the idea in *ὑποτάσσω* in ii. 5—8, . . . οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ὑπέταξεν τὴν οἰκουμ. τ. μέλλ. . . . ἐν τῷ γὰρ ὑποτάξαι αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα,

⁷ Lists of these have frequently been given. The following, from Bleek, comprises some of the most remarkable: ch. ii. 8, *ὑποτάξαι* . . . ἀνυπότακτον: v. 8, *ἔμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν* (this Michaelis endeavours to reconcile with a Hebrew original): v. 14, *καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ*: vii. 3, *ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ*: vii. 19, 22, *ἐγγίζομεν* . . . ἔγγυος: vii. 23, 24, *παρμένειν* . . . μένειν: viii. 7, 8, *ἄμεμπτος* . . . μεμφόμενος: ix. 10, *ἐπὶ βρώμασιν κ. πόμασιν*: ix. 28, *προσενεχθεῖς* . . . ἀνενεγκεῖν: x. 29, *ἡγησάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγιάσθη*: x. 34, *τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων* . . . προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς κρείσσονα ὑπαρξιν: x. 38, 39, *καὶ ἐὰν ὑποστείληται* . . . ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑποστολῆς: xi. 27, *τὸν γὰρ ἀόρατον ὡς ὁρῶν*: xiii. 14, *μένουσιν* . . . μέλλουσιν.

⁸ This argument has been met by denying that it is requisite to give the sense of *testament* to *διαθήκη* in that passage: but cf. my notes there. See Davidson, *Introd.* to N. T. vol. iii. p. 284. The same ground has been taken by Mr. Wratishaw, in his little volume of sermons and treatises.

οὐδὲν ἄφηκεν αὐτῷ ἀνυπότακτον . . . ὀρώμεν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ὑποτεταγμένα, whereas in Hebrew *יְסֻדָּאֵשׁוּ* can only be expressed by a periphrasis, to place under the feet (*שִׁית תַּחַת רַגְלֶיךָ*)⁹.

8. These considerations, coming in aid of the conviction which must be felt by every intelligent Greek scholar that he is reading an original composition and not a version, induce us to refuse the idea of a Hebrew original, and to believe the Epistle to have been first written in Greek.

9. The style of our Epistle has been already touched upon in our enquiry respecting the authorship, § i. 116 ff. From the earliest times, its diversity from that of the writings of St. Paul has been matter of remark¹. It is *συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως ἑλληνικωτέρα* (Orig.). The main difference for us, which will also set forth its characteristic peculiarity, is, that whereas St. Paul is ever as it were struggling with the scantiness of human speech to pour forth his crowding thoughts, thereby falling into rhetorical and grammatical irregularities, the style of our Epistle flows regularly on, with no such suspended constructions. Even where the subject induces long parentheses, the Writer does not break the even flow and equilibrium of his style, but returns back to the point where he left it².

10. Again, the greatest pains are bestowed on a matter which does not seem to have engaged the attention of the other sacred writers, even including St. Paul himself: viz. rhetorical rhythm, and equilibrium of words and sentences. In St. Paul's most glorious outbursts of eloquence, he is not rhetorical. In those of the Writer of our Epistle, he is elaborately and faultlessly rhetorical. The *πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως* of the opening, are as it were a key-note of the rhythmical style of the whole. The particles and participles used are all weighed with a view to this effect. The simple expressions of the other sacred writers are expanded into longer words, or into sonorous and majestic clauses: the *μισθός* of St. Paul becomes *μισθαποδοσία*: the *αἷμα*, *αἱματεκχυσία*; the *ὄρκος*, *ὄρκωμοσία*: where St. Paul describes our ascended Lord as *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ καθήμενος* (Col. iii. 1: cf. Rom. viii. 34: Eph. i. 20), here we have *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς* (ch. i. 3), *ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* (viii. 1), *ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ κεκάθικεν* (xii. 2): where St. Paul describes Him as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ* (2 Cor. iv. 4), or as *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (Col. i. 15), here we have *ὢν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως τοῦ θεοῦ* (i. 3).

⁹ See Davidson, *Introd.* vol. iii. p. 287.

¹ See the citations above, from Clement of Alexandria, § i. 14, and from Origen, *ib.* 19.

² See e. g. ch. xii. 18—24.

SECTION VI.

CANONICITY.

1. This part of our introduction must obviously be treated quite irrespective of the hypothesis of the Pauline authorship of the Epistle. That being assumed, its canonicity follows. That being denied, our object must be to shew how the Epistle itself was regarded, even by those who were not persuaded of its apostolicity.

2. The earliest testimonies to it are found where we might expect them, in the church of Rome, and in the writings of one who never cites it as apostolic. It will be important for us to see, in what estimation Clement held it. He makes, as we have already seen, the most frequent and copious use of it, never citing it expressly, never appealing to it as Scripture, but adopting its words and expressions, just as he does those of other books of the New Testament. It is to be observed, that when in the course of thus incorporating it he refers to ἡ γραφή, or uses the expression γέγραπται, it is with regard to texts quoted not from it only, but also from the O. T.: e. g. in c. 36, p. 281, where he introduces, in the midst of a passage adopted from Heb. i., with γέγραπται γὰρ οὕτως, the citation ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. (Ps. ciii. 4): in c. 23, p. 260, where we have συνεπιμαρτυρούσης καὶ τῆς γραφῆς, ὅτι ταχὺ ᾗξει καὶ οὐ χρονιᾷ (Heb. x. 37: Hab. ii. 3). By this procedure we cannot say that Clement casts any slight on this Epistle, for it is his constant practice. He frequently quotes Scripture as such, but it is always the O. T. Two or three times he adduces the sayings of our Lord, but never even this in the form of a citation from our existing Gospels, or in agreement with their exact words. All we can gather from Clement is, that, treating this as he does other Epistles³, and appropriating largely as he does its words and expressions, he certainly did not rank it below those others: an inference which would lead us to believe that he recognized its canonical authority. But to found more than this on Clement's testimony⁴, would be unwarranted by fair induction.

3. Justin Martyr, amidst a few allusions to our Epistle, makes what can hardly but be called canonical use of it in his first Apology, § 63, p. 81. There, in explaining that the λόγος of God is also His Son, he adds, καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος. Now it appears from the

³ The only exception is in an express citation in c. 47 from 1 Corinthians, where, writing to the Corinthians, he is appealing to the authority of St. Paul.

⁴ As e. g. Stuart, Comm. p. 73: but his expressions have become somewhat modified since Davidson quoted them, Introd. vol. iii. p. 264.

Dial. cont. Tryph. c. 57, p. 154, that the allusion in the *καλεῖται ἄγγελος* is to Gen. xviii. 2. It would seem, therefore, seeing that Heb. iii. 1 is the only place where our Lord is entitled *ἀπόστολος*, that the *καλεῖται* is meant to embrace under it that passage as a Scripture testimony equi-pollent with the other.

4. In Clement of Alexandria and Origen, the recognition of our Epistle as canonical depends on its recognition as the work of St. Paul. Where they both cite it as Scripture, it is as written by him: and where Origen mentions the doubt about its being his, he adduces other Scripture testimony, observing that it needs another kind of proof, not that the Epistle is canonical, but that it is St. Paul's⁵.

5. And very similar was the proceeding of those parts of the church where the Pauline authorship was not held. Irenæus, as we have seen, makes no use of the Epistle. The fragment of Muratori, representing the view of the Roman church, probably does not contain it. Tertullian, who regards it as written by Barnabas, the *comes apostolorum*, cites it, not as authoritative in itself, but 'ex redundantia,' as recording the sentiments of such a companion of the Apostles.

6. Our Epistle is, it is true, contained in the Syriac version (Peschito) made at the end of the second century: but it is entirely uncertain, whether this insertion in the canon accompanied a recognition of the Pauline authorship, or not. This recognition, which prevailed in that part of the church in after times, may have at first occasioned its insertion in the canon; but we cannot say that it did.

7. But in the Alexandrine church the case was different. There, as we have seen, the assumption of Pauline authorship appears early and soon prevails universally: and in consequence we find the canonical authority there unquestioned, and the Epistle treated as the other parts of Scripture⁶.

8. Throughout the Eastern churches, the canonicity and apostolicity were similarly regarded as inseparably connected. It is true that Eusebius⁷, in numbering it among the Antilegomena, together with the Epistles of Barnabas and Clement and Jude, and the Wisdom of the Son of Sirach, might seem to attribute to it another authorship, were it not evident from his constant use of it and his numbering it in his principal passage on the canon (H. E. iii. 25) among the Homologoumena, that the doubt must be resolved into that on the Pauline authorship.

9. In the Western church, where this was not recognized, neither do we find, even down to the middle of the fourth century, any use made of the Epistle as canonical. Even Novatian and Cyprian, who might

⁵ See above, § i. 18.

⁶ See the testimonies adduced § i. 10—24.

⁷ H. E. vi. 13: see it quoted above, § i. 49.

well have thus used it, have not done so : nor in the controversies on the reception of the lapsed, and on the repetition of heretical baptism, do we ever find it adduced on either side, apposite as some passages are to the subjects in dispute. Only with the assumption, gradually imported from the East, of a Pauline origin, do we find here and there a Western writer citing it as of canonical authority.

10. It is in Jerome first that we find^a any indication of a doubt whether canonicity and Pauline authorship are necessarily to stand and fall together. The same is found^o now and then in the writings of Augustine. But soon after this time the general prevalence, and ultimately authoritative sanction, of the view of the Pauline authorship, closed up any chance of the canonicity of the Epistle being held on independent grounds : and it was not till the times of the Reformation, that the matter began to be again enquired into on its own merits.

11. The canonicity was doubted by Cardinal Cajetan¹, but upheld by Erasmus, in these remarkable words :—

“Imo non opinor periclitari fidem, si tota ecclesia fallatur in titulo hujus epistolæ, modo constet Spiritum Sanctum fuisse principalem auctorem, id quod interim convenit².”

In the Roman Catholic church, however, the authoritative sanction given by the Council of Trent to the belief of the Pauline origin effectually stopped all intelligent enquiry.

12. Among reformed theologians, the canonicity of our Epistle was strongly upheld, even when the Pauline authorship was not recognized. Calvin says, in his prologue to the Epistle—

“Ego vero eam inter apostolicas sine controversia amplector : nec dubito Satanae artificio fuisse quondam factum ut illi auctoritatem quidam detraherent. Nullus enim est e sacris libris qui de Christi sacerdotio tam luculenter disserat, unicus quod morte sua obtulit sacrificii vim dignitatemque tam magnifice extollat, de caerimoniarum tam usu quam abrogatione uberius tractet, qui denique plenius explicet Christum esse finem legis. Quare ne patiamur Dei Ecclesiam et nos ipsos tanto bono spoliari, sed ejus possessionem constanter nobis asseramus. Quis porro eam composuerit, non magnopere curandum est.”

13. Beza speaks in the same strain :—

“Verum quid attinet de scriptoris nomine contendere, quod scriptor ipse celatum voluit? Sufficiat hoc nosse, vere esse dictatum a Spiritu Sancto, quæ luculentissimam ac plane apos-

^a See above, § i. 68—80 : esp. parr. 74 ff.

^o See § i. 81 ff.

¹ In his Comm. on the Epistle, referred to by Bl. ; which I have not been able to see.

² Supportatio Errorum Natalis Beddæ, Opp. t. ix. pp. 594, 595.

tolicam veteris fœderis cum novo collationem, atque adeo novi fœderis veluti singularem quandam promulgationem ac sanctionem complectatur" (N. T. p. 335).

And again, *ib.* p. 382:—

"Non dubitavimus tamen passim eum apostolum vocare, quod spiritu vere apostolico præditus fuerit."

14. Similarly also the *Confessio Gallicana*, which, though it divides it off from the Pauline writings, yet includes it without remark among the canonical books. So also the Arminians, e. g. Limborch, who, believing it to have been written "ab aliquo e Pauli comitibus et quidem conscio Paulo," says—

"Interim divinam hujus epistolæ auctoritatem agnoscimus multisque aliis quas ab apostolis esse scriptas constat, ob argumenti quod tractat præstantiam præferendam judicamus."

15. Among the early Lutheran divines there were some differences of opinion respecting the place to be assigned to the Epistle; the general view being, that it was to be read, as Jerome first wrote (*Præfat. in libr. Salomon. Opp. ed. Migne, vol. ix. p. 1243*) of the Apocryphal O. T. books, "ad ædificationem plebis," but not "ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam³." In other words, it was set apart,—and in this relegation six other books shared, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, James, Jude, and the Apocalypse,—among the apocryphal writings appended to the N. T. And this order was usually followed in the German Bibles.

16. Soon however after the beginning of the 17th century, this distinction began to be obliterated, and the practice to be introduced⁴ of calling these books "*deuterocanonici*" or "*canonici libri secundi ordinis*," and, although thus called, of citing them as of equal authority, and equally inspired, with the other books. Since that time, the controversies respecting the books of Scripture have taken a wider range, and it has not been so much respecting canonicity, as respecting origin, character, and doctrine, that the disputes of divines have been waged.

17. In our own country, at the time of the Reformation, while the question of authorship was left open, the canonical authority of the Epistle was never doubted. To establish this, it may be enough to cite some testimonies.

In Tyndale's prologue to the Epistle, he says, having mentioned the objection to the Pauline authorship from ch. ii. 3—

"Now whether it were Paul's or no, I say not, but permit it to

³ See the long extract from Martin Chemnitz's *Examen Consilii Tridentini*, in Bleek, vol. i. p. 449 ff.: and the others which follow from the Wittenberg divines.

⁴ By Gerhard: see the references in Bleek, pp. 466, 467.

other men's judgments : neither think I it to be an article of any man's faith, but that a man may doubt of the author."

Then, having met several objections against its canonicity urged from certain texts in it, as ch. vi. 4 ff., ch. x. 26 ff., ch. xii. 17, he concludes—

"Of this ye see that this Epistle ought no more to be refused for a holy, godly, and catholic, than the other authentic Scriptures."

And, speaking of the Writer, he says—

"It is easy to see that he was a faithful servant of Christ, and of the same doctrine that Timothy was of, yea and Paul himself was of, and that he was an Apostle, or in the Apostles' time, or near thereunto. And seeing the Epistle agreeth to all the rest of the Scripture, if it be indifferently looked on, why should it not be authority, and taken for holy Scripture⁵?"

18. Fulke, in his defence of Translations of the Bible⁶, while defending the omission of the name of St. Paul in the title of the Epistle in the Geneva Bible of 1560, says—

"Which of us, I pray you, that thinketh that this Epistle was not written by St. Paul, once doubteth whether it be not of apostolical spirit and authority? Which is manifest by this, that both in preaching and writing we cite it thus, the Apostle to the Hebrews."

19. Bp. Jewel again, in his Defence of the Apology, p. 186, where he is speaking of the charge of anonymousness brought against it, says—

"The Epistle unto the Hebrews, some say, was written by St. Paul, some by Clemens, some by Barnabas, some by some other: and so are we uncertain of the author's name."

20. Whittaker (*Disputatio de Sacr. Script. Controvers. i. quæst. i. c. 16'*), says—

"Si Lutherus aut qui Lutherum sequenti sunt nonnulli aliter senserint aut scripserint de quibusdam libris N. T., . . . ii pro se respondeant: nihil ista res ad nos pertinet, qui hac in re Lutherum nec sequimur nec defendimus, quique meliori ratione ducimur. . . . De auctoritate nullius libri qui pertinet ad N. T. dubitamus, nec vero de auctore, præterquam Epistolæ ad Hebræos. Epistolam hanc esse omni modo canonicam concedimus: sed num a Paulo apostolo conscripta fuerit, non perinde liquet . . . non valde de hac re contendamus: neque enim necesse est: et res in dubio relinqui potest, ut interim sua epistolæ auctoritas constet atque conservetur."

⁵ Tyndale's Doctrinal Treatises, &c. Parker Society's edn., pp. 521, 522.

⁶ Parker Society's edn., pp. 32, 33.

⁷ Cited in Bleek, p. 464. See the Eng. translation in the Parker Society's edn., p. 103 ff.

21. With regard to the question itself, in what light we are to look on our Epistle with respect to canonicity, it is one which it will be well to treat here on general grounds, as it will come before us again more than once, in writing of the remaining books of the N. T.

22. We might put this matter on the ground which Jerome takes in his Epistle to Dardanus, "*nihil interesse cujus sit, cum sit ecclesiastici viri*:" or on that which Erasmus takes, when he says that the "*auctor primarius*" is the "*Spiritus Sanctus*," and so puts by as indifferent the question of the "*auctor secundarius*:" thus in both cases resting the decision entirely on the character of the contents of the book itself.

23. But this would manifestly be a wrong method of proceeding. We do not thus in the case of other writings, whose unexceptionable evangelic character is universally acknowledged. To say nothing of later productions, no one ever reasoned thus respecting the Epistle of Barnabas, or that of Clement to the Corinthians, or any of the quasi-apostolic writings. None of the ancients ever dealt so before Jerome, nor did Jerome himself in other passages. More than intrinsic excellence and orthodoxy is wanting, to win for a book a place in the N. T. canon. Indeed any reasoning must be not only in itself insufficient, but logically unsound, which makes the authority of a book which is to set us our standard of doctrine, the result of a judgment of our own respecting the doctrine inculcated in it. Such judgment can be only subsidiary to the enquiry, not the primary line of its argument, which must of necessity be of an objective character.

24. And when we come to proofs of this latter kind, it may well be asked, which of them are we to accept as sufficient. It is clear, we cannot appeal to tradition alone. We must combine with such an appeal, the exercise of our own judgment on tradition. When, for example, the Church of England takes, in her sixth Article, the ground of pure tradition, and says,—

"In the name of the Holy Scripture, we do understand those canonical books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church,"

she would by implication, if consistent with herself, exclude from the canon at the least the Apocalypse, which was for some centuries not received by the Eastern and for the most part by the Greek church, and our Epistle, which was for some centuries not received by the whole Latin church. Nay, she would go even further than this: for even to the present day the Syrian church excludes the Apocalypse, the Epistles of St. Jude, 2 and 3 John, and 2 Peter, from the canon. It is fortunate that our Church did not leave this definition to be worked out for itself, but, giving a detailed list of O. T. books, has appended to it this far more definite sentence: "All the books of the New Testament, as they are commonly received, we do receive, and

account them canonical:" thus adopting the list of N. T. books in common usage in the Western church at the time, about which there could be no difference.

25. If then tradition pure and simple will not suffice for our guide, how are we to combine our judgment with it, so as to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion? It is manifest, that the question of *origin* comes in here as most important. If the *genuineness* of a book be in dispute, as e. g. that of 2 Peter, it suffices, to make it reasonably probable that it was written by him whose name it bears. When this is received, all question of canonicity is at rest. In that case, the name of the Apostle is ample guarantee. And so with our Epistle, those who think they can prove it to be the work of St. Paul, are no longer troubled about its canonicity. This is secured, in shewing it to be of apostolic origin.

26. And so it ever was in the early church. Apostolicity and canonicity were bound together. And in the case of those historical books which were not written by Apostles themselves, there was ever an effort to connect their writers, St. Mark with St. Peter, St. Luke with St. Paul, so that at least apostolic sanction might not be wanting to them. What then must be our course with regard to a book, of which we believe neither that it was written by an Apostle, nor that it had apostolic sanction?

27. This question must necessarily lead to an answer not partaking of that rigid demonstrative character which some reasoners require for all inferences regarding the authority of Scripture. Our conclusion must be matter of moral evidence, and of degree: must be cumulative—made up of elements which are not, taken by themselves, decisive, but which, taken together, are sufficient to convince the reasonable mind.

28. First, we have reason to believe that our Epistle was written by one who lived and worked in close union with the Apostle Paul: of whom that Apostle says that "he planted, and Apollos watered, and God gave the increase:" of whom it is elsewhere in holy writ declared, that he was "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures:" that he "helped much them which had believed through grace:" that he "mightily convinced the Jews, and that publicly, shewing by the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ."

29. Secondly, having, as we believe, from his pen such an Epistle, we find it largely quoted by one who was himself a companion of the Apostles,—and almost without question appealed to as Scripture by another primitive Christian writer: and both these testimonies belong to that very early age of the Church, when controversies about canonicity had not yet begun.

30. Thirdly, in the subsequent history of the Church, we find the

reception of the Epistle into the canon becoming ever more and more a matter of common consent : mainly, no doubt, in connexion with the hypothesis of its Pauline authorship, but, as we have shewn above, not in all cases in that connexion.

31. Fourthly, we cannot refuse the conviction, that the contents of the Epistle itself are such as powerfully to come in aid of these other considerations. Unavailing as such a conviction would be of itself, as has been previously noticed, yet it is no small confirmation of the evidence which probable authorship, early recognition, and subsequent consent, furnish to the canonicity of our Epistle, when we find that no where are the main doctrines of the faith more purely or more majestically set forth ; no where Holy Scripture urged with greater authority and cogency ; no where those marks in short, which distinguish the first rank of primitive Christian writings from the second, more unequivocally and continuously present.

32. The result of this combination of evidence is, that though no considerations of expediency, nor consent of later centuries, can ever make us believe the Epistle to have been written by St. Paul, we yet conceive ourselves perfectly justified in accounting it a portion of the N. T. canon, and in regarding it with the same reverence as the rest of the Holy Scriptures.

There are other subjects of deep interest connected with our Epistle, such as its relation, in point of various aspects of Christian doctrine, to the teaching of St. Paul, of St. John, of St. James, and of St. Peter : its connexion with, and independence of, the system of Philo : to treat of which would extend these prolegomena, already long, to the size of a volume. They will be found discussed in the first part of Riehm's "*Lehrbegriff des Hebraerbriefes*," Ludwigsburg, 1858.

CHAPTER II.

THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. It has been very generally agreed, that among the apostolic persons bearing the name of James (*Ἰάκωβος*), the son of Zebedee, the brother of St. John, cannot well have written our Epistle. The state

of things and doctrines which we find in it can hardly have been reached as early as before the execution of that Apostle, related in Acts xii.

2. But when we have agreed on this, matter of controversy at once arises. It would appear from the simple superscription of our Epistle with the name Ἰάκωβος, that we are to recognize in its Writer the apostolic person known simply by this name in the Acts,—who was the president of the church at Jerusalem (Acts xii. 17; xv. 13 ff.; xxi. 18), and is called by St. Paul the brother of our Lord (Gal. i. 19). This also being pretty generally granted, the question arising is: Was this James identical with, or was he distinct from, James the son of Alphæus, one of the Twelve Apostles (Matt. x. 3: Mark iii. 18: Luke vi. 15: Acts i. 13)?

3. I have partly anticipated the answer to this question in my note on Matt. xiii. 55, where I have maintained that, consistently with the straightforward acceptation of Scripture data, we cannot believe any of those who are called the brethren of our Lord to have been also of the number of the Twelve. I conceive John vii. 5, as compared with ib. vi. 67, 70 immediately preceding, to be decisive on this point; and since I first expressed myself thus, I have seen nothing in the least degree calculated to shake that conviction^s. And, that conclusion still standing, I must of course believe this James to be excluded from the number of the Twelve, and if so, distinct from the son of Alphæus.

4. Still, it will be well to deal with the question on its own ground. And first, as to the notices in Scripture itself which bear on it. And these, it must be acknowledged, are not without difficulty. As e. g. those which occur in St. Luke, who must have been well aware of the state of matters in the church at Jerusalem. He names, up to Acts xii., but two persons as James: one, whom he always couples with John (Luke v. 10; vi. 14; viii. 51; ix. 28, 54 (Acts i. 13)), and in Acts xii. 2 relates, under the name of τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰωάννου, to have been slain with the sword by Herod: the other, whom he twice introduces as Ἰάκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ἀλφαίου (Luke vi. 15: Acts i. 13). Besides, the genitive of the name, Ἰακώβου, is thrice mentioned by him as designating by relation-

^s Nothing can be lamer than the way in which Lange (in Herzog's Encycl. art Jacobus) endeavours to escape the conclusion. I subjoin it as the latest specimen of what ingenuity can do against plain matter of fact: "The kind of unbelief here predicated of our Lord's Brethren is parallel with that of Peter, Matt. xvi. 22, 23, and of Thomas, John xx. 25. John is evidently speaking, not of unbelief in the ordinary sense, which rejected the Messiahship of Jesus, but of that unbelief, or that want of trust which made it difficult for our Lord's disciples, His Apostles, and even His Mother, to reconcile themselves to His way of life, or to His concealment of Himself." Against this finessing I would simply set (1) the usage of πιστεύειν εἰς αὐτόν, John ii. 11; iv. 39; vii. 31, 39, 48; viii. 30; ix. 36; x. 42; xi. 45, 48; xii. 37 (with οὐκ), 42: and (2) the οὐδὲ γάρ, following on the unbelief of the Jews ver. 1, with which the οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν is introduced.

ship other persons : in Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13, we read of Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, and in Luke xxiv. 10, of Μαρία Ἰακώβου : interpreting which latter expression by Matt. xxvii. 56 : Mark xv. 40, 47, and xvi. 1, and by John xix. 25, we shall infer that the Mary here mentioned being the wife of Alphæus (or Clopas), the ellipsis must be filled up by the word *mother*, and Ἰακώβου in this place designates James the son of Alphæus. And as regards Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, we may well suppose that the same person is designated by the genitive, however difficult it may be to fill in the ellipsis. We have a Judas, who designates himself ἀδελφός Ἰακώβου, Jude 1 : but whether these are to be considered identical, must be determined by the result of our present investigation.

5. The question for us with regard to St. Luke, is the following : In Acts xii. 17, and in the subsequent parts of that book, we have a person mentioned simply as Ἰάκωβος, who is evidently of great authority in the church at Jerusalem. Are we to suppose that St. Luke, careful and accurate as his researches were, was likely to have introduced thus without previous notice, a new and third person bearing the same name ? Does not this testify strongly for the identity of the two ?

6. The best way to answer this question will be, to notice St. Luke's method of proceeding on an occasion somewhat analogous. In Acts i. 13, we find Φίλιππος among the Apostles. In ib. vi. 5, we find a Φίλιππος among the seven, appointed to relieve the Apostles from the daily ministration of alms. In ib. viii. 5, we read that Φίλιππος went down to a city of Samaria and preached. Now as there is nothing to identify this part of the narrative with what went before, or to imply that this was not a missionary journey of one of the Apostles, distinct from the διασπορά from which they were excepted above, ver. 1, it is not at the first moment obvious which Philip is meant. It is true, that intelligent comparison of the parts of the narrative makes it plain to us : but the case is one in point, as shewing that St. Luke is in the habit of *leaving it to such comparison to decide*, and not of inserting notices at the mention of names, to prevent mistake. This would be much more in the practice of St. John, who writes, xiv. 22, Ἰούδας οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης : cf. also xi. 2. It seems then that the practice of St. Luke will not decide for us, but our enquiry must still be founded on the merits of the question itself.

7. And in so doing, we will make first the hypothesis of the *identity* of James the son of Alphæus with James the Lord's brother. Then, besides the great, and to me insuperable difficulty in John vi. 70 and vii. 5, we shall have the following circumstances for our consideration : (1) In Matt. xxvii. 56, and Mark xv. 40, we read of Mary the mother of James and Joses : and in Mark, the epithet τοῦ μικροῦ is attached to Ἰακώβου. Now on the hypothesis of James, the brother of the Lord,

being identical with the son of Alphæus, there were *four such sons*, Matt. xiii. 55 ; James, Joseph, Simon, and Judas : and of these four, two, James and Judas, were Apostles. So that, leaving out of the question for the moment the confusion of the names Joses and Joseph, we should thus have Mary the wife of Clopas designated as the mother of James, who *was an Apostle*, and of Joses, who *was not an Apostle*, to the exclusion of her son Judas, who was also an Apostle. Is not this, to say the least, extremely improbable ?

8. And besides this, let us review for a moment the epithet τοῦ μικροῦ, attached to Ἰακώβου by St. Mark. Beyond question, at the time when this Gospel was written, James the son of Zebedee had long ago fallen by the sword of Herod⁹. And as certainly, at this time James the Lord's brother was at the head of the mother church at Jerusalem, one of the three pillars (Gal. ii. 9) of the Christian body. Was it likely that at such a time (for the notice and epithet is one whose use must be sought at the time of the publication of the Gospel, not at that of the formation of the apostolic oral history, seeing that it does not occur in the parallel place in Matthew) the epithet τοῦ μικροῦ would be attached to this James by way of distinguishing him from that other, long since martyred ? Is it not much more probable that the epithet, for whatever reason, was attached to James the son of Alphæus to distinguish him from this very James the brother of the Lord ?

9. If James the son of Alphæus, the Apostle, were the head of the mother church at Jerusalem, and a man of such distinction among the Jewish Christians, how comes it, that when an Apostle of the circumcision is to be named, over against St. Paul, St. Peter, and not he, is dignified by that title ?

10. There is another more general consideration, which, however much it may be disallowed by some, yet seems to me not without weight. It hardly consists with the mission of the Twelve, that any of them should be settled in a particular spot, as the president or Bishop of a local church. Even granting the exceptional character of the Jerusalem church, it does not seem likely that the ἀρχιερεσβύτερος there would be one of those to whom it was said πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει : and of whom all that we read in the Acts of the Apostles, and all that primitive tradition relates to us, assures us that they fulfilled this command.

11. If we compare this hypothesis with early tradition, its first notices present us with a difficulty. Speaking of James the brother of the Lord, Eusebius (H. E. ii. 23) says,—

ἀκριβέστατά γε μὴν τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ὁ Ἑγήσιππος, ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς, ἐν τῷ πεμπτῷ αὐτοῦ ὑπομνήματι τοῦτου

⁹ See Prolegg. Vol. I. ch. iii. § iv.

λέγων ἱστορεῖ τὸν τρόπον· Διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος, ὁ ὀνομασθεὶς ὑπὸ πάντων δίκαιος ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου χρόνων μέχρι καὶ ἡμῶν. ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ Ἰάκωβοι ἐκαλοῦντο.

12. This passage seems most plainly to preclude all idea of James the Lord's brother being one of the Twelve. However we understand the not very perspicuous words μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων; whether we boldly suppose with Jerome, on account of the verb διαδέχεται, that they are a mistake for μετὰ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ("Suscepit ecclesiam Hierosolyma post apostolos frater domini Jacobus:" Catal. Script. Eccl. 2, vol. ii. p. 829), or take them as they stand, and as is most likely from comparison with St. Paul's narrative in Gal. ii.,—of joint superintendence with the Apostles; on either, or any view, they expressly exclude James from the number of the Apostles themselves¹.

13. And entirely consistent with this is the frequently misunderstood other testimony from Hegesippus, cited by Eusebius (H. E. iv. 22):—
καὶ μετὰ τὸ μαρτυρῆσαι Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον ὡς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῷ αὐτῷ λόγῳ, πάλιν ὁ ἐκ θείου αὐτοῦ Συμεὼν ὁ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ καθίσταται ἐπίσκοπος· ὃν προέθεντο πάντες, ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ κυρίου δεύτερον.

The straightforward interpretation of which passage is, that "after James the Just had been martyred, as was the Lord also for the same cause, next was appointed bishop Symeon, the son of Clopas, the offspring of his (James's, not the Lord's, as Lange and others have most unfairly attempted to make it mean) uncle, whom all agreed in preferring, being, as he was, second of the cousins of the Lord." That is, Joseph and Clopas (Alphæus) being brothers, and one son of Alphæus, James, being an Apostle, his next brother Symeon (Josès may have been dead ere this) being thus ἀνεψιὸς κυρίου δεύτερος, and born ἐκ τοῦ θείου αὐτοῦ (Ἰακώβου), succeeded James the Just in the bishopric of Jerusalem. I submit that on the hypothesis of Symeon being James's own brother, such a sentence is simply unaccountable.

14. It is true that in this, as in so many other matters, ancient tradi-

¹ How Lange, in his article in Herzog's Encyclopædia, can cite these words in proof of the *identity*, I cannot imagine. This,—besides his suppression here of the following ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ Ἰάκωβοι ἐκαλοῦντο,—is one of the many tokens of unfairness which appear in that specious and clever article. I subjoin his own words: Hegesippus spricht offenbar für die Identität, διαδέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου Ἰάκωβος. Hieronymus übersetzte in seinem Catalog falsch, „nach den Aposteln;" Rufinus verbesserte, „mit den Aposteln." Er übernahm die Leitung der Kirche von Jerusalem mit den Aposteln. Das heißt, er wurde nicht ausschließlicher Bischof, sondern den übrigen Aposteln als Aposteln war die Mitwirkung der Natur der Sache nach vorbehalten. Als Bischof wird er von den Aposteln unterschieden, obgleich er Apostel ist, so wie Petrus als Sprecher von den Aposteln unterschieden wird, obgleich er zu ihnen gehört, Apg. v. 29 (ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι). Surely any one may see through the fallacy of this last citation, as compared with the expression in Hegesippus.

tion is not consistent with itself. For Euseb. (H. E. ii. 1) quotes from the Hypotyposeis of Clement of Alexandria—

Ἰακώβῳ τῷ δικαίῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ καὶ Πέτρῳ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν ὁ κύριος. οὗτοι τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις παρέδωκαν. οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ ἀπόστολοι τοῖς ἐβδομήκοντα, ὧν εἷς ἦν καὶ Βαρνάβας. δύο δὲ γεγόνασιν Ἰάκωβοι, εἷς ὁ δίκαιος, ὁ κατὰ τοῦ πτερυγίου βληθείς καὶ ὑπὸ κναφέως ξύλῳ πληγείς εἰς θάνατον, ἕτερος δὲ ὁ καρατομηθείς.

And in the same chapter he speaks of Clement as reporting that Stephen was the first martyr πρὸς τῶν κυριοκτόνων,—

τότε δὴτα καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ κυρίου λεγόμενον ἀδελφόν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ οὗτος τοῦ Ἰωσήφ ὀνόμαστο παῖς τοῦτον δὲ οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰάκωβον, ὃν καὶ δίκαιον ἐπικλῆν οἱ πάλοι δι' ἀρετῆς ἐκάλουν προτερήματα, πρῶτον ἱστοροῦσι τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐγχειρισθῆναι θρόνον.

15. Compare with this Euseb. H. E. i. 12:—

ἔπειτα δὲ θῆναι αὐτὸν Ἰακώβῳ φησὶν εἷς δὲ καὶ οὗτος τῶν φερομένων τοῦ σωτήρος μαθητῶν, ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀδελφῶν ἦν :

and vii. 19 : and the Apostolical Constitutions, ii. 55, and vi. 12, 14, where, after the enumeration of the Twelve Apostles, we have named—

Ἰακώβός τε ὁ τοῦ κυρίου ἀδελφὸς καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων ἐπίσκοπος καὶ Παῦλος ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος.

Thus it appears, that the assumption of the identity encounters several difficulties, both from Scripture itself (even supposing the crowning one of John vii. 5 got over), and from primitive tradition. It nevertheless became very prevalent, as soon as the setting in of asceticism suggested the hypothesis of the perpetual virginity of the Mother of our Lord. This is found from Jerome downwards ; and all kinds of artificial explanations of the relationship of the brethren to our Lord have been given, to escape the inference from the simple testimony of Holy Scripture, that they were veritably children of Joseph and Mary, younger than our Lord.

16. Let us now follow the other hypothesis, that James the brother of the Lord and James the son of Alphæus were *different persons*. Against this, many objections have been brought, the principal of which seems to be, that thus we have so considerable a repetition of names among the family and disciples of our Lord. But this cannot on any hypothesis be got rid of. The undoubted facts of the Gospel history give us the following repetitions of names:—

(A) We have under the name SIMON, (1) Simon Peter : (2) Simon *καναναῖος* or *ζηλωτής*, the Apostle : (3) Simon, the brother of the Lord, Matt. xiii. 55 : Mark vi. 3 : (4) Simon, the father of Judas Iscariot, John vi. 71 al. : (5) Simon the leper, in Bethany, Matt. xxvi. 6 : Mark xiv. 3 : (6) Simon of Cyrene, who bore the cross after our Lord, Matt. xxvii. 32 || : (7) Simon Magus : (8) Simon the tanner : besides (9)

Simon the Pharisee, in whose house our Lord was anointed by the woman who was a sinner, Luke vii. 40.

(B) Under the name JUDAS, (1) Judas Lebbæus or Ἰακώβου, the Apostle : (2) (?) Judas, the brother of the Lord : (3) Judas Iscariot : (4) Judas Barsabas, Acts xv. 22 : if not also (5) the Apostle Thomas, the twin (Θωμᾶς ὁ καὶ Ἰούδας, Eus. H. E. i. 13), so called by way of distinction from the two other Judases among the Twelve.

(C) Under the name MARY, (1) the Mother of our Lord : (2) the mother of James and Joses, Matt. xxvii. 56 : (3) Mary Magdalene : (4) Mary, the sister of Lazarus : (5) Mary, the mother of John Mark.

17. Besides these, we have (D) at least four under the name JOSEPH, viz. (1) the reputed father of our Lord, (2) Joseph of Arimathea : (3) Joseph Barnabas, Acts iv. 36 : (4) Joseph Barsabas, Acts i. 23 : if not two more, a brother of our Lord, Matt. xiii. 55, and according to some mss., a son of Mary and brother of James, Matt. xxvii. 56.

This being so, it really is somewhat out of place to cry out upon the supposed multiplication of persons bearing the same name in the N. T.

18. The improbability of there being in each family, that of Joseph and that of Alphæus (Clopas), two sets of four brothers bearing the same names, is created by assuming the supplement of Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου Luke vi. 16 and Acts i. 13, to be ἀδελφός, which, to say the least, is not necessary. The sons of Alphæus (except Levi (Matthew) who appears to have been the son of another Alphæus, but has been most unaccountably omitted from all consideration by those who object to the multiplication of those bearing the same name) are but two, James the less the Apostle, and Joses. We have not the least trace in Scripture, or even in tradition rightly understood, indicating that Simon Zelotes was a son of Alphæus. What is the improbability, in two brethren of our Lord bearing the same names as two of their cousins? Cannot almost every widely-spread family even among ourselves, where names are not so frequently repeated, furnish examples of the same and like coincidences?

19. No safe objection can be brought against the present hypothesis from St. Paul's *ἕτερον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐκ εἶδον εἰ μὴ Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου*, Gal. i. 19. For (1) the usage of the word ἀπόστολος by St. Paul is not confined to the Twelve, and Christian antiquity recognized in Paul himself and this very James, two supplementary Apostles besides the Twelve² : and (2) it has been shewn by Fritzsche, Neander, and Winer, and must be evident to any one accustomed to the usage of εἰ μὴ in the N. T., that it need not necessarily qualify *ἕτερον* here, but may just as well refer to the whole preceding clause³.

² See the citation from the Apostolic Constt. above, par. 15.

³ If we want an example of even a wider use of εἰ μὴ, we have it in the same chapter, ver. 7.

20. The objection of Lange (Herzog's Encyclop. ut supra) that it is impossible to imagine the growth of an apocryphal Apostleship, by the side of that founded by our Lord, entirely vanishes under a right view of the circumstances of the case. There would be no possibility, on Lange's postulates, of including St. Paul himself among the Apostles. There was nothing in the divine proceeding towards him, which indicated that he was to bear that name: still less was there any thing designating Barnabas as another Apostle, properly so called. These two, on account of their importance and usefulness in the apostolic work, were received among the Apostles as of apostolic dignity. Why may the same not have been the case, with a person so universally noted for holiness and justice as James the brother of the Lord?

21. Again, Lange (ut supra) objects, that "real Apostles thus altogether vanish from the field of action, and are superseded by other Apostles introduced afterwards." I would simply ask, what can be a more accurate description, than these words furnish, of the character of the history of the book which is entitled the *Acts of the Apostles*? Is it not, in the main, the record of the journeyings and acts of a later introduced Apostle, before whom the work of the other Apostles is cast into the shade? Besides, what do we know of the actions of any of the Apostles, except (taking even Lange's hypothesis) of Peter, James, John, and James the son of Alphæus? Where shall we seek any record of the doings of St. Matthew, St. Thomas, St. Philip, St. Jude, St. Bartholomew, St. Andrew, St. Simon, St. Matthias? In Acts xv. 22, an Ἰούδας appears as an ἀνὴρ ἡγούμενος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς: but he is not St. Jude the Apostle. In Acts viii. we hear much of the missionary work of Φίλιππος: but he is not St. Philip the Apostle.

22. It seems to me from the above considerations, far the more probable inference from Scriptural and traditional data, that James the brother of the Lord, the Bishop of Jerusalem, the presumed Author of our Epistle, was distinct from James the son of Alphæus, one of the Twelve Apostles. And assuming this, I shall now gather up the notices which we find of this remarkable person.

23. It is certain, from John vii. 3—5, that he was not a believer in the Messiahship of Jesus at the period of His ministry there indicated. And from our Lord, when on the Cross, commending His mother to the care of St. John, the son of Zebedee, and probably His cousin after the flesh, we may infer that neither then did His brethren believe on Him. It would appear however, from our finding them expressly mentioned in Acts i. 13, as assembled in the upper room with the Apostles and with the Mother of our Lord, and the believing women, that they were then believers, having probably been, from a half-persuaded and

wavering faith, fixed, by the great events of the Passion and Resurrection, in a conviction of the divine mission of Jesus.

24. And of these the Lord's brethren, let us now fix our attention on JAMES, who seems, from his being placed first in the enumeration, Matt. xiii. 55 and || Mark, to have been the eldest among them.

25. The character which we have of him, as a just and holy man, must in all probability be dated from before his conversion. And those who believe him to have been not by adoption only, but by actual birth a son of our Lord's parents, will trace in the appellation of him as *δίκαιος*, the character of his father (Matt. i. 19), and the humble faith and obedience of his mother (Luke i. 38). That the members of such a family should have grown up just and holy men, is the result which might be hoped from the teaching of such parents, and above all from the presence ever among them of the spotless and bright example of Him, of whom his cousin according to the flesh, yet not *knowing* Him to be the Messiah, could say, "I have need to be baptized of Thee" (Matt. iii. 14).

26. The absence in the Holy Family of that pseudo-asceticism which has so much confused the traditions respecting them, is strikingly proved by the notice, furnished by St. Paul in 1 Cor. ix. 5, that "the brethren of the Lord" were married men. At the same time there can be no doubt from the general character of St. James's Epistle, and from the notices of tradition, confirmed as they are by the narrative in the Acts, ch. xxi. 17 ff., and by Gal. ii. 11 ff., that he was in other matters a strong ascetic, and a rigid observer of the ceremonial Jewish customs. In the testimony of Hegesippus, quoted by Eus. H. E. ii. 23, we read, οὗτος ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ ἅγιος ἦν. οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐκ ἔπιεν, οὐδὲ ἔμψυχον ἔφαγε. ξυρὸν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέβη, ἔλαιον οὐκ ἠλείψατο, καὶ βαλανεῖον οὐκ ἐχρήσατο. τούτῳ μόνῳ ἐξῆν εἰς τὰ ἅγια εἰσιέναι. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἑρεοῦν ἐφόρει ἀλλὰ συνδόνας. καὶ μόνος εἰσῆρχετο εἰς τὸν ναόν, ἠγύρισκετό τε κείμενος ἐπὶ τοῖς γόνασι καὶ αἰτούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ ἄφεσιν, ὥς ἀπεσκληκέναι τὰ γόνατα αὐτοῦ δίκην καμήλου, διὰ τὸ ἀεὶ κάμπτειν ἐπὶ γόνυ προσκυνοῦντα τῷ θεῷ καὶ αἰτεῖσθαι ἄφεσιν τῷ λαῷ διὰ γέτοι τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐκαλεῖτο δίκαιος καὶ ὠβλίᾶς⁴. And without taking all this as literal fact, it at least shews us the character which he bore, and the estimation in which he was held.

27. That such a person, when converted to the faith of Jesus, should have very soon been placed in high dignity in the Jerusalem church, is not to be wondered at. The very fact of that church being in some measure a continuation of the apostolic company, would, in the absence of Him who had been its centre beforetime, naturally incline their thoughts towards one who was the most eminent of His nearest relatives

⁴ On the interpretation of this word, which is quite uncertain, see Suicer, sub voce, vol. ii. p. 1593.

according to the flesh : and the strong Judaistic tendencies of that church would naturally group it around one who was so zealous a fautor of the Law.

28. This his pre-eminence seems to have been fully established as early as the imprisonment of St. Peter, Acts xii. ⁵ : i. e. about A.D. 44 : which would allow ample time for the reasonable growth in estimation and authority of one whose career as a disciple did not begin till the Ascension of our Lord, i. e. 14 years before ⁶.

29. From this time onward, James is introduced, and simply by this name, as the president, or bishop, of the church at Jerusalem. In the apostolic council in Acts xv. (A.D. 50), we find him speaking last, after the rest had done, and delivering, with his *ἐγὼ κρίνω* (ver. 19), that opinion, on which the act of the assembly was grounded. On St. Paul reaching Jerusalem in Acts xxi. (A.D. 58), we find him, on the day after his arrival, entering in *πρὸς Ἰάκωβον* : and it is added *πάντες τε παρεγένοντο οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* : shewing that the visit was a formal one, to a man in authority.

30. Thenceforward we have no more mention of James in the Acts. In Gal. i. 19, St. Paul relates, that at his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion he saw *Ἰάκωβον τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ κυρίου* : but without any mark, unless the title *ἀπόστολος*, there given him, is to be taken as such, that he had then the pre-eminence which he afterwards enjoyed. The date of this visit I have set down elsewhere as A.D. 40 ⁷.

31. In the same apologetic narrative in the Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul recounts the events, as far as they were germane to his purpose, of the apostolic council in Acts xv. And here we find James ranked with Cephas and John, as *στῦλοι* of the church. At some shortly subsequent time, probably in the end of A.D. 50 or the beginning of 51, we find, from the same narrative of St. Paul, that *τινὲς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* came down to Antioch, of whose Judaistic strictness Peter being afraid, prevaricated, and shrunk back from asserting his Christian liberty. This speaks for the influence of James, as it does also for its tendency.

32. At the time when we lose sight of James in the Acts of the Apostles, he would be, supposing him to have been next in the Holy Family to our Blessed Lord, and proceeding on the necessarily some-

⁵ Thus—for we can hardly suppose it to have been a sudden thing,—we should have it already subsisting during the lifetime of the greater James, the son of Zebedee : one additional argument for distinguishing this James from James the less, the son of Alphaeus.

⁶ For these dates, see the Chronological Table in the Prolegg. to the Acts, Vol. II. It has been objected, that it would be unlikely that one who at the Ascension was not a believer, should so soon after be found in the dignity of an Apostle. But the objectors forget, that less than half the time sufficed to raise one, who long after the Ascension was “a persecutor and injurious,” to the same dignity.

⁷ See the Chronological Table, ut supra.

what uncertain⁸ inference deducible from the plain sense of Matt. i. 25, about sixty years of age.

33. From this time we are left to seek his history in tradition. We possess an account in Josephus of his character and martyrdom. In Antt. xx. 9. 1, we read, ὁ Ἄνανος, νομίσας ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον, διὰ τὸ τεθνᾶναι τὸν Φῆστον, Ἀλβῖνον δὲ ἔτι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίζει συν-έδριον κριτῶν καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος ὄνομα αὐτῷ, καὶ τινες ἑτέροις, ὡς παρανομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησάμενος, παρέδωκε λευσθησομένους.

34. Further particulars of his death are given us from Hegesippus, by Eusebius, ut supra, H. E. ii. 23 : but they do not seem to tally with the above account in Josephus. According to Hegesippus, whose narrative is full of strange expressions, and savours largely of the fabulous, some of the seven sects of the people (see Eus. H. E. iv. 22) asked James, τίς ἡ θύρα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ⁹. And by his preaching to them Jesus as the Christ, so many of them believed on Him, that πολλῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων πιστευόντων, ἦν θόρυβος τῶν Ἰουδαίων κ. γραμματέων κ. Φαρισαίων λεγόντων ὅτι κινδυνεύει πᾶς ὁ λαὸς Ἰησοῦν τὸν χριστὸν προσδοκᾶν. On this they invited James to deter the people from being thus deceived, standing on the πετερίγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ at the Passover, that he might be seen and heard by all. But, the story proceeds, when he was set there, and appealed to by them to undeceive the people, he ἀπεκρίνατο φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Τί με ἐπερωτᾶτε περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; καὶ αὐτὸς κᾶθηται ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, καὶ μέλλει ἔρχεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. On this, many were confirmed in their belief, and glorified God for his testimony, and cried Hosanna to the son of David. Whereat the Scribes and Pharisees said to one another, κακῶς ἐποιήσαμεν τοιαύτην μαρτυρίαν παρασχόντες τῷ Ἰησοῦ· ἀλλὰ ἀναβάντες καταβάλωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα φοβηθέντες μὴ πιστεύσωσιν αὐτῷ. καὶ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες Ὡ ὦ, καὶ ὁ δίκαιος ἐπλανήθη. So they went up, and cast him down : and said to one another, λιθάσωμεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν δίκαιον. καὶ ἤρξαντο λιθάζειν αὐτόν, ἐπεὶ καταβληθεὶς οὐκ ἀπέθανεν, ἀλλὰ στραφεὶς ἔθηκε τὰ γόνατα λέγων Παρακαλῶ κύριε θεὲ πάτερ ἀφ' ἐς αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν. And while they were stoning him, a priest, one of the sons of Rechab, cried out, τί ποιεῖτε; εὐχεται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ὁ δίκαιος. καὶ λαβὼν τις ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τῶν κναφῶν τὸ ξύλον ἐν ᾧ ἀπεπίεζε τὰ ἱμάτια, ἤνεγκε κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς τοῦ δικαίου. καὶ οὕτως ἐμαρτύρησεν. καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῦ ἡ στήλη μένει παρὰ τῷ ναῷ.

⁸ Because there were also *sisters* of our Lord, and more than two, or the word *πᾶσαι* could not have been used of them, Matt. xiii. 55.

⁹ On this expression, Valesius says, "Ostium hoc loco est introductio seu institutio atque initiatio. Ostium igitur Christi nihil est aliud quam fides in Deum Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum." &c. But this seems doubtful, and the expression enigmatical.

35. This last sentence seems wholly inexplicable, considering that long before it was written both city and temple were destroyed. And the more so, as Hegesippus proceeds to say, that immediately upon St. James's martyrdom, Vespasian formed the siege of the city. He adds, οὕτω δὲ ἄρα θαυμάσιός τις ἦν, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἐπὶ δικαιοσύνῃ βεβόητο ὁ Ἰάκωβος, ὡς καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίων ἔμφρονas δοξάζειν ταύτην εἶναι τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς παραχρῆμα μετὰ τὸ μαρτύριον αὐτοῦ πολιορκίας τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣν δι' οὐδὲν ἕτερον αὐτοῖς συμβῆναι, ἢ διὰ τὸ κατ' αὐτοῦ τολμηθὲν ἄγος. And he quotes from Josephus, ταῦτα δὲ συμβέβηκεν Ἰουδαίοις κατ' ἐκδίκησιν Ἰακώβου τοῦ δικαίου, ὃς ἦν ἀδελφὸς Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου χριστοῦ· ἐπειδήπερ δικαίωτατον αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπέκτειναν : but no such passage as this latter is now found in Josephus.

36. The character of St. James is sufficiently indicated in the foregoing notices. He appears to have been a strong observer of the law, moral and ceremonial : and though willing to recognize the hand of God in the Gentile ministry of Paul and Barnabas, to have remained himself attached to the purely Judaistic form of Christianity. "Had not," observes Schaff (Kirchengesch. i. p. 314), "a Peter, and above all a Paul, arisen as supplementary to James, Christianity would perhaps never have become entirely emancipated from the veil of Judaism and asserted its own independence. Still there was a necessity for the ministry of James. If any could win over the ancient covenant people, it was he. It pleased God to set so high an example of O. T. piety in its purest form among the Jews, to make conversion to the gospel, even at the eleventh hour, as easy as possible for them. But when they would not listen to the voice of this last messenger of peace, then was the measure of the divine patience exhausted, and the fearful and long-threatened judgment broke forth. And thus was the mission of James fulfilled. He was not to outlive the destruction of the holy city and the temple. According to Hegesippus, he was martyred in the year before that event, viz. A.D. 69."

37. According to the above hypothetical calculation (par. 32), he would be, at the date of his martyrdom, about 71 years of age. The various particulars of his connexion with our present Epistle will be found in the following sections.

38. The literature of the subject treated in this section is very extensive. I may refer the reader to the Einleitungen of De Wette, Huther, and Wiesinger : to Lange's art. in Herzog's Encyclopädie : to Gieseler's Kirchengeschichte, i. p. 89 ff. : to Schaff's do. vol. i. §§ 79, 80 : to Neander's Pflanzung u. Leitung, p. 553 ff. and note : to Schneckenburger, Annotatio ad Epist. Jacobi, p. 144 : and Davidson, Introd. to N. T., vol. iii. p. 302 ff.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN.

1. It is evident from the contents of the Epistle, that it was written for *Christian* readers. The Writer calls himself κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δοῦλος, and addresses the readers throughout as his ἀδελφοί. In ch. i. 18 he says that God has begotten *us* (ἡμᾶς) by the word of truth: in ch. ii. 1 he addresses them as having the faith of Jesus Christ the Lord of glory: in id. ver. 7, he speaks of the καλὸν ὄνομα by which they were called: and in ch. v. 7, he exhorts them to patience on the ground that the coming of the Lord was near. Besides which, the whole passage, ch. ii. 14, proceeds on the manifest supposition that writer and readers had one and the same faith.

2. At the same time, the address of the Epistle, ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ, which will not bear a spiritual meaning, but only the strictly national one, quite forbids us from supposing that Christians *in general* were in the Writer's view. Believing Jews, and they only, were the recipients of the Epistle. Not the words of the address, but the circumstances of the case, and the language of the Epistle, exclude those who did not believe.

3. This Judaistic direction of the letter is evident from ch. ii. 2, where συναγωγή is the place of assembly: from ib. 19, where monotheism is brought forward as the central point of faith: from ch. v. 12, where, in the prohibition of swearing, the formulæ common among the Jews are introduced: from ib. ver. 14, where anointing with oil is mentioned. And not only so, but all the ethical errors which St. James combats, are of that kind which may be referred to carnal Judaism as their root.

4. Huther, from whom I have taken the foregoing paragraphs of this section, remarks, that the argument against faith alone without works is no objection to the last-mentioned view, but is rather in refutation of this same Jewish error, which was but the successor of the Pharisaical confidence in the fact of possessing the law, without a holy life: see Rom. ii. 17 ff.: and compare Justin Mart. Dial. § 141, p. 231, who says of the Jews, οἱ λέγουσιν ὅτι κἂν ἁμαρτωλοὶ ᾤσι, θεὸν δὲ γινώσκουσιν, οὐ μὴ λογίσσεται αὐτοῖς ἁμαρτίαν. There is indeed no trace in the Epistle of an anxious and scrupulous observance of the Mosaic ritual on the part of the readers: but this may be because in the main on this point the Writer and his readers were agreed. And we do find in it traces of an erroneous estimate of the value of mere θρησκεία (ch. i. 22 ff.): and a trace of fanatical zeal venting itself by ὀργή.

5. The situation of these Judæo-Christian churches or congregations, as discernible in the Epistle, was this. They were tried by manifold trials, ch. i. 2. We are hardly justified in assuming that they were entirely made up of poor, on account of ch. ii. 6, 7: indeed the former verses of that chapter seem to shew, that rich men were also found among them. However, this probably was so for the most part, and they were oppressed and dragged before the judgment-seats by the rich, which trials they did not bear with that patience and humility which might have been expected of them as Christians, nor did they in faith seek wisdom from God concerning them: but regarded Him as their tempter, and their lowliness as shame, paying carnal court to the rich, and despising the poor.

6. As might have been expected, such worldliness of spirit gave rise to strifes and dissensions among them, and to a neglect of self-preservation from the evil in the world, imagining that their Christian faith would suffice to save them, without a holy life.

7. There is some little difficulty in assigning a proper place to the rich men who are addressed in ch. v. 1 ff. They can hardly have been altogether out of the pale of the Christian body, or the denunciations would never have reached them at all: but it is fair to suppose that they were unworthy professing members of the churches.

8. It must be owned that the general state of the churches addressed, as indicated by this Epistle, is not such as any Christian teacher could look on with satisfaction. And it is extremely interesting to enquire, how far this unsatisfactory state furnishes us with any clue to the date of our Epistle: an enquiry which we shall follow out in our next section.

9. The designation ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ need not necessarily limit the readers to the Jewish churches *out of* Palestine: but the greater circumference may include the lesser: the διασπορά may be vaguely used, regarding Jerusalem as the centre; and as in Acts viii. 1, where we read πάντες τε διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Σαμαρείας,—the exception being the Apostles, who remained in Jerusalem,—may comprehend Palestine itself.

SECTION III.

THE PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. As regards the place of writing, if the general opinion as to the author be assumed, there can be but one view. His fixed residence, and

centre of influence, was JERUSALEM. There we find him, at every date in the apostolic period. If he wrote the Epistle, it was written from the holy city.

2. And with this the character of the Epistle very well agrees. Most of the Judæo-Christians addressed in it would be in the habit of coming up to Jerusalem from time to time to the feasts. There St. James, though at a distance, might become well acquainted with their state and temptations, and exercise superintendence over them.

3. It has been pointed out also¹, that the physical notices inserted in the Epistle are very suitable to this supposition. The Writer appears to have written not far from the sea (ch. i. 6; iii. 4): it was a land blessed with figs, oil, and wine (iii. 12). Wide as these notices may be, we have others which seem to come nearer to Palestine. Salt and bitter springs are familiar to him (iii. 11, 12): the land was exposed to drought, and was under anxiety for fear of failure of crops for want of rain (v. 17, 18): it was burnt up quickly by a hot wind (καύσων, i. 11), which is a name not only belonging to West Asia, but especially known in Palestine. "Another phænomenon," says Hug, "which was found where the Writer was, decides for that locality: it is, the former and latter rain, which he names *πρώϊμος* and *ὀψιμος*, ch. v. 7, as they were known in Palestine."

4. With regard to the date of the Epistle, opinions are more divided. That it was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, will follow as matter of course from what has already been said. But there are two other termini, with reference to which it is important that its place should be assigned. These are (1) the publication of the doctrine of St. Paul respecting justification by faith only: and (2) the Apostolic council in Jerusalem of Acts xv.

5. A superficial view will suggest, that it cannot be till after the doctrine of justification by faith had been spread abroad, that ch. ii. 14 ff. can have been written. And this has been held even by some, whose treatment of the Epistle has been far from superficial². But I believe that a thorough and unbiassed weighing of probabilities will lead us to an opposite conclusion. It seems most improbable that, supposing ch. ii. 14 ff. to have been written after St. Paul's teaching on the point was known, St. James should have made no allusion either to St. Paul rightly understood, or to St. Paul wrongly understood. Surely such a method of proceeding, considering what strong words he uses, would be, to say the least, very ill-judged, or very careless: the former, if he only wished to prevent an erroneous conception of the great Apostle's doctrine,—the latter, if he wished to put himself into direct antagonism with it.

¹ By Hug, *Einleitung*, edn. 4, p. 438 f.

² c. g. Wiesinger.

6. It is much more probable, that all which St. James says respecting works and faith has respect to a former and different state and period of the controversy : when, as was explained above³, the Jewish Pharisaic notions were being carried into the adopted belief in Christianity, and the danger was not, as afterwards, of a Jewish law-righteousness being set up, antagonistic to the righteousness which is by the faith of Christ, but of a Jewish reliance on exclusive purity of faith superseding the necessity of a holy life, which is inseparably bound up with any worthy holding of the Christian faith.

7. The objection brought against this view is, that the examples adduced by St. James are identical with those which we find in the Epistles of St. Paul, and even in that to the Hebrews : and that they presuppose acquaintance with those writings. But we may well answer, what right have we to make this, any more than the converse assumption ? Or rather, for I do not believe the converse to be any more probable, why should not the occurrence of these common examples have been due in both cases to their having been the ordinary ones cited on the subject ? What more certain, than that Abraham, the father of the faithful, would be cited in any dispute on the validity of faith ? What more probable than that Rahab, a Canaanite, and a woman of loose life, who became sharer of the security of God's people simply because she believed God's threatenings, should be exalted into an instance on the one hand that even a contact with Israel's faith sufficed to save, and that the Apostle on the other should shew that such faith was not mere assent, but fruitful in practical consequences ?

8. Again it is urged that, owing to several expressions and passages in our Epistle, we are obliged to believe that St. James had read and used the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians. Wiesinger says that any unbiassed reader will see in ch. i. 3 and iv. 1, 12, allusions to Rom. v. 3 ; vi. 13 ; vii. 23 ; viii. 7 ; xiv. 4. Of these certainly the first is a close resemblance : but that in the others is faint, and the connecting of them together is quite fanciful. And even where close resemblance exists, if the nature of the expressions be considered, we shall see how little ground there is for ascribing to the one writer any necessary knowledge of the other. The expressions are, τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν, James i. 3 : ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονήν κατεργάζεται, Rom. v. 3. Now what could be more likely than that a πιστὸς λόγος like this, tending to console the primitive believers under afflictions which were coeval with their first profession of the Gospel, should have been a common-place in the mouths of their teachers ? And accordingly we find a portion of St. James's expression, viz. τὸ δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς

³ § ii. 4.

πίστεως, again occurring in 1 Pet. i. 7 : a circumstance which may or may not indicate an acquaintance with the contents of our Epistle.

9. A similar inference has been drawn from the use by St. James of such terms as *δικαιοῦσθαι*, ἐκ πίστεως, ἐξ ἔργων : which, it is urged, no N. T. writer except St. Paul, or, in the case of the verb, St. Luke under influence of St. Paul, has used. But here again it is manifest that the inference will not hold. The subject, as argued by St. Paul, was no new one, but had long been in the thoughts and disputes of the primitive believers ⁴.

10. With regard to the other question, as to whether our Epistle must be dated before or after the council in Acts xv., one consideration is, to my mind, decisive. We have no mention in it of any controversy respecting the ceremonial observance of the Jewish law, nor any allusion to the duties of the Judæo-Christian believers in this respect. Now this certainly could not have been, after the dispute of Acts xv. 1 ff. If we compare what St. Paul relates in Gal. ii. 11 ff. (see the last note) of the influence of certain from James, and the narrative of Acts xxi. 18—25, with the entire absence in this Epistle of all notice of the subjects in question, we must, I think, determine that, at the time of writing the Epistle, no such question had arisen. The obligation of observing the Jewish ceremonial law was as yet confessed among Jewish Christians, and therefore needed no enforcing.

11. But here again various objections are brought against assigning so early a date to our Epistle as before the Jerusalem council, principally derived from the supposed difficulty of imagining so much development at that time in the Judæo-Christian congregations. We find, it is alleged, *πρεσβύτεροι* of an *ἐκκλησία*, which is not the mere Jewish synagogue used in common by both, but a regularly organized congregation.

12. Now we may fairly say, that this objection is unfounded. The Christian *ἐκκλησία* is mentioned by our Lord Himself in Matt. xviii. 17, and was so easy and matter-of-course a successor of the synagogue, that it would be sure to be established, wherever there was a Christian community. We find that the different varieties of Jews had their separate synagogues, Acts vi. 9 : and the establishment of a separate organization and place of worship would be the obvious and immediate consequence of the recognition of Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah. In such a congregation, *πρεσβύτεροι* would be a matter of course.

13. It is also objected, that in the Epistle the readers are treated as mature in the belief and doctrines of the Gospel : that it exhorts, but does not teach ⁵. Witness, it is said, the allusions to their knowledge,

⁴ As a proof of this, see Gal. ii. 16, a speech which was made certainly a very short time after the council in A.D. 50, and in consequence of a message from James.

⁵ Wiesinger, p. 38.

and exhortations to perfection, ch. i. 3 ; iii. 1 ; iv. 1. But in those passages there is nothing which might not well apply to the primitive Jewish believers : nothing which, from their knowledge of the O. T., and of the moral teaching of our Lord, they might not well have been aware of.

14. Yet again it is said, that the character of the faults here stigmatized in the Christian congregations is such as to require a considerable period for their development⁶ : that they are those which arise from relaxation of the moral energy with which we must suppose the first Jewish converts to have received the Gospel. In answer to this, we may point to the length of time which may well be allowed as having elapsed between the first Pentecost sermon and the time of writing the Epistle, and to the rapidity of the dissemination of practical error, and the progress of moral deterioration, when once set in. We may also remind the reader of the state of the Jewish church and the heathen world around, as shewing that it must not be supposed that all these evils sprung up within the Christian communities themselves : rather we may say, that the seed fell on soil in which these thorns were already sown,—and that, even conceding the position above assumed, § i. 1, a very short time,—less than the 20 years which elapsed between the first Pentecost and the Jerusalem council,—would have sufficed for the growth of any such errors as we find stigmatized in this Epistle.

15. “Where,” asks Wiesinger, “shall we look for the Judæo-Christian churches out of Palestine, which will satisfy the postulates of the Epistle ?” I answer, in the notice of Acts ii. 5—11, in following out which, we must believe that Christian churches of the dispersion were very widely founded at a date immediately following the great outpouring of the Spirit. Such a persuasion does not compel us to believe that our Epistle was addressed principally to the church at Antioch, or to those in Syria and Cilicia, but leaves the address of it in all the extent of its own words, *ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ*.

16. The notice of Acts xi. 19 ff., will amply provide for such Christian congregations, consisting mainly or entirely of Jewish believers, as the purposes of this Epistle require. And that notice may surely be regarded as a record of that taking place with increased energy nearer home, which must have been long going on far and wide owing to the agency of the first Pentecostal believers. We find traces of this in the first missionary journey of Paul and Barnabas, where in several cases we have, besides the new converts made, an implied background of *μαθηταί*, naturally consisting mainly of Jews ; and it appears to have been at and by this visit chiefly that the enmity of the Jews every

⁶ Wiesinger, ut supra.

where against the Gentile converts, and against the Gospel as admitting them, was first stirred up.

17. These things being considered, I cannot agree with Wiesinger and Schmid in placing our Epistle late in the first age of the church ; but should, with the majority of recent Commentators, and historians, including Schneckenburger, Theile, Neander, Thiersch, Hofmann, and Schaff, place it before, perhaps not long before, the Jerusalem council : somewhere, it may be, about the year 45 A.D.

SECTION IV.

OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND STYLE.

1. The object of the Epistle has been already partially indicated, in treating of its readers. It was ethical, rather than didactic. They had fallen into many faults incident to their character and position. Their outward trials were not producing in them that confirmation of faith, and that steadfastness, for which they were sent, but they were deteriorating, instead of improving, under them. St. James therefore wrote this hortatory and minatory Epistle, to bring them to a sense of their Christian state under the Father of wisdom and the Lord of glory, subjects as they were of the perfect law of liberty, new-begotten by the divine word, married unto Christ, and waiting in patience for His advent to judgment.

2. The letter is full of earnestness, plain speaking, holy severity. The brother of Him who opened His teaching with the Sermon on the Mount, seems to have deeply imbibed the words and maxims of it, as the law of Christian morals. The characteristic of his readers was the lack of living faith : the falling asunder, as it has been well called⁷, of knowledge and action, of head and heart. And no portion of the divine teaching could be better calculated to sound the depths of the treacherous and disloyal heart, than this first exposition by our Lord, who knew the heart, of the difference between the old law, in its externality, and the searching spiritual law of the gospel⁸.

⁷ Wiesinger, *Einleitung*, p. 42.

⁸ The connexion between our Epistle and the Sermon on the Mount has often been noticed : and the principal parallels will be found pointed out in the *reft.* and *commentary*. I subjoin a list of them : ch. i. 2, Matt. v. 10—12 ; ch. i. 4, Matt. v. 48 ; ch. i. 5 and v. 15, Matt. vii. 7 ff. ; ch. i. 9, Matt. v. 3 ; ch. i. 20, Matt. v. 22 ; ch. ii. 13, Matt. vi. 14, 15 and v. 7 ; ch. ii. 14 ff, Matt. vii. 21 ff. ; ch. iii. 17, 18, Matt. v. 9 ; ch. iv. 4, Matt. vi. 24 ; ch. iv. 10, Matt. v. 3, 4 ; ch. iv. 11, Matt. vii. 1 f. ; ch. v. 2,

3. The main theme of the Epistle may be described as being the *ἀνὴρ τέλειος*, in the perfection of the Christian life: the *ποιητὴς τοῦ νόμου τελείου*: and his state and duties are described and enforced, not in the abstract, but in a multitude of living connexions and circumstances of actual life, as might suit the temptations and necessities of the readers.

4. St. James begins by a reference to their *πειρασμοί*, exhorting them to consider them matter of joy, as sent for the trial of their faith and accomplishment of their perfection, which must be carried on in faith, and prayer to God for wisdom, without doubt and wavering. The worldly rich are in fact not the happy, but the subject of God's judgment: the humble and enduring is he to whom the crown of life is promised (ch. i. 1—12).

5. Then he comes to treat of a *πειράζεσθαι* which is not from God, but from their own lusts. God on the contrary is the Author of every good and perfect gift, as especially of their new birth by the word of His truth. The inference from this is that, seeing they have their evil from themselves, but their good from Him, they should be eager to hear, but slow to speak and slow to wrath, receiving the word in meekness, being thoroughly penetrated with its influence, in deed and word, not paying to God the vain *θρησκεία* of outward conformity only, but that of acts of holy charity and a spotless life.

6. The second chapter introduces the mention of their special faults: and as intimately connected with ch. i. 27, first that of respect of persons in regard of worldly wealth (ii. 1—13); and then that of supposing a bare assensive faith sufficient for salvation without its living fruits in a holy life (ii. 14—26). Next, the exhortation of ch. i. 19, "slow to speak, slow to wrath," is again taken up, and in ch. iii. 1—18, these two particulars are treated, in the duties of curbing the tongue and the contentious temper.

7. This last leads naturally on in ch. iv. 1—12 to the detection of the real source of all contention and strife, viz. in their lusts, inflamed by the solicitations of the devil. These solicitations they are to resist, by penitence before God, and by curbing their proud and uncharitable judgments. Then he turns (iv. 13—v. 6) to those who live in their pride and worldliness, in assumed independence on God, and severely reproves the rich for their oppression and defrauding of the poor, warning them of a day of retribution at hand.

8. Then, after an earnest exhortation to patient endurance (ch. v. 7—11) and to abstain from words of hasty profanity (v. 12), he takes occa-

Matt. vi. 19; ch. v. 10, Matt. v. 12; ch. v. 12, Matt. v. 33 ff.; and from other discourses of our Lord, ch. i. 14, Matt. xv. 19; ch. iv. 12, Matt. x. 28. Compare also the places where the rich are denounced with Luke vi. 24 ff.

sion in prescribing to them what to do in adversity, prosperity, and sickness, and as to mutual confession of sin, to extol the efficacy of prayer (v. 13—18), and ends with pronouncing the blessedness of turning a sinner from the error of his way.

9. The character of the Epistle is thus a mixed one: consolatory and hortatory for the believing brethren; earnest, minatory, and polemical, against those who disgraced their Christian profession by practical error. Even in ch. ii. 14—26, where alone the Writer seems to be combating doctrinal error, all his contention is rather in the realm of practice: he is more anxious to shew that justification cannot be brought about by a kind of faith which is destitute of the practical fruits of a Christian life, than to trace the *ultimate ground*, theologically speaking, of justification in the sight of God.

10. As regards the style and diction of our Epistle, Huther has well described it as being “not only fresh and vivid, the immediate outflowing of a deep and earnest spirit, but at the same time sententious, and rich in graphic figure. Gnome follows after gnome, and the discourse hastens from one similitude to another: so that the diction often passes into the poetical, and in some parts is like that of the O. T. prophets. We do not find logical connexion, like that in St. Paul: but the thoughts arrange themselves in single groups, which are strongly marked off from one another. We every where see that the author has his object clearly in sight, and puts it forth with graphic concreteness. Strong feelings, as Kern remarks, produce strong diction: and the style acquires emphasis and majesty by the climax of thoughts and words ever regularly and rhetorically arrived at, and by the constantly occurring antithesis.”

11. The introduction and putting forth of the thoughts also is peculiar. “The Writer ever goes at once *in res medias*; and with the first sentence which begins a section,—usually an interrogative or imperative one,—says out at once fully and entirely that which he has in his heart: so that in almost every case the first words of each section might serve as a title for it. The further development of the thought then is regressive, explaining and grounding the preceding sentence, and concludes with a comprehensive sentence, recapitulating that with which he began.”

12. The Greek of our Epistle is peculiar. It is comparatively free from Hebraisms; the words are weighty and expressive: the constructions for the most part those found in the purer Greek. It does not sound, in reading, like the rest of the N. T. There is only a slight link or two, connecting the speech of James in Acts xv. with it, which serves somewhat to identify its language with that. Such is ἀκούσατε,

ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί, ch. ii. 5, compared with ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατε μου, Acts xv. 13. We trace his hand also in the only two places where in a Christian Epistle the ordinary Greek greeting χαίρειν occurs, Acts xv. 23 : James i. 1. The Greek style of this Epistle must ever remain, considering the native place and position of its Writer, one of those difficulties, with which it is impossible for us now to deal satisfactorily.

SECTION V.

ITS GENUINENESS, AND PLACE IN THE CANON.

1. The previous enquiry, in § i., regarding the authorship of our Epistle, proceeded *ex concessio*, assuming that the commonly received superscription rightly designates the Epistle as the work of some apostolic person bearing the name of James. It remains for us now to enquire, how far such an assumption is justified.

2. And here we have before us a question not easily settled, and on which both the ancients and moderns have been much divided. The sum of ancient testimony is as follows :

3. The intimate connexion admitted to subsist between it and the First Epistle of St. Peter, while it is valueless as an evidence of priority on either side, may fairly be taken into account as an element in our enquiry¹. The places cited in the note cannot be for a moment fairly called imitations. The case stands much as that between the common passages in 2 Peter and Jude. It may legitimately be supposed, that the writers of the two Epistles were accustomed to hold the same language and exhort much in the same strains—were employed in the apostolic work together : and that thus portions of that teaching in the Spirit, which they had long carried on in common at Jerusalem, found their way into their writings also. I cannot but regard this circumstance as a weighty evidence for the Epistle being written in the apostolic age, and by one who was St. Peter's friend and companion at Jerusalem in its earlier periods.

4. If this were so, it surprises us to find the Epistle so little used or referred to by the Apostolic Fathers. Several more or less distant and uncertain allusions have been pointed out in the writings of Clement of

¹ Compare especially James i. 2 f. with 1 Pet. i. 6, 7 ; James i. 10 f. with 1 Pet. i. 24 ; James i. 21 with 1 Pet. ii. 1 f. ; James iv. 6, 10 with 1 Pet. v. 5 f. ; James v. 20 with 1 Pet. iv. 8.

Rome², Hermas³, and Irenæus⁴. Of these the two former are very doubtful indeed: the latter would seem as if Irenæus was acquainted with our Epistle, seeing that two particulars, not conjoined, and one of them not perhaps even mentioned by the LXX⁵, are coupled by him as they are in this Epistle. Still we must remember that for this citation we have not the Greek of Irenæus, but only his Latin interpreter.

5. It is difficult to believe, notwithstanding the precariousness of the phrases cited to prove it, but that Hermas was acquainted with our Epistle. The whole cast of some passages resembles its tone and tenor exceedingly. Cf. especially lib. ii. Mandate ix. p. 836, where he treats of *διψυχία*, and in fact expands the thoughts and words of St. James: e. g.—

ἄρον ἀπὸ σοῦ τὴν διψυχίαν, καὶ μηδενὸς ὅλως διψυχήσης, αἰτήσασθαι ἀπὸ θεοῦ . . . οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ὡς οἱ ἄνθρωποι μνησικακοῦντες, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἀμνησικακός ἐστι καὶ σπλαγχνίζεται ἐπὶ τὴνποίησιν αὐτοῦ . . . ἐὰν δὲ διστάσης ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, οὐδὲν οὐ μὴ λήψῃ τῶν αἰτημάτων σου. οἱ γὰρ διστάζοντες εἰς τὸν θεόν, οὗτοί εἰσιν ὡς δίσυχοι, καὶ οὐδὲν ὅλως λαμβάνουσι τῶν αἰτημάτων αὐτῶν. οἱ δὲ ὀλοτελεῖς ὄντες ἐν τῇ πίστει πάντα αἰτοῦνται, πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ λαμβάνουσιν, ὅτι ἀδιστακτως αἰτοῦνται, μηδὲν διψυχοῦντες. πᾶς γὰρ δίσυχος ἀνὴρ, ἐὰν μὴ μετανοήσῃ, δυσκόλως σωθήσεται.

Compare this with our ch. i. 5—7, and it is hardly possible to believe the two entirely independent of one another.

6. The first Father who has expressly cited the Epistle is Origen. In his Comm. in Joan. tom. xix. 6, vol. iv. p. 306, we read—

ἐὰν γὰρ λέγῃται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνῃ, νεκρά ἐστὶν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν.

Cf. also Selecta in Exodum, vol. ii. p. 124, διὸ καὶ ἐλέχθη, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀπείραστός ἐστι κακῶν, James i. 13. And in several places in Rufinus's Latin version we have citations, as e. g. in the Homil. viii. 4 on Exod. ib. p. 158, "Sed et apostolus Jacobus dicit:" see also Hom. ii. 4 on Levit. ib. p. 191, "ita enim dicit scriptura divina: Qui converti fecerit peccatorem, &c.," James v. 20: and again in the same section, "illud quod Jacobus apostolus dicit," and ib. pp. 251, 255, 340.

7. Eusebius (H. E. iii. 25) says—

τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὁμῶς τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη

² Ep. i. ad Cor. c. 10, p. 228, Ἀβραὰμ ὁ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς πιστὸς εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκοον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι τοῦ θεοῦ: cf. James ii. 21, 23. Ib. c. 12, p. 232, διὰ πιστὶν κ. φιλοξενίαν ἐσώθη Ῥαββὴ ἡ πόρνη: cf. James ii. 25.

³ ii. Mand. xii. 5, Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. ii. p. 949, δύναται ὁ διάβολος παλαῖσαι καταπαλαῖσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται: ἐὰν οὖν ἀντιστῇς αὐτόν, νικηθεὶς φεύγεται ἀπὸ σοῦ κατησχυμμένος; cf. James iv. 7.

⁴ Hæc. iv. 16. 2, p. 246, "Abraham . . . credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est:" cf. James ii. 23.

⁵ See note in loc., James ii. 23.

Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, ἥ τε Πέτρον δευτέρα ἐπιστολή, καὶ ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννον, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνῳ.

And again in H. E. ii. 23, after relating the death of St. James, he says—

τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται· ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μὲν οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μίας καὶ αὐτῆς οὐσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν. ὁμῶς δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιευμένας ἐκκλησίαις.

In this passage it can hardly be that *νοθεύεται* expresses Eusebius's own opinion as to the fact—"it is spurious:" but it simply announces the fact, that "*it is accounted spurious.*"

8. In H. E. vi. 14, Eusebius says of Clement of Alexandria—

ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτεμνημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθὼν, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τὴν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρον λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν.

But it is manifest, that even were we to take this as fact, its testimony, when taken with the last clause, is very feeble as regards the canonicity of our Epistle.

9. Hippolytus, Bishop of Portus near Rome, quotes our Epistle apparently as Scripture, but not by name (ed. Lagarde, p. 122, l. 8):—

αἱ λαμπάδες ὑμῶν σκοτειναὶ εἰσιν ἐκ τῆς ἀσπλαγχνίας· ἀπέλθετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνίλεώς ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος (James ii. 13).

10. Jerome, in his Catalog. Scriptorum Eccles. 2, vol. ii. p. 829, says—

"Jacobus, qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quæ de septem catholicis est, quæ et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paullatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem."

11. Against these somewhat equivocal testimonies of the early Fathers, may be set the fact, that the Peschito, or primitive Syriac version, contained our Epistle from the first, although it omitted the second and third of John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. And this fact has the more weight because the Syrian church lay so near to the country whence the Epistle originated, and to those to which it was, in all probability, principally addressed. And, as might be expected, we find it received and cited by the Syrian church as the Epistle of James the Lord's brother. So Ephrem Syrus, and other writers of that church.

12. In the Western church also it soon, though gradually, rose into general acceptation and canonical authority. It was recognized by the council of Carthage in 397. From that time onward, we find it univer-

sally received: and indeed the great company of illustrious Greek Fathers of the fourth century all quote it as canonical Scripture: Athanasius, both the Cyrils, Gregory of Nazianzum, Epiphanius, Philastrius, Chrysostom, the author of the Synopsis, &c.

13. Various reasons might be assigned for the delay in receiving the Epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty about the personal identity and standing of its Writer: the fact, that it was addressed entirely to Jewish believers: the omission in it of most of the particulars of distinctively Christian doctrine: its seeming opposition to the doctrine of justification as laid down by St. Paul: all these would naturally work together to indispose the minds of Gentile Christians towards it. But as Thiersch and Wiesinger have rightly remarked, so much the more valuable are those recognitions of its genuineness and canonicity which we do meet with.

14. At the time of the Reformation, the doubts which once prevailed concerning the Epistle, were again revived. Erasmus, Cardinal Cajetan, Luther, Grotius, Wetstein, shared more or less in these doubts: and their example has been followed by several of the modern Commentators, e. g. Schleiermacher, De Wette, Reuss, Baur, Schwegler, Ritschl. The opinions of all these and their grounds will be found fairly set forth in Huther's *Einleitung*, pp. 24—35: and in Davidson's *Introduction to the N. T.*, vol. iii. pp. 339—345.

15. On the whole, on any intelligible principles of canonical reception of early writings, we cannot refuse this Epistle a place in the canon. That that place was given it from the first in some part of the church; that, in spite of many adverse circumstances, it gradually won that place in other parts; that when thoroughly considered, it is so consistent with and worthy of his character and standing whose name it bears; that it is marked off by so strong a line of distinction from the writings and Epistles which have not attained a place in the canon: all these are considerations which, though they do not in this, any more than in other cases, amount to demonstration, yet furnish when combined a proof hardly to be resisted, that the place where we now find it in the N. T. canon is that which it ought to have, and which God in His Providence has guided His Church to assign to it.

CHAPTER III.

THE FIRST EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

SECTION I.

ITS GENUINENESS.

1. THE First Epistle of St. Peter was universally acknowledged by the ancient church as a part of the Christian Scriptures. The earliest testimony in its favour is found in the Second Epistle of Peter (iii. 1), a document which, even if we were to concede its spuriousness as an Apostolic Epistle, yet cannot be removed far in date from the *age* of the Apostles.

2. The second witness is POLYCARP: of whom Eusebius writes (H. E. iv. 14)—

ὁ μὲν τοι Πολυκαρπος ἐν τῇ δηλωθείσῃ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους (pp. 1005 ff. ed. Migne) αὐτοῦ γραφῇ φερομένη εἰς δεῦρο κέχρηταί τισι μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Πέτρου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς.

These *μαρτυρίαι* are too numerous to be cited at length. In ch. ii., he cites 1 Pet. i. 13, 21 and iii. 9 : in ch. v., 1 Pet. ii. 11 ; in ch. vi., 1 Pet. iv. 7 ; in ch. viii., 1 Pet. ii. 21—24 ; in ch. x., 1 Pet. ii. 17, 12. Eusebius also says of PAPIAS (H. E. iii. 39)—

κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίας ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως.

3. None of the above testimonies from Polycarp mention the Epistle expressly ; but IRENÆUS does so, more than once : e. g. Hær. iv. 9. 2, p. 238 :—

“Et Petrus ait in Epistola sua, Quem non videntes diligitis, inquit, in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inenarrabili (1 Pet. i. 8).”

And again, ib. iv. 16. 5, p. 247 :—

“Et propter hoc Petrus ait, Non velamentum malitiæ habere nos libertatem, sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei (1 Pet. ii. 16).”

4. CLEMENT of ALEXANDRIA also quotes it expressly, Strom. iii. 11 [75], p. 544 Potter :—

διὸ καὶ ὁ θαυμάσιος Πέτρος φησὶν, Αγαπητοί, παρακαλῶ ὡς παροίκους κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. ii. 11 f., 15 f.).

And again, ib. 18 [110], p. 562 :—

καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τὰ ὅμοια λέγει, "Ὡστε τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν καὶ τὴν ἐλπίδα κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. i. 21 f. : and 14—16).

And iv. 7 [47], p. 584 :—

ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχομεν διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι, φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος· τὸν δὲ φόβον αὐτῶν μὴ φοβήθητε, κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iii. 14—17).

And again [ib. 48], p. 585 :—

μὴ ξενίζεσθε τοίνυν, ὁ Πέτρος λέγει, κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iv. 12—14).

And ib. 20 [131], p. 622 :—

ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησὶν, 'Ολίγον ἄρτι εἰ δέον κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. i. 6—9).

Also in his Pædag. i. 6 [44], p. 124 :—

διὰ τοῦτο φησὶ καὶ Πέτρος, 'Αποθέμενοι οὖν κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. ii. 1—3).

And ib. iii. 11 [74], p. 296, with φησὶν ὁ Πέτρος, he quotes 1 Pet. ii. 18 ; iii. 8 ff. ; and ib. 12 [85], p. 303, with the same formula, 1 Pet. i. 17—19 ; iv. 3 ; iii. 13.

5. Besides these express citations, he several times quotes without mentioning the name, as 1 Pet. iv. 8 in Strom. i. [27 (173)] p. 423 ; 1 Pet. i. 32 in Quis Div. Serv. [23] p. 948 ; 1 Pet. ii. 9, 10 in Protrep. 4 [59], p. 52 ; 1 Pet. ii. 12, as τοῦτο τὸ εἰρημένον ἀγλως, in Pæd. iii. [11 (53)] p. 285.

6. It is to be noted likewise that the heretic Theodotus, in the tract commonly printed among the works of Clement of Alexandria, twice expressly quotes our Epistle (§ 12, p. 961) : εἰς ἃ ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι παρακύψαι, ὁ Πέτρος φησὶν (1 Pet. i. 12), and ib., κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον τιμίῳ καὶ ἀμώμῳ καὶ ἀσπίλῳ αἵματι ἐλντρώθημεν (1 Pet. i. 19).

7. ORIGEN bears, expressly and often, the same testimony. In the passage on the canon, reported by Eusebius H. E. vi. 25, he says—

Πέτρος δέ, ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία ἥς πύλαι ᾄδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένην καταλέλοιπεν ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ.

Again in Homil. 7 in Josuam, vol. ii. p. 412 :—

"Petrus etiam duabus epistolarum suarum personabat tubis."

And in his Comm. on Ps. iii., vol. ii. p. 553 :—

κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἐν ᾧ δὲ τοῖς κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iii. 19).

And in his Comm. on John, tom. vi. 18, vol. iv. p. 135 :—

καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορείας μετὰ πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ· θανατωθεὶς γάρ φησι σαρκί, ζωοποιηθεὶς δὲ κ.τ.λ. (1 Pet. iii. 18—21).

Many other places have been collected by Mayerhoff and others, in which Origen quotes our Epistle.

8. TERTULLIAN testifies to the same point. Thus, Scorp. c. 12, vol. ii. p. 146 :—

"Petrus quidem ad Ponticos quanta enim inquit gloria, si non ut delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis ! Hæc enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis" &c. (1 Pet. ii. 20 f.).

And ib. c. 14, p. 150 :—

"Condixerat scilicet Petrus, regem quidem honorandum" (1 Pet. ii. 17).

9. The opinion of Eusebius, as gathered from those before him, is given in his H. E. iii. 3—

Πέτρον μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη αὐτοῦ προτέρα, ἀνωμολόγηται· ταύτη δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλας πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτω ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κατακέχρηται συγγράμμασι.

10. This Epistle is also found in the Peschito version, which contains three only of the Catholic Epistles. It is true, it is not mentioned in the fragment on the canon known by the name of Muratori. But the passage is one not easily understood :—

"Epistola sane Judæ et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur. Et sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta. Apocalypsis etiam Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus, quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt."

The simplest interpretation of which latter sentence is, "We receive also only the Apocalypses of John and Peter, which (latter) some of our brethren refuse to have read in the church."

11. It is inferred from a passage of Leontius of Byzantium (+ cir. 610) that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the Epistle : but the inference is not a safe one, the words being too general to warrant it : "ob quam causam, ut arbitror, ipsam epistolam Jacobi et alias deinceps catholicas abrogat et antiquat."

12. It is said, in a passage of Petrus Siculus, that the Paulicians rejected it : "Binas vero catholicas . . . Petri principis apostolorum, pessime adversus illum affecti, . . . non admittunt."

13. So that, with these one or two insignificant exceptions, we have the united testimony of antiquity in its favour. It would be superfluous to go on citing later testimonies on the same side.

14. The first doubt in modern times was thrown on its authenticity by Cludius, in his Uransichten des Christenthums, on the ground that its thoughts and expressions are too like those of St. Paul, to have been written by the Apostle whose name it bears.

15. This was taken up by Eichhorn and expanded into the hypothesis, that some one wrote the Epistle who had been long with St. Paul, and had adopted his ideas and phrases : and as this will not fit St. Peter, he

⁶ Wieseler proposes an ingenious way of taking the words: We receive also (i.e. besides the two Epistles) the Apocalypse of John, and as much of Peter; i.e. two Epistles and an Apocalypse. Then he refers "quam" to "Apocalypsin." This rendering might perhaps stand, were it not for this latter, which is quite beyond all probability.

supposes that St. Peter found the material, but it was worked up by John Mark. This hypothesis is rejected by Bertholdt, but taken up in another form: viz. by adopting the idea hinted at by Jerome and formally announced by Baronius, that the Epistle was originally written in Hebrew (so Baronius), or Aramaic, and rendered into Greek by Mark (so Baronius) or Silvanus. But, as Huther well remarks, this hypothesis is as arbitrary as the other: and the whole diction of the Epistle and its modes of citation protest against its being thought a translation.

16. De Wette finds reason to doubt the genuineness, but on grounds entirely derived from the Epistle itself. He thinks it too deficient in originality, and too much made up of reminiscences from other Epistles. This ground of objection will be examined, and found untenable, in treating of the character and style of the Epistle.

17. It was to be supposed, that the Tübingen school, as represented by Baur and Schwegler, would repudiate this, as they have done so many other Epistles. The arguments on which the latter of these founds his rejection are worth enumerating, admitting as most of them do, of a ready and satisfactory answer. They are⁷—

(1) *The want of any definite external occasion, and the generality of the contents and purpose.* But it may be replied, it is surely too much to expect that an Apostle should be confined to writing to those churches with which he has been externally connected, and in which an assignable cause for his writing has arisen: and besides, it will be found below, in treating on the occasion and object of the Epistle, that these, though of a general nature, are perfectly and satisfactorily assignable.

(2) *The want of a marked individual character both in composition and in theology.* But on the one hand this is not conceded *in toto*, and on the other it is manifestly unreasonable to require that in one man's writing it should be so plainly notable as in that of another: in St. Peter, as in St. Paul and St. John.

(3) *The want of close connexion and evolution of thought.* But, it may be answered, the purpose and character of the Epistle itself forbids us to require such a connexion: and we may notice that even in St. Paul's Epistles Schwegler professes not to be able to find it⁸.

(4) *The impossibility that St. Peter, labouring in the far East, could have become acquainted with the later Epistles of St. Paul so soon (assuming their genuineness) after their composition.* But, it is replied, there is no trace in our Epistle of acquaintance with the latest, viz. that to Titus and 2 Timotheus. The only possible difficulty is the ap-

⁷ I have taken this statement mainly from Huther, Einl. pp. 28—32.

⁸ See on this below, § vi. 9.

parent (?) acquaintance with 1 Timotheus : but this may have come to St. Peter through John Mark.

(5) *The impossibility, on the assumption of the Epistle being written in Babylon* (see below, § iv., on the time and place of writing), *of bringing together the Neronian persecution which is alluded to in it, and the death of St. Peter by martyrdom, during that very persecution.* But it is a pure assumption that the persecution alluded to in the Epistle is that under Nero ; and another, that the Apostle suffered martyrdom under Nero at that time.

18. It is also not without interest, to discuss the reasons which Schwegler adduces for believing the Epistle to be a production of the post-apostolic age under Trajan. They are (1) the tranquil unimpassioned tone of the Epistle, contrasted with the effect on the Christians of the Neronian persecution : (2) the circumstance that under the Neronian persecution the Christians were involved in a charge of a definite crime, viz. the setting fire to the city, whereas in our Epistle they suffer as *χριστιανοί*, on account of the general suspicion of a bad life (*ὡς κακοποιοί*) : (3) the improbability that the Neronian persecution extended beyond Rome : (4) the assumption in the Epistle of regular legal processes, whereas the persecution under Nero was more of a tumultuary act : (5) the state of Christianity in Asia Minor as depicted by the Epistle, answering to that which we find in the letter of Pliny to Trajan.

19. But to these reasons it has been well replied by Huther (1) that the tranquillity of tone is no less remarkable as under the later persecution than under the earlier, and that any other tone would have been unworthy of an Apostle : (2) the suffering of Christians, *as Christians*, did not begin in Trajan's persecution, but was common to the earlier ones likewise : (3) even if the Neronian persecution did not extend beyond Rome, the Christians in the provinces were always liable to be persecuted owing to the same popular hatred : (4) there is in reality no trace of judicial proceedings in our Epistle : (5) the features of persecution in the Epistle *do not* agree with those in Pliny's letter : there, the Christians are formally put to death as such : here, we have no trace of such a sentence being carried out against them.

20. The hypothesis of Schwegler, that the purpose of the Epistle is to be detected in ch. v. 12, as one of reconciliation of the teachings of St. Peter and St. Paul by some disciple of the former who was inclined also to the latter, is well treated by Huther as entirely destitute of foundation.

21. So that, whether we consider external evidence, or the futility of internal objections, we can have no hesitation in accepting the Epistle as the undoubted work of the Apostle whose name it bears.

SECTION II.

ITS AUTHOR.

1. The Apostle Peter, properly called Simon or Simeon (Acts xv. 14; 2 Pet. i. 1), was born at Bethsaida on the sea of Galilee (John i. 45), the son of one Jonas (Matt. xvi. 17) or John (John i. 43; xxi. 15), with whom, and with his brother Andrew, he carried on the trade of a fisherman at Capernaum, where he afterwards lived (Matt. viii. 14; iv. 18 || Luke v. 3), with his wife's mother, being a married man⁹ (1 Cor. ix. 5).

2. He became very early a disciple of our Lord, being brought to Him by his brother Andrew, who was a disciple of John the Baptist, and had followed Jesus on hearing him designated by his master as the Lamb of God (John i. 35—43). It was on this occasion that Jesus, looking on him and foreseeing his disposition and worth in the work of His Kingdom, gave him the name *Κηφᾶς* (Aram. ܟܦܝܐ), in Greek *Πέτρος*, a stone or Rock (John i. 43 &c. : Mark iii. 16). He does not however appear to have attached himself finally to our Lord till after two, or perhaps more, summons to do so (cf. John, l. c. : Matt. iv. 18 || Mark : Luke v. 1 ff. and notes), but to have carried on his fishing trade at intervals.

3. It would be beside the present purpose to follow St. Peter through the well-known incidents of his apostolic life. His forwardness in reply and profession of warm affection, his thorough appreciation of our Lord's high Office and Person, the glorious promise made to him as the Rock of the Church on that account (Matt. xvi. 16 and note), his rashness, and over-confidence in himself, issuing in his triple denial of Christ and his bitter repentance, his reassurance by the gentle but searching words of his risen Master (John xxi. 15 ff.),—these are familiar to every Christian child : nor is there any one of the leading characters in the gospel history which makes so deep an impression on the heart and affections of the young and susceptible. The weakness, and the strength, of our human love for Christ, are both mercifully provided for in the character of the greatest of the Twelve.

⁹ His wife is variously named Concordia or Perpetua by the legends: the Commentators refer to J. F. Meyer de Petri Conjugio (Wittenburg, 1684). Clem. Alex. (Strom. vii. 11 [63], p. 869 P.) relates, *φασὶ γοῦν τὸν μακάριον Πέτρον, θεασάμενον τὴν αὐτοῦ γυναῖκα ἀγομένην τὴν ἐπὶ θάνατον ἡσθῆναι μὲν τῆς κλήσεως χάριν καὶ τῆς εἰς οἶκον ἀνακομιδῆς, ἐπιφωνήσαι δὲ εὖ μάλα προτρεπτικῶς τε καὶ παρακλητικῶς ἐξ ὀνόματος προσειπόντα· μεμνήσθω αὐτῇ τοῦ κυρίου* (qu. μέμνησο, ᾧ αὕτη, τ. κ.). And in Strom. iii. 6 [52], p. 535 P., he says, *Πέτρος μὲν γὰρ καὶ φίλιππος ἐπαιδοποιήσαντο*. On the question whether Mark was his son, see note on 1 Pet. v. 13.

4. After the Ascension, we find St. Peter at once taking the lead in the Christian body (Acts i. 15 ff.), and on the descent of the Holy Spirit, he, to whom were given the keys of Christ's kingdom,—who was to be the stone on which the church was to be built, first receives into the door of the church, and builds up on his own holy faith, three thousand of Israel (Acts ii. 14—41): and on another occasion soon following, some thousands more (Acts iv. 4).

5. This prominence of St. Peter in the church continues, till by his specially directed ministry the door into the privileges of the gospel covenant is opened also to the Gentiles, by the baptism of Cornelius and his party (Acts x.). But he was not to be the Apostle of the Gentiles: and by this very procedure, the way was being made plain for the ministry of another who was now ripening for the work in the retirement of his home at Tarsus.

6. From this time onward, the prominence of St. Peter wanes behind that of St. Paul. The "first to the Jew" was rapidly coming to its conclusion: and the great spreading of the feast to the Gentile world was henceforward to occupy the earnest attention of the apostolic missionaries, as it has done the pages of the inspired record. Only once or twice, besides the notices to be gathered from this Epistle itself, do we gain a glimpse of St. Peter after this time. In the apostolic council in Acts xv. we find him consistently carrying out the part which had been divinely assigned him in the admission of the Gentiles into the church; and earnestly supporting the freedom of the Gentile converts from the observance of the Mosaic law.

7. This is the last notice which we have of him, or indeed of any of the Twelve, in the Acts. But from Gal. ii. 11, we learn a circumstance which is singularly in keeping with St. Peter's former character: that when at Antioch, in all probability not long after the apostolic council, he was practising the freedom which he had defended there, but being afraid of certain who came from James, he withdrew himself and separated from the Gentile converts, thereby incurring a severe rebuke from St. Paul (ib. vv. 14—21).

8. From this time, we depend on such scanty hints as the Epistles furnish, and upon ecclesiastical tradition, for further notices of St. Peter. We may indeed, from 1 Cor. ix. 5, infer that he travelled about on the missionary work, and took his wife with him: but in what part of the Roman empire, we know not. If the Babylon of ch. v. 13 is to be taken literally, he passed the boundaries of that empire into Parthia.

9. The best text, and starting-point, for treating of the traditions respecting St. Peter, is the account given by Jerome, after others, *De Scriptor. Eccl.* i, vol. ii. p. 827:—

"Simon Petrus . . . princeps Apostolorum, post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiæ et prædicationem dispersionis eorum qui de

circumcisione crediderant, in Ponto, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia et Bithynia, secundo Claudii anno ad expugnandum Simonem Magum Romam pergit, ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit, usque ad ultimum annum Neronis, id est, decimum quartum. A quo et affixus cruci martyrio coronatus est, capite ad terram verso et in sublime pedibus elevatis, asserens se indignum qui sic crucifigeretur ut dominus suus. Sepultus Romæ in Vaticano juxta viam triumphalem tötius urbis veneratione celebratur."

10. In this account, according to Huther, we have the following doubtful particulars :—

(1) The episcopate of St. Peter at Antioch. This is reported also by Euseb. (Chron. A.D. 40), who makes St. Peter *found* the church at Antioch, in contradiction to Acts xi. 19—22.

(2) His personal work among the churches of Asia Minor, which seems to be a mere assertion founded on Origen's conjecture (Eus. H. E. iii. 1), Πέτρος ἐν Πόντῳ κ.τ.λ. κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίοις εἶπεν, grounded upon 1 Pet. i. 1¹.

(3) His journey to Rome to oppose Simon Magus : which, as Eus. (Chron.) appeals to Justin Martyr for it, appears to be founded on Justin's story of the statue found at Rome, see note on Acts viii. 10 : which is now known to have been a statue of the Sabine god Semo Sancus.

(4) The twenty-five years' bishopric of St. Peter at Rome. This has been minutely examined by Wieseler, and shewn on chronological grounds to have been impossible, and to be inconsistent with Gal. ii. 7—9, according to which Peter, who by this hypothesis had been then for many years bishop of Rome, and continued so for many years after, was to go to the circumcision as their Apostle.

(5) The peculiar manner of his crucifixion, which seems to have been an idea arising from Origen's expression (Eus. H. E. iii. 1), ἀνεσκολοπίσθη κατὰ κεφαλῆς. This expression, it has been suggested, might import no more than *capital punishment*. But surely this cannot be, in connexion with ἀνεσκολοπίσθη ; the words must be taken literally, as qualifying the verb, which is already sufficiently definite of itself. Besides which, the words following in Origen are entirely against such a supposition ; οὕτως αὐτὸς ἀξιώσας παθεῖν : for it would deprive them of all meaning.

11. The residuum from this passage, which is worth our consideration and elucidation, is, the death of the Apostle by martyrdom, and that in Rome. This seems to be the concurrent testimony of Christian antiquity. I subjoin the principal testimonies.

12. First we have John xxi. 19, which, whether a notice inserted

¹ This is granted even by the R.-Cath. Windischmann (Viudiciæ Petrinæ, p. 112 f.).

after the fact, and referring to it, or an authoritative exposition of our Lord's words to Peter, equally point to the fact as having been, or about to be accomplished.

13. Clement of Rome, Ep. i. ad Corinth. c. 5, p. 217, says—

(. . . ὁ Πέτρος) διὰ ζήλον ἄδικον οὐχ (ἕνα οὐ) δὲ δύο ἀλλὰ πλείους ἤνεγκεν πόνους, καὶ οὕτω μαρτυρ(ήσας) ἐπορεύθη εἰς ὀφειλ(όμενον) τόπον τῆς δόξης.

Here indeed there is no mention of Rome : but the close juxta-position of the celebrated passage about St. Paul (cited in Vol. III. Prolegg., ch. vii. § ii. 20) seems to point to that city as the place of Peter's martyrdom. Besides, I would suggest that these words, ἐπορεύθη εἰς . . . τόπον τ. δ., are a reminiscence of Acts xii. 17, καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕτερον τόπον, which by the advocates of the twenty-five years' Roman bishopric was interpreted to mean Rome.

14. Dionysius of Corinth is cited by Eusebius, H. E. ii. 25, as saying in an Epistle to the Romans—

ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης νοουθεσίας τὴν ἀπὸ Πέτρου κ. Παύλου φυτεῖαν γεννηθεῖσαν Ῥωμαίων τε κ. Κορινθίων συνεκεράσατε. καὶ γὰρ ἄμφω καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμετέραν Κόρινθον φυτεύσαντες² ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἰταλίαν ὁμοίως διδάξαντες ἐμαρτύρησαν κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρόν.

15. Tertullian, Contra Marcion. iv. 5, vol. ii. p. 366, says—

“Romani . . . quibus evangelium et Petrus et Paulus sanguine quoque suo signatum reliquerunt.”

And, Præscript. Hær. c. 36, ib. p. 49—

“Si autem Italiæ adjaces, habes Romam, unde nobis quoque auctoritas præsto est. Ista quam felix ecclesia, cui totam doctrinam apostoli cum sanguine suo profuderunt, ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Joannis exitu coronatur, ubi apostolus Joannes, posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur.”

16. Caius the presbyter of Rome, in Eus. H. E. ii. 25, is reported as saying—

ἐγὼ δὲ τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχω δεῖξαι· ἐὰν γὰρ θελήσης ἀπελθεῖν ἐπὶ τὸν Βατικανὸν ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Ὀστίαν, εὐρήσεις τὰ τρόπαια τῶν ταύτῃν ἰδρυσαμένων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

This passage can mean nothing else than that Peter and Paul suffered at Rome, and that either their graves or some memorials of their martyrdom were to be seen on the spot.

17. To these testimonies we may add that of Eusebius himself, who says (H. E. ii. 25)—

² These three words, ἡμᾶς ὁμοίως ἐδίδαξαν, are omitted, apparently by a misprint, in Heinichen's edition, which I use. See Wieseler, Chron. der Apost. Zeitalters, p. 534, note 2.

ταύτῃ γοῦν οὗτος θεόμαχος (Nero) ἐν τοῖς μάλιστα πρῶτος ἀνακηρυχθείς, ἐπὶ τὰς κατὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπήρθη σφαγὰς. Παῦλος δὲ οὖν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης κεφαλὴν ἀποτμηθῆναι, καὶ Πέτρος ὡσαύτως ἀνασκολοπισθῆναι κατ' αὐτὸν ἰστοροῦνται.

And in his *Demonstratio Evang.* iii. 5, vol. iv. p. 116—

καὶ Πέτρος δὲ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης κατὰ κεφαλῆς σταυροῦται, Παῦλος δὲ ἀποτέμνεται.

18. And that of Lactantius (*De Mortibus Persecutorum*, c. 2, vol. ii. p. 195 f., ed Migne):—

“Cumque jam Nero imperaret, Petrus Romam advenit, et editis quibusdam miraculis, quæ virtute ipsius Dei data sibi ab eo potestate faciebat, convertit multos ad justitiam, Deoque templum fidele et stabile collocavit. Qua re ad Neronem delata, quum animadverteret non modo Romæ sed ubique quotidie magnam multitudinem deficere a cultu idolorum, et ad religionem novam damnata vetustate transire, ut erat execrabilis ac nocens tyrannus, prosilivit ad excidendum cæleste templum, delendamque justitiam : et primus omnium persecutus Dei servos, Petrum cruci adfixit, et Paulum interfecit.”

19. In this report later testimonies concur.

In forming an estimate of its trustworthiness, some discrimination is necessary. The whole of that which relates to the earlier visits under Claudius, and the controversy with Simon Magus, fails us, as inconsistent with what we know, or are obliged to infer, from Scripture itself. This being so, is the rest, including the martyrdom at Rome, so connected with this fabulous matter, that it stands or falls with it? When we find in this, as in other matters, that the very earliest Christian writers might and did fall into historical errors which we can now plainly detect and put aside,—when we find so prevalent a tendency even in early times to concentrate events and memorials of interest at Rome, how much are we to adopt, how much to reject, of this testimony to St. Peter's martyrdom there?

20. These are questions which it would far exceed the limits of these Prolegomena to discuss, and which moreover do not immediately belong even to collateral considerations regarding our Epistle. They have been very copiously treated, and it seems almost impossible to arrive at even reasonable probability in our ultimate decision upon them. Their own data are perplexing, and still more perplexing matters have been mixed up with them. On the one hand, ancient tradition is almost unanimous: on the other, it witnesses to particulars in which even its earliest and most considerable testimonies must be put aside as inconsistent with known fact. Then again we have on the one hand the patent and unscrupulous perversion of fact to serve a purpose, which has ever been the characteristic of the church of Rome, in her desperate

shifts to establish a succession to the fabulous primacy of St. Peter, and on the other the exaggerated partisanship of Protestant writers, with whom the shortest way to save a fact or an interpretation from abuse has been to demolish it.

21. So that on the whole it seems safest to suspend the judgment with regard to the question of St. Peter's presence and martyrdom at Rome. That he was not there before the date of the Epistle to the Romans (cir. A.D. 58), we are sure: that he was not there during any part of St. Paul's imprisonment there, we may with certainty infer: that the two apostles did not together found the churches of Corinth and Rome, we may venture safely to affirm: that St. Peter ever was, in any sense like that usually given to the word, Bishop of Rome, is we believe an idea abhorrent from Scripture and from the facts of primitive apostolic history. But that St. Peter travelled to Rome during the persecution under Nero, and there suffered martyrdom with, or nearly at the same time with, St. Paul, is a tradition which does not interfere with any known facts of Scripture or early history, and one which we have no means of disproving, as we have no interest in disproving it.

22. It may be permitted us on this point, until the day when all shall be known, to follow the cherished associations of all Christendom—to trace still in the Mamertine prison and the Vatican the last days on earth of him to whom was committed especially the feeding of the flock of God: to “witness beside the Appian way the scene of the most beautiful of ecclesiastical legends³, which records his last vision of his crucified Lord: to overlook from the supposed spot of his death⁴ the city of the seven hills: to believe that his last remains repose under the glory of St. Peter's dome⁵.”

23. The matters relating to the above questions will be found in Winer, *Realwörterbuch*, art. *Petrus*: in Wieseler, *Chronologie des Apostolischen Zeitalters*, pp. 553—593: Neander, *Pflanzung u. Leitung u.s.w.*, ii. p. 514 ff.: Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, i. 1, p. 101 ff.: David-

³ Stanley, *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 96. The legend referred to is that related by Ambrose, *Sermo de Basil.*, appended to Ep. 21 (33, ed. Paris 1586), vol. iii. p. 867, that St. Peter not long before his death, being overcome by the solicitations of the faithful to save himself, was flying from Rome, when he was met by our Lord, and on asking, “Lord, whither goest thou?” received the answer, “I go to be crucified afresh.” On this the Apostle returned and joyfully went to martyrdom. The memory of this legend is yet preserved in Rome by the Church called “Domine, quo vadis?” on the Appian way.

⁴ “The eminence of S. Pietro in Montorio on the Janiculum” (Stanley, note ib.).

⁵ “The remains of St. Peter, as is well known, are supposed to be buried immediately under the great altar in the centre of the famous basilica which bears his name” (Stanley, ib.). See in the same work an interesting account of the Judaizing party which gathered round the person of Peter, p. 96 ff.

son, Introd. to N. T. vol. iii. pp. 357 ff. The Roman Catholic side is stated and defended by Baronius, *Annals*, on A.D. 44—46, 56, 69: and of late by Windischmann, *Vindiciæ Petrinæ*, Ratisb. 1836.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The inscription of the letter itself has on this point an apparent precision: *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας*. This would seem to include the Christians dwelling in those very provinces where St. Paul and his companions had founded churches.

2. But it has been attempted, both in ancient days and in modern, to limit this address to the Jewish Christians resident in those provinces. This has been done by Eusebius, Didymus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Œcumenius, Theophylact: and by Erasmus, Calvin, Grotius, Bengel, Augusti, Hug, Bertholdt, Pott, Weiss, al.

3. Still, there is nothing in the words to warrant such a limitation. The *παρεπιδήμοις* is sufficiently explained in the Epistle itself, in ch. ii. 11, as used in a spiritual sense, strangers and pilgrims on earth: and the *διασπορᾶς* following may well designate the ingrafting of Gentile converts into, and their forming a part of, God's covenant people, who already, according to the flesh, were thus dispersed.

4. With this view well-known facts, both external to the Epistle and belonging to it, agree. These churches, as we learn from the Acts, were composed mainly of Gentile converts: and it would be unreasonable to suppose that St. Peter, with his views on the Christian relation of Jew and Gentile, as shewn in Acts xi. and xv., should have selected out only the Jewish portion of those churches to address in his Epistle. Rather, if one object of the letter were that which I have endeavoured to establish in § v., would he be anxious to mingle together Jew and Gentile in the blessings and obligations of their common faith, and though himself the Apostle of the circumcision, to help on the work and doctrines of the great Apostle of the uncircumcision.

5. And this is further evident from many passages in the Epistle itself. Such is the *μὴ συνοχηματιζόμενοι ταῖς πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις* (ch. i. 14), words which would hardly be addressed to Jews exclusively, cf. Eph. ii. 1 ff, where the Jews are indeed included in *ἡμεῖς πάντες*, but Gentiles are mainly addressed: such the *οἱ ποτὲ οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ* (ii. 10)⁶, as compared with ver. 9, *τοῦ ἐκ σκότους*

⁶ It has been argued (see amongst others Weiss, *Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff*, p. 119) that this passage, being originally written by Hosea of the rejected people of God, must

ἡμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς, and with Rom. ix. 25: such the ἡς (Σάρρας) ἐγενήθητε τέκνα (iii. 6), implying adoption into the (spiritual) family of Abraham: such the ἀρετὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ βούλημα τῶν ἐθνῶν κατεργάσθαι πεπορευμένους ἐν . . . ἀθεμίτοις εἰδωλολατρείαις (iv. 3), which words are addressed to the readers, and not to be supplied with ἡμῖν: and seem decisive as to Gentiles in the main, and not Jews, being designated. The expression of ch. i. 18, οὐ φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ἡμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου, may seem ambiguous, and has in fact been quoted on both sides: but it seems to me to point the same way as those others: the Apostle would hardly have characterized all that the Jew left to become a Christian by such a name⁷.

6. Steiger, in his *Einleitung*, § 6, has given a list of such churches as would be comprehended under the address in ch. i. 1, Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, Ἀσίας, καὶ Βιθυνίας. The provinces here named proceed in order from N.E. to S. and W.: a circumstance which will be of some interest in our enquiry as to the place of writing⁸. The first of them, PONTUS, stretched from Colchis and Lesser Armenia to the mouth of the river Halys, and was rich both in soil and in commercial towns. It was the country of the Christian Jew Aquila. Next comes GALATIA, to which St. Paul paid two visits (Acts xvi. 6 and Gal. iv. 13 ff.: Acts xviii. 23 and xix. 1 ff.), founding and confirming churches. After him, his companion Crescens went on a mission there (2 Tim. iv. 10). Its ecclesiastical metropolis was in after time Ancyra. Further particulars respecting it will be found in the Prolegg. to Vol. III. ch. i. § ii.

7. Next in order comes CAPPADOCIA, south but returning somewhat to the E., where in after times the towns of Nyssa and Cæsarea gave the church a Gregory and a Basil, and whence (see Acts ii. 9, and

be so understood here. But this is mere arbitrary assertion. The context here must determine in what sense the Apostle adopts the words of the Prophet: and I have no hesitation in saying with Augustine and Bede, "Hoc testimonium quondam per Hoseam antiquo Dei populo datum est, quod nunc recte gentibus dat Petrus." The express citation of the same passage by St. Paul in Rom. ix. 25, as applying to Gentiles, should have prevented Weiss at all events from speaking here with his usual overweening positiveness.

⁷ Weiss, in his treatise quoted in the last note, has taken very strongly the side or Judæo-Christian readers only being addressed. He has laid great stress, p. 108 ff., on the O. T. allusions in the Epistle, as shewing this. But either his instances prove nothing, or they prove too much. In the same way we might argue of the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, which abound much more with O. T. allusions. I may remark here generally, that Weiss's treatise, conclusive as he would represent his results, and strongly as he states them, is very deficient in thoroughness and fairness of investigation; being rather an attempt to justify a preconceived view, than an impartial dealing with the phenomena of the Epistle. See this further illustrated, when we come to speak of the date of the Epistle, below, § iv.

⁸ See below, § iv. 17.

Josephus, Ant. xvi. 6) Jews came up to the feasts in Jerusalem, who might well have carried back the knowledge of Christianity, and have founded churches. Next, going southward and westward, we have proconsular ASIA, including Mysia, Lydia, Caria, Phrygia, Pisidia, and Lycaonia,—containing the churches of Iconium where Paul and Barnabas preached (Acts xiv. 1 ff.), Lystra, the birthplace of Timotheus, where St. Paul was stoned by the Jews (Acts xiv. 8—19; xvi. 1, 2: 2 Tim. iii. 11),—Derbe, the birthplace of Caius, where many were made disciples (Acts xiv. 20 f.; xx. 4),—Antioch in Pisidia, where St. Paul converted many Gentiles, but was driven out by the Jews (Acts xiii. 14 ff., 48 ff.): returned however, and confirmed the churches (ib. xiv. 21—23),—then Miletus, on the Carian coast, where from Acts xx. 17 and 2 Tim. iv. 20, there must have been Christian brethren,—Phrygia, where St. Paul preached on both his journeys to Galatia (Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 23),—then along the banks of the Lycus, Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colossæ, celebrated Christian churches, to which he wrote his Colossian Epistle, whose leaders Archippus and Epaphras, whose member Onesimus, are well known to us (Col. i. 7; iv. 9, 12 f., 17: Philem. 2, 10),—where erroneous doctrines and lukewarmness in the faith soon became prevalent (Col. ii.: Rev. iii. 14—22).

8. Then passing westward, we find in Lydia at the foot of the Tmolus, Philadelphia, known to us favourably from Rev. iii. 7 ff., and Sardis the capital (Rev. iii. 1 ff.), and Thyatira, blamed in Rev. ii. 18 ff. as too favourably inclined towards false teachers: then on the coast the famous Ephesus, where first St. Paul (Acts xviii. 19), then perhaps Aquila and Priscilla, then Apollos (Acts xviii. 24—28), taught, then St. Paul returned and remained *τριετίαν ὅλην* building up the church with such success (Acts xx. 17; xix. 1 ff., 8—10, 17), a church well known and loved by every Christian reader of the Epistle to the Ephesians, but grieved over when we read (Rev. ii. 4) that it had deserted its first love. Then northwards we have Smyrna, known favourably to us from Rev. ii. 8 ff., and in Mysia, Pergamus (Rev. ii. 12 ff.); and lastly Alexandria Troas, whence St. Paul was summoned over by a vision to preach in Europe, where afterwards he preached, and raised Eutychus to life (Acts xx. 6 ff.: 2 Cor. ii. 12), and where he was on a subsequent occasion entertained by Carpus (2 Tim. iv. 13).

This closes the list of churches known to us, BITHYNIA containing none whose names are handed down in Scripture.

9. The enquiry as to the then state of these Christian congregations is one which must be here conducted simply on grounds furnished by the Epistle itself. Its effect on the conclusion to which we must come as to the date of the Epistle will be dealt with in a subsequent section.

10. From the Epistle itself then we gather, that in external form and government they were much in the same state as when St. Paul exhorted

the Ephesian elders at Miletus in Acts xx. Here (ch. v. 1 ff.), as there, the elders (πρεσβύτεροι) are exhorted to tend (ποιμαίνειν) the church or flock of God : and no other officers in either place appear.

11. It was manifestly during a time of persecution that the Apostle thus addressed them. His expressions, especially those in ch. iii. 17 and iv. 12—19, can hardly be interpreted of the general liability of Christians to persecutions, but must necessarily be understood of some trial of that kind then pressing on them⁹.

12. It would seem by ch. iv. 4, 5, that some of these trials had befallen the Christians on account of their separating themselves from the licentious shows and amusements of the heathen. And the same passage will shew that it was from heathens, rather than from unbelieving Jews, that the trials came.

13. We may gather, from hints dropped in the course of the Epistle, that there were in the internal state of the churches some tendencies which required repression, as e. g. the disposition to become identified with the heathen way of living (ch. ii. 11, 12, 16 al.),—that to greed and ambition and self-exaltation on the part of the presbyters (v. 2, 3),—that to evil thoughts and evil words towards one another (ii. 1 ; iii. 8—12 ; iv. 9).

SECTION IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. The former of these enquiries is very closely connected with that of the last section. Many Commentators have fancied that the state of the readers implied in the Epistle, points at the persecution under Nero as the time when it was written¹: others that the persecution under Trajan is rather indicated². But to both of these it has been sufficiently replied³, that the passages relied on do not warrant either inference : that the ἀπολογία to be rendered (ch. iii. 15), is not necessarily, nor indeed well can be at all, a public defence in court, seeing that they are to be ready to make it παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι κ.τ.λ. : that the suffering as κακοποιοί cannot well be connected with the *malefici* of Tacitus, because in the Epistle the readers are exhorted to *live down* the ill repute, which, had it consisted in the mere name of Christian,

⁹ The bearing of this consideration on the date of the Epistle is treated below, § iv. 1.

¹ So Hug, Einl. ii. p. 469 ff.: Neander, Pflanz. u. Leit. p. 590: De Wette, Einl. p. 1700: Thiersch, Apost. Kirche, pp. 205—208: Mayerhoff: Greswell, al.

² So Schwegeler, Nachapost. Zeit. ii. 10 ff.

³ By Credner, Steiger, Wieseler, Davidson, al.

they could not have been. Again it is answered that we have no proof of the Neronian persecution having extended itself into the Asiatic provinces.

2. On the whole it seems to me that we are not justified in connecting the Epistle with either of these persecutions, but are rather to take its notices as pointing to a time when a general dislike of the Christians was beginning to pass into active tyranny, and in some cases into infliction of capital punishment. As Davidson remarks (vol. iii. p. 375), "the trials were not yet excessive. They were alarming in the future. A severe time was *approaching*. Judgment was soon to begin at the house of God. The terrible persecutions and sufferings which the Christians were about to endure, were impending."

3. These remarks are favoured by the tone in which suffering is spoken of, as by no means a matter of course: not sure, nor even likely, to follow upon a harmless Christian life: cf. ch. iii. 13, 14, where, by *τίς ὁ κακῶσων ὑμᾶς ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ζηλωταὶ γένησθε*; it seems as if the good liver was in general likely to be let alone; and by what follows, *ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ πάσχοιτε διὰ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι*, it is implied that in some exceptional cases, Christians might be hunted out by zealous enemies and made to suffer *quoad* Christians.

4. So that I should be disposed, judging from the internal notices given of the state of the readers, to place the writing of the Epistle during the latter years of Nero, but before the persecution related by Tacitus, Ann. xiv., broke out. The "odium generis humani" which justified that victimizing of the Christians, was gathering, and producing its anticipatory fruits here and there, wherever circumstances were favourable.

5. And with this agree the personal notices in our Epistle, and inferences to be gathered from it. We must conclude from passages in it that St. Peter was acquainted with the Epistles of St. Paul; not only with his earlier ones, but with those written during his first Roman imprisonment⁴. If now St. Paul was set free from that imprisonment in the year 63 (see Prolegg. to the Pastoral Epistles, Vol. III. § ii. 24), this Epistle cannot well have been written before the end of that year.

6. Another personal notice also agrees with this date. By ch. v. 13 we find that Mark was, at the time of its writing, with the Apostle in Babylon, which I here by anticipation assume to be the well-known city in Chaldaea. Now from Coloss. iv. 10, we learn that Mark was at the time of writing that Epistle (61—63) with St. Paul in Rome, but intending to journey into Asia Minor: and from 2 Tim. iv. 11 (67 or 68), we find that he was in Asia Minor, and was to be brought with

⁴ See this shewn below, § vi. 2 note.

Timotheus to Rome. Now one of two contingencies is possible. Mark may either have spent some of the interval between these two notices with St. Peter in Babylon, or have betaken himself to that Apostle after the death of St. Paul.

7. Of these two alternatives, it is urged by the advocates of the usual view taken of our Epistle, the latter is the more probable. This Epistle is addressed to churches mostly founded by St. Paul: is it probable that St. Peter would have thus addressed them during the great Apostle's lifetime? When we consider St. Paul's own rule, of not encroaching on other men's labours (Rom. xv. 20), and put together with it the fact of the compact made between the two Apostles as related in Gal. ii. 9, it seems difficult to imagine that such an Epistle should have been written before St. Paul was withdrawn from his labours; which latter took place only at his death. That event, and the strengthening of the influences adverse to St. Paul's doctrine consequent on it, might well agree with the testimony to that doctrine which we find in this Epistle, and especially in ch. v. 12.

8. According to this view, we must place the Epistle late in the second apostolic period. We have seen in the Prolegomena to the Pastoral Epistles, that it is not easy to assign a date for the death of St. Paul before the last year of Nero, i. e. 67 to 68. If we suffer ourselves to be guided by these considerations, we should say, that in the latter part of that year, or the beginning of the next, our Epistle may have been written.

9. But these considerations, forcible as they seem, bring us into a greater difficulty than that of believing the Epistle to have been written during St. Paul's lifetime. They leave absolutely no room for the journey of St. Peter to, and martyrdom at, Rome: none for the writing of the second Epistle, which clearly must not be rejected on such grounds alone. We must therefore adopt the other alternative, and suppose the writing to have taken place during a temporary withdrawal of the great Apostle to some other and distant scene of missionary action between the year 63 and 67.

10. Next as to the place, whence it was written. If words are to be taken literally, this is pointed out with sufficient plainness in the Epistle itself (ch. v. 13), where we read ἀσπάζεταιται ἡμᾶς ἢ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή, as being BABYLON.

And there does not appear to be any reason to depart from the *prima facie* impression given by this notice, that St. Peter was at that time dwelling and working at the renowned Babylon on the Euphrates.

11. It is true, that from very early times the name has suggested other interpretations. Eusebius (H. E. ii. 15) quotes with a *φασίν*, and alleges for it generally the authority of Papias and Clement of Alexandria in the Hypotyposeis, τοῦ Μάρκου μνημονεύειν τὸν Πέτρον ἐν τῇ

προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, ἣν καὶ συντάξαι φασὶν ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ῥώμης, σημαίνειν τε τοῦτ' αὐτὸν τὴν πόλιν τροπικώτερον Βαβυλῶνα προσειπόντα, κ.τ.λ. And so also Œc. in loc., assigning however a very insufficient reason: Βαβυλῶνα τὴν Ῥώμην διὰ τὸ περιφανὲς καλεῖ, ὃ καὶ Βαβυλὼν πολλῷ χρόνῳ ἔσχηκε. And Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccles. 8, vol. ii. p. 848: "Meminit hujus Marci et Petrus in Epistola prima, sub nomine Babylonis figuratiter Romam significans." And on Isa. xlvii., vol. iv. p. 549: "Licet ex eo quod juxta LXX scriptum est, *ὅτιγατερ Βαβυλῶνος*, . . . non ipsam Babylonem quidam, sed Romanam urbem interpretentur, quæ in Apocalypsi Joannis et in Epistola Petri Babylon specialiter appellatur." So also Isidore of Seville, as alleged by Davidson, p. 362. And this has been a very general opinion among not only Roman Catholic but also other Commentators. It is held by Grotius, Lardner, Cave, Whitby, Macknight, Hales, Cludius, Mynster, Windischmann, al.: and recently Wiesinger.

12. But there seems to be no other defence for this interpretation than that of prescription. And it is now pretty generally recognized among Commentators that we are not to find an allegorical meaning in a proper name thus simply used in the midst of simple and matter-of-fact sayings. The personal notice too, conveyed in ἡ *συνεκλεκτή*, will hardly bear the violence which many have attempted to put upon it, in supplying *ἐκκλησία* (see digest in loc.). No such word has been mentioned: nor is the Epistle addressed *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς διασπορᾶς*, κ.τ.λ., but *ἐκλεκτοῖς παρεπιδήμοις διασπορᾶς*, κ.τ.λ. And as those are individual Christians, so it is but reasonable to believe that ἡ *συνεκλεκτή* is an individual also, the term being strictly correlative with that other: and if an individual, then that *ἀδελφῇ γυνή* whom, as we know from 1 Cor. ix. 5, St. Peter *περιῆγεν* in his missionary journeys.

13. And this being so, I can see no objection arising from the ἐν Βαβυλῶνι⁵ being inserted. The Apostle, in ch. i. 1, had seen fit to *localize* the Christians whom he was addressing: and he now sends them greeting from one whom indeed he does not name, but designates by an expression also local. To the elect Christians of the dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia, he sends greeting from their sister, an elect Christian woman in Babylon. There might obviously be a reason why he should thus designate her, rather than by her name and relation to himself: but no reason whatever why he should go out of his way to make an enigma for all future readers, if he meant the Church at Rome by these words.

14. But even when we have taken the words literally, we have not yet got their full solution. Some contend, that an insignificant fort in

⁵ So Weiss, p. 134 note, "Es unbegreiflich bleibt, warum Petrus den Aufenthalt seiner Gattin angibt und seinen eigenen nicht."

Egypt, called Babylon⁶, is intended. This appears to be the tradition of the Coptic church, and it is supported by Le Clerc, Mill, Pearson, Calov., Pott, Burton, and Greswell. The ground seems mainly to be this; that as it is believed that St. Mark preached, after St. Peter's death, in Alexandria and the parts adjacent, so it is likely that those same parts should have been the scene of his former labours with the Apostle.

15. Others again have supposed it to be Ctesiphon on the Tigris, the winter residence of the Parthian kings; or Seleucia, both of which seem to have borne the name of Babylon after the declension of the older and more famous city. So (as regards Seleucia) Michaelis, who however adduces no proof that it was thus called in the apostolic age.

16. With regard to the probability, or otherwise, of St. Peter having laboured in the Assyrian Babylon at this time, we may notice, that that city in its decayed state, and its neighbourhood, were inhabited by Jews, long after other inhabitants had deserted it: that, which is sufficient for us, Josephus and Philo describe it as thus inhabited in their time⁷. It is true that in the last years of Caligula, who died in A.D. 41, there was a persecution of the Jews there⁸, in consequence of which very many of them migrated to the new and rising Seleucia; and five years after, a plague further diminished their number. But this does not preclude their increase or return during the twenty years, at least, which intervened between that plague and the writing of our Epistle.

17. It is some corroboration of the view that our Epistle was written from the Assyrian Babylon to find, that the countries mentioned in the address are enumerated, not as a person in Rome or in Egypt would enumerate them, but in an order proceeding, as has already been noticed, from East to West and South: and also to find that Cosmas Indico-pleustes, in the sixth century, quotes the conclusion of our Epistle "as a proof of the early progress of the Christian religion without the bounds of the Roman Empire: by which therefore we perceive that by Babylon he did not understand Rome⁹."

⁶ Thus described by Strabo, xvii. 1, p. 807: ἀναπλεύσαντι δ' ἐστὶ Βαβυλῶν, φρούριον ἐρυμνόν, ἀποστάντων ἐνταῦθα Βαβυλωνίων τινῶν, εἰτα διαπραξαμένων ἐνταῦθα κατοικίαν παρὰ τῶν βασιλέων· νυνὶ δ' ἐστὶ στρατόπεδον ἐνδὲς τῶν τριῶν ταγμάτων τῶν φρουρούντων τὴν Αἴγυπτον.

⁷ Jos. Antt. xv. 3. 1, οὐ γὰρ ὀλίγαι μυριάδες τοῦδε τοῦ λισοῦ περὶ τὴν Βαβυλωνίαν ἀπφκίσθησαν: Philo de leg. ad Caium 36, vol. ii. p. 587, πᾶσα γὰρ ἔξω μέρους βραχέος Βαβυλῶν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων σατραπειῶν αἱ ἀρετῶσαν ἔχουσι τὴν ἐν κύκλῳ γῆν, Ἰουδαίους ἔχουσιν οἰκήτορας.

⁸ See Jos. Antt. xviii. 9. 8.

⁹ Lardner, Works, vol. v. p. 269: citing Cosmas, ii. p. 147.

18. With regard to any *journey* of St. Peter to Babylon, as recorded or implied by antiquity, we are quite unfurnished with any other evidence than that deduced from the passage under consideration. And the difficulties which beset the conjunction of the various notices respecting our Apostle remain much the same in amount, whichever way we attempt their solution : whether by forcing the ἐν Βαβυλῶνι to some far-fetched and improbable sense, as has been very generally done, or with Weiss and others assigning an early date to our Epistle, contrary to the plain sense of his own words and the common-sense inferences from the indications furnished by it. That St. Peter wrote this Epistle to churches in Asia Minor mainly consisting of Gentile converts : that those churches had been previously the scene of the labours of St. Paul and his companions : that he wrote from Babylon in Assyria, and at a time subsequent to St. Paul's missionary agency : these are points which can hardly be controverted, consistently with the plain acceptation of language in its obvious and ordinary meaning. That the same Apostle visited Rome and suffered martyrdom there, we would fain believe as the testimony of Christian antiquity. It is difficult to believe it : difficult to assign the time so as to satisfy its requisitions : but in the uncertainty which rests over all the later movements of the great Apostles, it would be presumption for us to pronounce it impossible. There may be means of reconciling the two beliefs, of which we are not aware. And since this may be so, we are not unreasonable in retaining both, both being reasonably attested.

19. One personal notice has not been mentioned in the foregoing paragraphs, viz. that of Silvanus having been the bearer of the Epistle (ch. v. 12). And the reason for its omission has been, that it is far too uncertain to found any argument on as to date or locality. Even assuming him to be the same person as the Silas of Acts xv. 22, 32, 40 ; xvi. 19, 25 ; xvii. 4, 10, 14 ; xviii. 5, or the Silvanus of 1 Thess. i. 1, 2 Thess. i. 1, 2 Cor. i. 19,—we know absolutely nothing of his history subsequently to that period of his companionship with St. Paul, and all that is founded on any filling up of the gap in his history can only tend to mislead, by giving to baseless conjecture the value of real fact.

SECTION V.

ITS OBJECT AND CONTENTS.

1. The object of the Epistle is plainly enough announced by the Apostle himself at its conclusion :

Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ . . . δι' ὀλίγων ἔγραψα, παρακαλῶν καὶ ἐπιμαρτυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθὴ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς ἣν στήτε.

2. But this apparently simple declaration is not easy to track to its meaning in detail. The παρακαλῶν portion of it involves no difficulty. The frequent exhortations in the Epistle, arising out of present circumstances, are too evident to be missed as being referred to by this word. And when we come to the ἐπιμαρτυρῶν portion, our difficulty is not indeed to find matter in the Epistle to which this may refer, but to identify the ταύτην, to which, as being the ἀληθῆς χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, the Apostle's testimony is given. The ἐπιμαρτυρίαι in the Epistle are plainly those constant references of practice to Christian doctrine, with which every exhortation terminates: being sometimes O. T. citations, sometimes reminders of facts in the evangelic history, sometimes assertions of the great hope which is reserved for God's elect.

3. Here there can be but little doubt: παράκλησις and ἐπιμαρτυρία alternate with and interpenetrate one another throughout the whole¹. It is only when we come to assign a meaning to the ταύτην, further specified as it is by the εἰς ἣν στήτε, that the real definition of the object of the Epistle comes before us, and with it, all its uncertainty and difficulty. What is this grace of God in which the readers were to stand—or rather, on account of the εἰς ἣν στ., into which they had been introduced as their safe standing-ground? Obviously in the answer to this question is contained the Apostle's motive for writing.

4. And as obviously, this answer is not to be found within the limits of the Epistle itself. For no such complete setting forth of Christian doctrine is found in it, as might be referred to in such terms: only a continual reminding, an ἐπιμαρτυρία, a bearing testimony to something previously known, received, and stood in, with such expressions as εἰδότες ὅτι, and such assertions as ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπάτε, and frequent repetitions of ὅτι, and γάρ, as falling back on previously known truths.

5. And this is further shewn by the εἰς ἣν στήτε, referring to a body of doctrinal teaching in which the readers had been grounded. Compare the parallel, which surely is not fortuitous, in 1 Cor. xv. 1: τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν, ὃ καὶ παρελάβετε, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐστήκατε,—and our assurance that such a reference is intended will be further confirmed.

6. But to what body of doctrine does the Apostle refer? Clearly not to one imparted by himself. There is not the remotest hint in the Epistle of his ever having been among the ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι whom he addresses. As clearly again, not to one fortuitously picked up here and there: the allusions are too marked, the terms used throughout the Epistle too definite for this to be the case. It was not merely the

¹ See this ably elucidated by Brückner, in his portion of the Einleitung to De Wette's Handbuch, edn. 2, pp. 2 ff.

Pentecostal message in its simplicity which these readers had received, nor are they to be sought in the earlier and less definite times of Christian teaching,—nor was the object of writing only general edification : there had been a previous building of them up, a general type of Christian doctrine delivered to them : and it was to confirm this mainly that the Apostle writes to them, exhorting them to holy practice, and “stirring up their pure minds by way of remembrance.”

7. It is hardly needful, after what has been already said respecting the churches addressed, to repeat, that this body of Christian teaching I believe to have been that delivered to them by St. Paul and his companions, and still taught among them after his decease by those who had heard him and were watering where he had planted. All the acuteness of such writers as Weiss, who maintain the negative to this, has only the more convinced me that the view is the right and only tenable one.

8. That St. Peter follows out the object not in a spirit dependent on St. Paul's teaching ; that he uses, not the expressions and thoughts of that Apostle, but his own, is no more than we should expect from his standing, and personal characteristics ; and is not for a moment to be adduced as against the view here maintained, that his object was to build up and establish those churches which had been founded and fostered under the Apostle of the Gentiles. This will be further elucidated in the next section.

9. The contents of the Epistle are summarily but lucidly given by Steiger, *Einleitung*, p. 27 ; which he prefaces by this remark : “It is not easy to give a logically arranged table of the contents, in a case where the Writer himself does not lay down an abstract division of his subject with a main and subordinate plan, but goes from one idea to another, not indeed with violent transitions, but still not according to logical connexion, only according to that of the subjects themselves. Besides, the changes are in general so imperceptibly made, that we can hardly tell when we are approaching them.”

10. He then gives the following table :

	ch.	ver.
Address to the elect of the triune God	i.	1, 2.
Preciousness of that mercy of God which has thus		
chosen them to salvation		3—5 ;
manifested even in their temporal trials		6—9.
Salvation of which prophets spoke, and which		
angels desire to look into		10—12.
Therefore, the duty of enduring hope, and of		
holiness in the fear of God		13—17 :
(considering the precious blood paid as the price		
of their ransom)		18—21 ;

	ch.	ver.
and of self-purification (as begotten of God's eternal word)	i.	22—25;
and of growth in the Truth	ii.	1—3;
and of building up on Christ as a spiritual priesthood		4, 5 :
Who is to the faithful precious, but to the disobedient a stone of stumbling		6—10.
The duty of pure conversation among the heathen		11, 12 ;
. of obedience to authorities		13—17 ;
. to masters, even when innocently suffering at their hands		18—20
(for such is the calling of those, for whom Christ suffered innocently)		21—25
. to husbands	iii.	1—6.
(reciprocal duty of husbands)		7
. of all, to one another, being kind and gentle ; and even to enemies		8—17 :
for Christ so suffered and so lives, for the living and the dead		18—20 :
and through His Resurrection and exaltation saves us by Baptism		20—22.
Thus then die to sin and live to God, for Christ is ready to judge all	iv.	1—7 :
watching, edifying one another, and glorifying God		8—11 :
submitting to trial as the proof of your participation in Christ's sufferings		12—19.
Elders, tend His flock, for His sake	v.	1—4 :
younger, be subject : all, be humble		5, 6 :
full of trust : watchful : resisting the devil		7—9 :
and may He who has graciously called you, after short suffering, strengthen and bless you		10, 11.
The bearer and aim of the Epistle : salutations ; concluding blessing		12—14.

SECTION VI.

CHARACTER AND STYLE.

1. Some Commentators² who have impugned the genuineness of our

² e. g., Schwegler and De Wette.

Epistle, have objected to it a want of distinctive character, and have alleged that it is less the work of an individual mind than a series of compilations from the work of others, mainly St. Paul and St. James.

2. This however has been distinctly, and as it seems to me successfully denied by others, and especially by Weiss in his work on the Epistle. It is hardly possible for an unprejudiced person to help tracing in the character of it marks of individuality, and a peculiar type of apprehension of Christian doctrine. That St. Peter was well acquainted with St. Paul's teaching is certain, not from this Epistle only, but from the latter Apostle's own declaration in Gal. ii. 2, where he says, ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ κηρύσσω ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσιν, of whom St. Peter certainly was one. That he had seen, and was familiar with, many of St. Paul's Epistles, is equally undeniable³. The coincidences in peculiar expression and sequence of thoughts are too marked to be accounted for by any participation in common forms of teaching and thinking, even had this latter been the case, which it was not. The coincidences now before us are of an entirely different nature from those in the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the exception perhaps of that one where an O. T. citation is apparently taken from the Epistle to the Romans.

3. If we seek for tokens of individual character and independence, we shall find them at every turn. Such are, for instance, the designation of the whole Christian revelation as χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, and treatment of it as such, which prevails throughout the Epistle. Cf. ch. i. 3, where it is described as the power of regeneration : i. 10, where it is the salvation promised by the prophets : ii. 19, where it breaks forth even in sufferings : iv. 10, where it is distributed in spiritual gifts : v. 10, where it is the pledge of continued divine help : iii. 7, where it is itself the inheritance of life : i. 13, where it is the material of the revelation of Christ at His coming. And connected with this same, is the way in which 1) *God's acts of grace* are ever brought forward : e. g. i. 20, His fore-ordination of Christ : v. 10, i. 15, ii. 9, His call of His people : i. 3, 23, His new-begetting of them by His word through Christ's Resurrection : iv. 14, the resting of His Spirit on them : iv. 11,

³ Tables of parallel passages will be found in Huther and Davidson. Brückner also, in his edition of De Wette, has discussed the usually alleged instances of dependency on St. Paul : and Weiss, in his fifth part, "Petrus und Paulus." The following are a few of the most remarkable : The address, as compared with that of Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., &c. : ch. i. 5, with Gal. iii. 23 : i. 21, with Rom. iv. 24 : ii. 1, with Col. iii. 8 (James i. 21) : ii. 6, with Rom. ix. 33 (x. 11) : ii. 13, 14, with Rom. xiii. 1—4 : ii. 16, with Gal. v. 13 : ii. 18, with Eph. vi. 5, Col. iii. 22 : ii. 21, with Rom. vi. 18 : iii. 1 ff., with Eph. v. 22, 1 Tim. ii. 9, 1 Thess. iv. 4 : iii. 8, 9, with Rom. xii. 10 ff. : iii. 22, with Rom. viii. 34, Eph. i. 21, 22 : iv. 1, 2, with Rom. vi. 7 : iv. 10, 11, with Rom. xii. 6—8 : v. 1, with Rom. viii. 18 : v. 8, with 1 Thess. v. 6 : v. 10, 11, with Heb. xiii. 20, 21) Phil. iv. 19, 20 : v. 14, with Rom. xvi. 16, 1 Cor. xvi. 20, 1 Thess. v. 26.

i. 5, v. 6, 10, His care for them in ministering strength to them, and guarding them by His power to salvation : and 2) *the connexion between God and His people* insisted on : e. g., ii. 9, 10 : iv. 17, v. 2, generally : iii. 21, where Baptism is *ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν* ; ii. 19, where *συνείδησις θεοῦ*, an expression no where else found, is a motive for enduring sufferings : iv. 11, where His glory is the ultimate motive of Christian action.

4. And in accordance with this constant setting forth of the reciprocal relation of God and His people, we find our Blessed Lord ever introduced as the *Mediator* : e. g. of things objective, as i. 3, of Regeneration ; iii. 21, of Baptism : of things subjective, as i. 21, of faith and hope ; ii. 5, of acceptable works for God ; iv. 11, of the power to glorify God. The central point of this mediatorial work is His Resurrection, i. 3, iii. 21 ; in subordination to which the other facts of Redemption are introduced, even where they occur without any necessary reference to it, as e. g., i. 11, 19—21 ; iii. 18 ; ii. 24, 25. And those particulars of Christ's agency are principally brought forward, which are connected with the Resurrection : e. g., His preaching to the imprisoned spirits, iii. 19 ff. ; His Ascension, iii. 22 ; His lordship over His people, ii. 25 ; His future Revelation, i. 7, 13, and that with judgment, iv. 5. Every where it is less the historical Christ, than the exalted Christ of the present and of the future, that is before the Apostle ; the Eternal One, i. 11 ; ii. 25. Even where His sufferings are mentioned, it is ever *χριστός* or *ὁ χριστός* : not so much the humiliated One, as the glorified and anointed One of God, ii. 21 ; iii. 18 f. ; iv. 1, 13. And this, partly because their present belief on Him, not their past experience or knowledge of Him, is that which is emphasized, i. 8 ; partly for the reason next to be noticed.

5. Another original and peculiar feature of our Epistle is, its constant reference and forward look to the *future*. This has been indeed by some exaggerated : as, e. g., Mayerhoff. Huther and Luthardt (Das Johan. Evang. p. 110) have considered *hope* as the central idea and subject of the Epistle : and Weiss adopts for St. Peter the title of *the Apostle of hope*. But the fact itself is not to be denied. Wherever we consult the Epistle, it is always the future to which the exhortations point : whether we regard the sufferings of Christ Himself, as pointing on to future glory, i. 11 ; iv. 13 ; or those of His followers, i. 6, 7, 9. Salvation itself is *τὸ τέλος τῆς πίστεως*, i. 9 ; is the object of living (i. 3) and certain (i. 13) hope, i. 3, 13, 21 ; iii. 15. The same expectation appears as expressed in *τιμὴ*, ii. 7 ; *ζωή*, iii. 10 (cf. i. 3) ; *δόξα*, v. 4, 10 : and as a constantly present motive, ii. 2 ; v. 4. The nearness of this future blessedness throws the present life into the background, so that God's people are *πάροικοι* and *παρεπίδημοι*, i. 1, 17 ; ii. 11. This

is ever before the Apostle; both in reference to his readers, iv. 13, and to himself, v. 1.

6. Brückner, from whom in the main the foregoing remarks have been adopted, and who goes much further into detail in following out the same, lays stress on several interesting points of individual peculiarity, even where the modes of speech of St. Paul appear to be adopted by St. Peter; e. g., in the comparison of our ch. ii. 24 with Rom. vi. 8—14, where St. Paul's *ζῆν τῷ θεῷ* would have been equally available for St. Peter, who uses *ζῆν τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ*, which on account of the close comparison with Christ in St. Paul, would not have been so apposite for him: where again the *ἀποθνήσκειν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ* of St. Paul is not adopted by St. Peter, though quite as well adapted to his purpose as *ἀπογίνεσθαι τῇ ἁμ.*, which he has used. In St. Paul, the death to sin is more a consequence of our union with Christ: in St. Peter, of Christ's having done away sin. The latter, as in other places, approaches nearer to St. John's form of thought and diction.

7. He shews the same with regard to the idea of the Christian *calling of God*: to that of *ἐλπίς*; of *ὑπακοή*; of Christian liberty, as in the one Apostle (Gal. v. 13) the *ἀφορμή*, in the other the *ἐπικάλυμμα* of sin (ch. ii. 16), and besides found in James i. 25, ii. 12, and in John viii. 36: to that of the *χαρίσματα*; of the Christian reward; and several other cases which at first sight seem alike. In all these there is reason to believe that our Apostle, though speaking sometimes exceedingly like St. Paul and possibly from reminiscence of his Epistles, yet drew from another fountain within himself, and had a treasure of spiritual knowledge and holy inspiration distinct from that of St. Paul, incorporated with his own individual habits of thought.

8. And this is confirmed by observing, that it is not with St. Paul only that such affinities are found, but as before observed, with St. John, and with other of the N. T. writers⁴: and by seeing, that in many expressions St. Peter stands quite alone⁵. Add to which, that in several glimpses, which in the course of treatment of other subjects he gives us, of things mysterious and unknown, we evidently see that such

⁴ Compare ch. i. 23 with 1 John iii. 9: i. 22 (ii. 2) with 1 John iii. 3: ii. 24 with 1 John iii. 7: iii. 13 with 3 John 11: v. 2 with John x. 16: iii. 18 with 1 John ii. 1, iii. 7: i. 19 with John i. 29: iv. 2 with 1 John ii. 16 f.: ii. 24 with Heb. ix. 28, 1 John iii. 5: i. 2 with Heb. xii. 24: v. 4 with Heb. xiii. 20: iii. 18 (*ἄπαξ*) with Heb. ix. 28: ii. 5 with Heb. xiii. 15. In almost all of the supposed imitations of St. James, O. T. citations are the material which forms ground common to both Apostles. This is the case with i. 6 f. compared with James i. 2: i. 24 with James i. 10: v. 5 with James iv. 6, 10: iv. 8 with James v. 20.

⁵ As, e. g., *πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρ*. ch. iii. 22: *φίλημα ἀγάπης*, v. 14: *συνείδησις θεοῦ*, ii. 19: *ἐλπίς ζωῆς*, i. 3: *κληρονομία ἁθαρτος ἁμικτος ἁμάραντος*, ib. 4. See a copious list given in Davidson, p. 386.

revelations come from a storehouse of divine knowledge, which could reveal much more, had it seemed good to Him by whom the hand and thoughts of the Apostle were guided ⁶.

9. As regards the *style* of our Epistle it has an unmistakeable and distinctive character of its own ⁷, arising very much from the mixed nature of the contents, and the fervid and at the same time practical rather than dialectical spirit of its Writer. There is in it no logical inference, properly so called: no evolving of one thought from another. The word *οὖν* occurs only in connexion with imperatives introducing practical inference: *οὕτω* and *διότι* only as substantiating motives to Christian practice by Scripture citation or by sacred facts: *γάρ* mostly in similar connexions. The link between one idea and another is found not in any progress of unfolding thought or argument, but in the last word of the foregoing sentence, which is taken up and followed out in the new one ⁸.

10. It has been noticed that the same thought is often repeated again and in nearly the same words ⁹. This is consistent with the fervid and earnest spirit of the Apostle: which however, as might be expected from what we know of him, was chastened by a sense of his own weakness and need of divine upholding grace. There is no Epistle in the sacred Canon, the language and spirit of which come more directly home to the personal trials and wants and weaknesses of the Christian life. Its affectionate warnings and strong consolation have ever been treasured up close to the hearts of the weary and heavy-laden but onward-pressing servants of God. The mind of our Father towards us, the aspect of our Blessed Lord as presented to us, the preparation by sufferings for our heavenly inheritance, all these as here set forth, are peculiarly lovely and encouraging.

⁶ See ch. i. 10, 11; iii. 19, 21; iv. 6, 17; v. 1, 8.

⁷ The similarity between the diction of the Epistle and St. Peter's recorded speeches in the Acts, has been often noticed. Compare 1 Pet. ii. 7 with Acts iv. 11: i. 12 with Acts v. 32: ii. 24 with Acts v. 30, x. 39: v. 1 with Acts ii. 32, iii. 15: i. 10 with Acts iii. 18, x. 43: i. 21 with Acts iii. 15, x. 40: iv. 5 with Acts x. 42: i. 21 with Acts iii. 16: ii. 24 with Acts iii. 19, 26. In connexion of sentence with sentence also (see below, par. 10) there is great similarity: cf. Acts iii. 21, *χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, δὲ δεῖ . . . πάντων, ὅν ἐλάλησεν . . .* besides the same spirit, and view of the Gospel facts and announcements, being manifest throughout. Compare e.g. the summary of that part of his first speech which is not recorded,—*σάθετε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης*, Acts ii. 40, with the frequent exhortations in our Epistle to separation from the heathen world.

⁸ See, e.g., ch. i. ver. 4, *ὕμᾱς . . .*, ver. 5, *τοὺς . . .*: ver. 5, *καὶ ὥς ἐσχάτω . . .*, ver. 6, *ἐν ᾧ . . .*: ver. 7, *Ἰησ. χριστοῦ . . .*, ver. 8, *δὲν . . .*: ver. 9, *σωτηρίαν . . .*, ver. 10, *περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας . . .*: ver. 10, *προφητῶν . . .*, ver. 12, *οἷς ἀπεκαλύφθη: &c., &c.* And so we might proceed through the Epistle.

⁹ Compare ch. iii. 1 with iii. 16, and with ii. 12: iv. 3 with i. 14 and ii. 11: iv. 12 with i. 6—9: iv. 14 with iii. 14, 17, and with ii. 20: v. 8, with iv. 7, and with i. 13.

And the motives to holy purity spring direct out of the simple and childlike recognition of the will of our Heavenly Father to bring us to His glory.

11. All who have worthily commented on the Epistle have spoken in similar strains of its character and style. “*Mirabilis est gravitas et alacritas Petrini sermonis, lectorem suavissime retinens,*” says Bengel. “*Habet hæc Epistola τὸ σφοδρὸν conveniens ingenio principis Apostolorum,*” says Grotius. And Erasmus calls it “*Epistolam profecto dignam Apostolorum principe, plenam auctoritatis et dignitatis apostolicæ, verbis parcam, sententiis differtam, &c.*” And recently Wiesinger sums up thus his characteristic of the Epistle: “Certainly, it entirely agrees in tone and feeling with what we have before said of the character of the Apostle. His warm self-devotion to the Lord, his practical piety and his active disposition, are all reflected in it. How full is his heart of the hope of the revelation of the Lord! With what earnestness does he exhort his readers to lift their eyes above the sufferings of the present to this future glory, and in hope of it to stand firm against all temptation! He who in loving impatience cast himself into the sea to meet the Lord, is also the man who most earnestly testifies to the hope of His return:—he who dated his own faith from the sufferings of his Master, is never weary in holding up the suffering form of the Lord before the eyes of his readers to comfort and stimulate them:—he before whom the death of a martyr is in assured expectation, is the man who most thoroughly, and in the greatest variety of aspects, sets forth the duty and the power, as well as the consolation, of suffering for Christ. If we had not known from whom the Epistle comes, we must have said, It must be a Rock of the church (ein Felsenmann) who thus writes: a man whose own soul rests on the living Rock, and who here, with the strength of his testimony, takes in hand to secure the souls of others, and against the harassing storm of present tribulation to ground them on the true Rock of ages¹.” The whole may be summed up by saying, that the entire Epistle is the following out of our Lord’s command to its Writer, καὶ σὺ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέψας στήριξον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου².

¹ Einl. p. 18.

² I cannot forbear, as caring above all for the spiritual life in God of the students of His holy word, recommending to them most strongly the commentary of our own Archbishop Leighton, as a devotional subsidiary to their critical and exegetical studies of this Epistle. To the mere scholar, it may not present much matter of interest; but to one who wishes that the mind of God’s Spirit, speaking in the Apostle, may live and grow within his own breast, no writer on Scripture that I know furnishes a more valuable help than Leighton.

It will be observed that I have throughout this chapter abstained from introducing considerations and comparisons of the Second Epistle of St. Peter. I have done this, because I wished to keep the first Epistle clear of all the doubt and difficulty which surround the treatment of the other, which I have reserved entire for the following chapter.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SECOND EPISTLE GENERAL OF PETER.

SECTION I.

OBJECT, CONTENTS, AND OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

1. I THINK it best to approach the difficult question of the genuineness of this Epistle, by a consideration of the internal characteristics of the writing itself.

2. Its general object is no where so distinctly declared, as that of 1 Pet. in v. 12 (ch. iii. 1, 2 being *special*). But the two concluding verses contain in them the double aim which has been apparent through the whole. In iii. 17 we read, *προγινώσκοντες φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα μὴ τῶν ἀθέσμων πλάνῃ συναπαχθέντες ἐκπέσητε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ*, and in iii. 18, *αὐξάνετε δὲ ἐν χάριτι καὶ γνώσει τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*. These two, the prohibitory and the hortatory, are the objects of the Epistle. The former is the introduction to the latter, which, as might be expected, is the main and ultimate aim.

3. And this ultimate aim is apparent from the very beginning. Ch. i. 1—11 is devoted to fervent enforcing of it. Then i. 12—21, laying down the grounds on which the *γνώσις* rests, viz. apostolic testimony and prophetic announcement, forms a transition to the description, ch. ii., of the false prophets and teachers who were even then coming in, and should wax onward in activity and influence. Then in ch. iii., the further error of false teachers in scorning and disbelieving the promise of the coming of the Lord is stigmatized and refuted, and the Epistle concludes with a general reference to the Epistles of St. Paul, as teaching these same truths, and as being perverted like the other Scriptures by the ignorant and unstable.

Throughout all, one purpose and one spirit is manifest. The *ἐπίγνωσις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησ. χρ.* is ever the condition of salvation (ch. i. 8 ; ii. 20 ; iii. 18). Sometimes we have it on the side of know-

ledge of the Father who hath called us (i. 2, 3), sometimes on that of knowledge of the gospel as the way of righteousness (ii. 21 : cf. ii. 2). This ἐπίγνωσις is the central point of the Christian life, both theoretically and practically considered : it is the vehicle of the divine agency in us, and so of our highest participation of God (i. 3, 4) : it is the means of escape from the pollutions of the world (ii. 20),—the crowning point of Christian virtues (i. 8),—the means of access into Christ's kingdom (i. 11).

And the side of our Lord's own Person and Office on which attention is fixed is not so much His historical life, as His δύναμις and ἐξουσία in His exalted state of triumph (i. 16). The promises which are introduced refer to His second coming and kingdom (i. 4 ; iii. 4, 13).

4. And in this peculiar setting forth of the Christian life must we look for the necessary bringing out of the dangers of seduction by false teachers, and the placing of this knowledge and these promises over against it. The ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι (ii. 1 ; ἄθεσμοι, iii. 17) are described partly theoretically, as denying the lordship of our glorified Saviour which He has won by Redemption (ii. 1, contrasted with δύναμις, i. 16), and His promise of coming again (iii. 1 ff., contrasted with παρουσία, i. 16),—partly practically,—as slandering God's way of righteousness (ii. 2) and His majesty (ii. 10 ff.),—as disgracing their profession of Christian freedom (ii. 19),—as degraded by a vicious life (ii. 13),—full of lust and covetousness (ii. 14),—speaking swelling words (ii. 18), deserters of the right way (ii. 15 f.), traitors (ii. 17), seducing the unstable (ii. 14, 18),—the objects of God's inevitable judgment (ii. 3—9, 17),—preparing destruction for themselves (ii. 12, 19), and the more so, because their guilt is increased by the sin of apostasy (ii. 20—22).

5. In strong contrast and counterpoise against both sides of this heretical error stands their ἐπίγνωσις : against the former of them, in its theoretical aspect, as the right knowledge of the power and coming of Christ (i. 16 : see above) : against the latter, in its practical, as insight into the ὁδὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης. This latter contrast is ever brought up in the description of the false teachers in ch. ii. Noah, as δικαιοσύνης κήρυξ, is excepted from the judgment of the Flood (ii. 5) : Lot, as δίκαιος, from that on Sodom (ii. 7, 8) : God knows how to punish the ἀδίκους, and rescue the εἰσεβείς (ii. 9) : the heretics are described as having left the εὐθεΐαν ὁδόν (ii. 15), and the example of Balaam applied to them (ii. 15, 16). And accordingly it is the ἐπίγνωσις Ἰησοῦ χρ. which is to preserve the readers from φθορά (i. 4 ; cf. ii. 12), and from falling away (i. 10).

6. This main subject of the Epistle, which not only occasions the minute depiction of the adversaries, but also keeps together the whole, is, notwithstanding the parenthetical allusions and polemical digres-

sions, in close coherence. The later portions are all based on the earlier. Thus ch. i. 16 ff. is the foundation of ii. 1 ff., iii. 1 ff.: thus the conclusion is in intimate connexion with the opening, the same union of (ἐπί)γνωσις, χάρις, and εἰρήνη being found in both (i. 2; iii. 14, 18): thus the *ἵνα μὴ ἐκπέσῃτε τοῦ ἰδίου στηριγμοῦ*, iii. 17, refers back to i. 10, 12: thus the conditioning clause, *ἀποφυγόντες . . . φθορὰς*, i. 4, is remembered in the warning *φυλάσσεσθε . . . συναπαχθέντες*, iii. 17; and the more detailed exhortation of i. 5—8 is compressed together in the shorter *αἰξάνετε δὲ κ.τ.λ.* of iii. 18. Thus also the qualifying *ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ* of ch. i. 1 is borne in mind in ii. 21 and iii. 13. So again, iii. 1 takes up again i. 13, and the *ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγίων προφητῶν* of iii. 2 refers back to i. 19. In fact, the contents of this short Epistle are bound together by the closest and most intimate connexion and coherence.

7. The above notices will make sufficiently plain the occasion of the Epistle. It was, the prompting of a holy desire to build up and confirm the readers, in especial reference to certain destructive forms of error in doctrine and practice which were then appearing and would continue to wax onward.

8. If we seek to fix historically the heretics here marked out, we find the same difficulty as ever besets similar enquiries in the apostolic Epistles. They are rather the germs of heresies that are described, than the heresies themselves as known to us in their ripeness afterwards. These germs ever found their first expansion in the denial of those distinctive doctrines of the Gospel which most closely involve Christian practice and ensure Christian watchfulness. First came the loosening of the bands which constrained man by the love of Christ and waiting for Him; then, when true liberty was lost, followed the bondage of fanciful theological systems and self-imposed creeds. The living God-man vanished first out of the field of love and hope and obedience, and then His place was taken by the great Tempter and leader captive of souls.

9. So that when we enquire to which known class of subsequent heretics the description in our Epistle applies,—whether to the Carpocratians as Grotius believed, or to the Sadducees, as Bertholdt, or to the Gnostics, or Nicolaitans, as others, the reply in each case must be, that we cannot identify any of these precisely with those here described: that the delineation is both too wide and too narrow for each in succession: but that (and it is an important result for the question of the date of our Epistle) we are here standing at a point higher up than any of these definite names of sects: during the great moral ferment of the first fatal apostasy, which afterwards distributed itself into various divisions and sects.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. The readers are no where expressly defined. By ch. iii. 1, it would appear that they are identical with at all events a portion of those to whom the first Epistle was addressed. And to this the ἐκάστοτε of ch. i. 15, "on each occasion which offers," seems also to point: besides appearing to refer to some previous personal connexion of the Writer with his readers. This latter has frequently been assumed from ch. i. 16: but without necessity; see note there. All that is there assumed is that which is also stated in ch. i. 1, the delivery of the truths and faith of the Gospel to them by competent eye-witnesses, of whom the Writer (in office, but not necessarily in connexion with themselves) had been one.

2. The address, ch. i. 1, is more general than that of the first Epistle: the words of warning and exhortation are for all who bore the Christian name. The dangers described were imminent throughout the then Christian world. And the expressions, whether of praise and encouragement, or of caution, must be taken as generally applicable to all believers in Christ, rather than as descriptive of the peculiar situation of any circle of churches at any one time.

3. Of necessity, the same general view must not be taken of the enemies of the faith here depicted. The city of God, with its bulwarks and towers, is ever the same: this was a special attack beginning to be made on it by a body of foes of a special character. The firmness and watchfulness which seem to be predicated of the readers (ch. i. 12, iii. 17, i. 19) are rather assumptions, certain to be true of true believers, than statements of objective matter of fact: whereas the depravities and errors of the heretics, as far as spoken of in the present, were things actually occurring under the Apostle's notice. This must be borne in mind, or we shall be liable to go wrong in our inference respecting those addressed.

4. On the other hand it must be borne in mind, that the Apostle's field of view, as he looked over the church, would naturally be bounded by the lines which marked out the cycle of his own observation: that those to whom he had before written would be on this second occasion nearest to his thoughts: and by consequence, that when he seems to address these readers as in the main identical with those, this inference must not be carried too far, but allowance made for the margin which may fairly be granted to each Epistle: for expanding the apparent limited character of the former address towards that more general reference which was sure to have been in the Apostle's mind: and for

contracting the very wide address of this one merely by believing that in writing he would fix his thoughts on those whom he knew and especially cared for.

5. If it be said, as it has been, that we find no trace in the former Epistle of the peculiar kind of adversaries of the faith of whom so much is here said, and on the other hand nothing in this Epistle of the persecutions, which bore so considerable a part in the matters treated in the former one: the answer to both these is exceedingly easy. A very short time would suffice for the springing up, or for the becoming formidable, of these deadly forms of error. As the Apostles were one by one removed by death, on the one hand their personal influence in checking evil tendencies was withdrawn, on the other that coming of Christ, of which they had once confidently spoken as to be in their own time, became in danger of being disbelieved. This would be a sufficient reason for the one supposed difficulty: and as regards the other, it is quite answer enough to say, that this second Epistle being written on a special occasion and for a special object, is, as we have seen, coherently and consistently devoted to that object, and does not, in its course, travel out of its way to speak of things with which the first Epistle was concerned. It is obvious that, supposing the two to have been written by the same person, he is not likely to have dwelt again in his second letter on things already brought forward in his first.

6. Besides, it has been not unjustly thought that we *can* discover traces in our Epistle of the same characteristics as those which marked the readers of the former one, or of others which would be probably subsequent to them. We have there the caution to take care that none of them suffer as an evil doer, *φονεύς, κλέπτης, κακοποιός, ἀλλοτριο-επίσκοπος* (iv. 15); which seems to contain in it the seed of that further development of evil among Christians, which we find actual in this Epistle. Again, the neglect of the caution there, *ἀναζωσάμενοι τὰς ὀσφύας τῆς διανοίας ὑμῶν, νήφοντες, τελείως ἐλπίζατε ἐπὶ τὴν φερομένην ὑμῖν χάριν ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰ. χ.* (i. 13), would lead exactly to the dissolute lives here described of those who had ceased to hope for His coming. There is close connexion between 1 Pet. ii. 16, *ὡς ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐπικάλυμμα ἔχοντες τῆς κακίας τὴν ἐλευθερίαν . . .* and 2 Pet. ii. 19, *ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς ἐπαγγελλόμενοι, αὐτοὶ δοῦλοι ὑπάρχοντες τῆς φθορᾶς*: between the cautions there given against pride (v. 5—7), and the *ὑπέρογκα ματαιότητος φθειρόμενοι* of our ch. ii. 18. And the same analogies might be carried yet further, shewing that from the circumstances of the readers which respectively underlie the one and the other Epistle, this may well have been a sequel to, and consequent on, the former.

SECTION III.

ON THE RELATION BETWEEN THIS EPISTLE AND THAT OF JUDE.

1. It is well known that, besides various scattered resemblances, a long passage occurs, included in the limits Jude vv. 3—19, 2 Peter ii. 1—19, describing in both cases the heretical enemies of the Gospel, couched in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. If considerations of human probability are here as every where else to be introduced into our estimate of the Sacred Writings, then either one saw and used the text of the other, or both drew from a common document or a common source of oral apostolic teaching.

2. Setting aside the supposition of a common documentary source, as not answering to the curious phænomena of concurrence and divergence, no one can say that the latter alternative *may not* have been the case : that a portion of oral teaching spoken originally in the power of the Spirit, may not, in its reproduction, have become deflected as we here see. Were the case in strict analogy with that of the three Gospels, we should have no hesitation in adopting this hypothesis. But the cases are not similar. For we have first to add to the phænomena of this passage the remarkable coincidences elsewhere, where no such common portion of teaching could have been concerned : and then to observe, that the coincidences and divergences in the passage itself do not entirely bear out the hypothesis. There is an intent and consistent purpose plainly visible in them, which is altogether absent, unless the wildest fancies be allowed to come into play, from the common text of passages in the three Gospels.

3. We have then to fall back on the supposition, that one of the Sacred Writers saw and used the text of the other. And if this is to be so, there can be but little hesitation in answering the enquiry, on which side the preference lies as to priority and originality. The grounds of that answer have indeed been amplified and exaggerated, beyond what we can fairly concede : but still in the main they are irrefragable. We cannot see, with De Wette and others, that St. Peter is less fresh or individual in his expressions and turns of thought than St. Jude : but, conceding to both Writers originality and individuality of thought, it is then for us to ascertain by inspection, which text bears the air of being the free outflow of the first thought, which the working up of the other for a purpose slightly differing.

4. The portion of the common matter which will best serve us for this purpose is that in which the traditional and historical examples are adduced, 2 Pet. ii. 1—16, Jude 4—11. In this passage, the object of St. Jude is to set forth the ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ. ἀρνούμενοι.

The persons described by St. Peter are not the same, in however many common points the characters coincide. With him they are *ψευδο-διδάσκαλοι*, answering to the *ψευδοπροφήται ἐν τῷ λαῷ* of old: like the others, they are described as *τὸν (ἀγοράσαντα αὐτοὺς) δεσπότην ἀρνούμενοι*, with the two words in brackets characteristically inserted. In Peter (ii. 1) we have merely a reminiscence of the first historical notice in Jude (ver. 5), consisting in his specifying the false *teachers* as answering to the false *prophets ἐν τῷ λαῷ*, as contrasted with the true ones of whom he has been speaking (i. 19—21). It was not to his purpose to mention the destruction of the *unbelieving* (Jude 5), and therefore he slightly passes this example with a mere allusion. I submit that this will not bear the converse hypothesis: that the weighty and pregnant sentence in St. Jude could not be the result of the passing hint *ἐν τῷ λαῷ* of St. Peter, nor can that hint be accounted for except as a reminiscence of St. Jude.

5. Passing to the next example, that of the sinning angels, we find the same even more strikingly exemplified. St. Jude is writing of apostates, and sets forth their fate by that of the angels, *τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ ἀπολιπόντας τὸ ἴδιον οἰκητήριον*: in allusion (see note there) to Gen. vi. 2, their going after strange flesh, a sin after the manner of which (*τὸν ὅμοιον τρόπον τούτοις*) Sodom and Gomorrah also sinned in after time (Jude 6, note). This special notice, so apposite to St. Jude's subject, is contracted in St. Peter into the mere mention of *ἀγγέλων ἀμαρτησάντων*. Here it is most natural to suppose, that the special notice preceded the general.

6. The next example in St. Peter is one exactly to the point for which he is adducing the whole series, viz., to shew God's power both to punish and to deliver, but, on one side at least, inapposite to St. Jude's purpose. It is found in St. Peter alone. But the reason why I adduce it here is, to remark, that, had St. Peter's been the original, St. Jude would have hardly failed to insert in his examples that portion of this one which so exactly tallied with his purpose, *ἀρχαίον κόσμον οὐκ ἐφείσατο, . . . κατακλυσμὸν κόσμῳ ἀσεβῶν ἐπάξας*.

7. The next example, that of Sodom and Gomorrah, is found in St. Jude in strict connexion and analogy with that which has immediately preceded it, viz. that of the angels. This connexion is broken in St. Peter, no such particular as that on which it depends being found in his mention of the angels' sin. These cities are adduced only as an example to the *μέλλοντες ἀσεβεῖν*, and, which is again noteworthy, the mention of the rescue of Lot is appended, conformably with that which we remarked in the preceding paragraph.

8. It is further to be noticed with respect to this same example, that St. Jude describes the cities as *δείγμα πύρὸς αἰωνίου δίκην ὑπέχουσai*, whereas St. Peter has resolved this, which might seem to imply the

eternity of the fire which consumed those cities, into a fuller and historical account, retaining the feature of their being a warning to the impious : *τεφρώσας καταστροφῇ κατέκρινεν, ὑπόδειγμα μελλόντων ἀσεβείν τεθεικώς*. Here again I submit that the converse hypothesis is inconceivable.

9. Again, in the description which follows in St. Peter (ver. 9), we have a characteristic continuation of his main subject, the rescue of the righteous united with the punishment of the wicked, and then, with a *μάλιστα* δέ, he returns to the particular characters here under description, and takes up the two traits which form the main subject in St. Jude, ver. 8 ; so that we have the original *ὁμοίως μέντοι καὶ οὗτοι ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι σάρκα μὲν μαιίνουσιν, κυριότητα δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν* replaced by *μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκὸς ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ μiasμοῦ πορευομένους καὶ κυριότητος καταφρονούντας. τολμηταί, αὐθαδεῖς, δόξας οὐ τρέμουσιν βλασφημοῦντες* : where again I submit that none can doubt for a moment which sacred Writer preceded the other.

10. The next example even more strikingly shews the same. St. Jude cites at length from some apocryphal book, probably that called the *ἀνάληψις* or *ἀνάβασις Μωυσέως* (see Origen de Principiis iii. 2. 1, vol. i. p. 138), an instance of the different conduct of mighty angels in contending with God's adversaries. St. Peter (ver. 11) merely asserts generally that such is the conduct of mighty angels, but gives no hint of an allusion to the fact on which the general assertion is based ; nor does the great Adversary appear in his sentence, but in his stead are substituted these heretics themselves ; *οπου ἄγγελοι ἰσχύι καὶ δυνάμει μεῖζονες ὄντες οὐ φέρουσιν κατ' αὐτῶν βλάσφημον κρίσιν*. This, standing as it does thus by itself, would constitute, were it not for the original in St. Jude being extant, the most enigmatical sentence in the N. T.

11. I shall not treat at length every separate verse, but shall only remark, that as we pass on through 2 Pet. ii. 12 ff., while this view of the priority of St. Jude is at every step confirmed, we derive some interesting notices of the way in which the passage in our Epistle has been composed : viz. by the Apostle having in his thoughts the passage in St. Jude, and adapting such portions of it as the Spirit guided him to see fit, taking sometimes the mere sound of St. Jude's words to express a different thought, sometimes, as we saw above, contracting and omitting, sometimes expanding and inserting, as suited his purpose. Thus while in St. Jude we have the comparison *ὡς τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα* simply introduced with reference to certain things which the persons under description know naturally (*φυσικῶς*) and use corruptly, in St. Peter it is the heretics themselves who are *ὡς ἄλογα ζῶα*, the additional point of comparison is introduced, that they are *γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν κ. φθοράν*, and the *φθείρονται* of St. Jude is made to serve a very different purpose,—*ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ φθαρήσονται*. So in 2 Pet. ii. 13, in the reminiscence of the passage, *σπίλαδες* of Jude 12 becomes *σπίλοι κ.*

μῶμοι,—ἐν ταῖς ἀγάπαις ἡμῶν of St. Jude becomes ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν. So in 2 Pet. ii. 17, we have somewhat similar figures to those in Jude 13, but whereas originally it was “waves of the sea foaming out their own shame,” and ἀστέρες πλανῆται οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους εἰς αἰῶνα τετήρηται, in the latter text it becomes, more suitably to St. Peter’s purpose of depicting false *teachers*, “wells without water,” and ὁμίχλαι ὑπὸ λαίλαπος ἐλανόμεναι, οἷς ὁ ζόφος τοῦ σκότους τετήρηται.

12. In ver. 11, St. Jude, fervidly borne along in his impassioned invective, collects together three instances of O. T. transgressors, to all of whom he compares those whom he is stigmatizing. They were murderers like Cain, covetous like Balaam, rebellious like Korah. But out of these St. Peter, dealing with *false teachers*, whom he is comparing with the *false prophets* of old, selects Balaam only, and goes at length (vv. 15, 16) into his sin and his rebuke. Can any one persuade us that in the impetuous whirlwind of St. Jude’s invective he adopted and abridged the example furnished by St. Peter, prefixing and adding those of Cain and Korah?

13. I shall carry the comparison no further, but refer the student to some sources where he will find it elaborately treated. Of these the best worth consulting is Brückner’s Excursus on 2 Pet. ii. in his Edition of De Wette’s Handbook, vol. i. pt. 3, pp. 163—170. There he impartially, and in a critical and scholarly manner, examines the whole question, and while he successfully maintains the priority of St. Jude, and St. Peter’s acquaintance with his Epistle, he sets in a very striking light the independence of our Apostle, and his coherence of purpose and language. The same is done, but less completely, and, unless the fault is in myself, with some little confusion, by Davidson, vol. iii. pp. 399—408. The same again is done very fairly by Huther, in the Anhang to his Commentary on the Epistle. I am sorry I cannot speak with praise of the work of Dietlein, Der zweite Brief Petri, Berlin, 1851, either as regards this, or other parts of the great question regarding our Epistle. It is a book with which I have been much disappointed both in point of scholarship and of logic, and the reader will find many notices of its mistakes scattered through my notes. On this part of the subject he is an unflinching advocate for the priority of St. Peter to St. Jude. The same side is taken by Schmid, Michaelis, Storr, Hengstenberg, Thiersch, Hofmann, and Stier.

SECTION IV.

AUTHENTICITY.

1. As regards the external grounds for or against the authenticity of

this Epistle, we have very various opinions. Dietlein finds traces of its use in the earliest apostolic Fathers; in Polycarp, in Ignatius, in the Epistle of Barnabas, in Clement of Rome. Most of these however are very shadowy and fanciful: some of them even absurd³. The explanation of the coincidence in these cases is generally to be sought in the fact that these writers had the same sources to draw from, in the main, as the Apostle, viz. O. T. prophecy, and the common-places of Christian teaching: and this being so, it would be strange indeed if we did not find such coincidence in insulated words and occasional phrases.

2. A few however of the instances adduced from the Apostolic Fathers are worth notice: not as by any means proving the use by them of this Epistle, but as remarkable in connexion with the question before us. Such are 1) Hermas, iii. *simil.* vi. 4, p. 968, ἀκουε ἀμφοτέρων τὴν δύναμιν, τῆς τρυφῆς κ. τοῦ βασάνου. τῆς τρυφῆς κ. τῆς ἀπάτης ὁ χρόνος ὥρα ἐστὶ μία· τῆς δὲ βασάνου ὥραι τριάκοντα ἡμερῶν δύναμιν ἔχουσαι. ἐὰν οὖν μίαν ἡμέραν τις τρυφήσῃ καὶ ἀπατηθῇ, μίαν δὲ ἡμέραν βασανισθῇ κ.τ.λ., as compared with a) ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν and b) τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τρυφήν, 2 Pet. ii. 13, where see note: 2) Clement of Rome, *ad Cor.* c. 7, p. 225, Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, and c. 9, p. 228, Νῶε πιστὸς εὐρεθεὶς διὰ τῆς λειτουργίας αὐτοῦ παλιγγενεσίαν κόσμῳ ἐκήρυξεν: *ib.* c. 11, p. 232, in speaking of Lot's deliverance out of Sodom, πρόδηλον ποιήσας ὁ δεσπότης, ὅτι τοὺς ἐλπίζοντας ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπει, τοὺς δὲ ἑτεροκλινεῖς ὑπάρχοντας εἰς κόλασιν καὶ αἰκισμὸν τίθησιν; . . . εἰς τὸ γινώσκειν εἶναι πᾶσιν ὅτι οἱ δάψυχοι καὶ οἱ διστάζοντες περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως εἰς κρίμα κ. σημειώσιν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται, as compared with 2 Pet. ii. 5, 9.

3. Neither the Epistle of Barnabas, nor Justin Martyr, nor Theophilus of Antioch, nor Irenæus, can be fairly adduced as citing or alluding to our Epistle. This assertion may surprise the reader who is acquainted with the strong assertions and easy assumptions of Dietlein. But let him take them one by one and examine them strictly and impartially, and he will find them all in succession prove worthless, except as shewing that primitive Christianity had a Greek vocabulary of its own to express its doctrines and convey its exhortations, which the Apostles and their immediate successors used in common. Neither does the ancient fragment known as the canon of Muratori make any mention of our Epistle⁴. Neither does Tertullian, nor Cyprian, nor Clement of Alexandria in any of his extant works.

4. There is a passage in Hippolytus de Antichristo, c. 2, p. 729, which seems to be an amplification of 2 Pet. i. 21;—speaking of οἱ προφηῆται, he says, οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἰδίας δυνάμεως ἐφθέγγοντο, οὐδὲ ἄτερ αὐτοῖ

³ See Brückner, Einleit. pp. 131 ff.

⁴ See the amusing special-pleading by which Dietlein endeavours to convert even this omission to his purpose, Einl. pp. 41—50.

ἐβούλοντο ταῦτα ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν διὰ τοῦ λόγου ἐσοφίζοντο ὀρθῶς, ἔπειτα δι' ὀραμάτων προεδιδάσκοντο τὰ μέλλοντα καλῶς, εἴθ' οὕτω πεπεισμένοι ἔλεγον ταῦτα, ἅπερ αὐτοῖς ἦν μόνοις ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (ἀποκεκαλυμμένα, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς) ἀποκεκρυμμένα. Still, striking as the similarity is, we cannot venture to affirm that the inference is really a sound one, any more than in the case of that place in Theophilus *ad Autolyicum*, l. ii. p. 87, οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι πνευματοφόροι πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ προφητῆται γενόμενοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐμπνευσθέντες κ. σοφισθέντες ἐγένοντο θεοδιδάκτοι.

5. Eusebius, H. E. vi. 14, reports of Clement of Alexandria, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς, ἐπιτετηγμένας πεποιήται διηγήσεις. μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθόν, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τὴν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν. And Cassiodorus, in his *de Instit. divin. præf.*, vol. ii. p. 538, says, "Ferunt itaque scripturas divinas veteris novique Testamenti ab ipso principio usque ad finem Græco sermone declarasse Clementem Alexandrinum." But this testimony seems to be contradicted by another from Cassiodorus, *ib.* c. 8, p. 543;—"In epistolis autem canonicis, Clemens Alexandrinus presbyter, qui et Stromateus dicitur, id est in epistola S. Petri prima, S. Joannis prima et secunda, et Jacobi, quædam Attico sermone declaravit. Ubi multa quidem subtiliter, sed aliqua incaute locutus est, quæ nos ita transferri fecimus in Latinum, ut exclusis quibusdam offendiculis purificata doctrina ejus securior potuisset hauriri. . . . Sed cum de reliquis canonicis epistolis magna nos cogitatio fatigaret, subito nobis codex Didymi Græco stilo conscriptus in expositionem septem canonicarum epistolarum . . . concessus est."

6. The judgment between these conflicting testimonies must apparently be given on the side of Eusebius, and Cassiodorus's first assertion taken literally. For Eusebius mentions expressly the Epistle of Jude, as one of those on which Clement commented, whereas by the last-cited statement of Cassiodorus it is excluded. Still even thus we have no express mention of our Epistle, but can only include it by inference among the ἀντιλεγόμεναι of which Eusebius speaks.

7. The testimony of Origen appears somewhat ambiguous.

Eusebius, H. E. vi. 25, reports it thus : Πέτρος δέ, ἐφ' ᾧ οἰκοδομεῖται ἡ χριστοῦ ἐκκλησία, ἥς πύλαι ᾄδου οὐ κατισχύσουσι, μίαν ἐπιστολὴν ὁμολογουμένως καταλέλειπεν· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν, ἀμφιβάλλεται γάρ⁵.

On the other hand, in those works which are extant only in the Latin version of Rufinus, Origen again and again quotes our Epistle as Scripture : e. g. Hom. vii., on Joshua (cited above, ch. iii. § i. 7),

⁵ Dietlein has made the unscholarlike attempt to infer from this ἔστω δὲ an opinion of Origen as to the genuineness. I need hardly remind the student that the words mean simply nothing more than "and if you will, a second also."

“Petrus enim duabus epistolarum suarum personat tubis :” Hom. iv. on Leviticus (vol. ii. p. 200), “Et iterum Petrus dicit, Consortes, inquit, facti estis divinæ naturæ” [2 Pet. i. 4] : Hom. xiii. on Numbers (vol. ii. p. 321), “Ut ait quodam in loco Scriptura : mutum animal humana voce respondens arguit prophetæ dementiam” [2 Pet. ii. 16].

8. Perhaps the solution of this is to be found, not by supposing that Rufinus interpolated the passages⁶, but by remembering the loose way in which both Origen himself and others were found to cite the Epistle to the Hebrews⁷ : ordinarily, and *currente calamo*, speaking of it as St. Paul’s, but whenever they wrote deliberately, giving expression to their doubts respecting its authorship. We have only to believe that Origen acted similarly with regard to 2 Peter, and the mystery is at once solved.

In Origen’s extant Greek works, it is true, we nowhere find the Epistle quoted. Nay, it is more than once by implication excluded from the number of the Catholic Epistles. Thus in his Comm. on John (tom. vi. 18, vol. iv. p. 135) cited above, ch. iii. § i. 7, he cites 1 Pet. iii. 18—21, as being *ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ* : and in his passage on the Canon, Eus. H. E. vi. 25, *δευτερον δὲ τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ ὃ καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ . . . ὡμολόγησε*⁸.

9. Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, a disciple of Origen (+ 270), certainly alludes to our Epistle, if his words are rightly given in the Latin version in which only we now have them :

“Petrum et Paulum beatos apostolos, . . . qui in epistolis suis hæreticos execrati sunt, et ut eos evitemus monuerunt.” *Ep. ad Cyprian.* § 6 (Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. iii. p. 1159, usually in Cypr. opp. ep. 75).

Nothing is proved here by “*epistolis suis*” as to two Epistles of St. Peter being meant : but by the fact mentioned, this second Epistle must be intended, seeing that it is in this only that heretics are inveighed against by St. Peter.

10. The testimony of Didymus, whose commentary on the Epistle is extant in a Latin version only, is given at the end of his remarks on this Epistle (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. xxxix. p. 1774) :

“Non igitur est ignorandum, hanc Epistolam esse falsatam, quæ, licet publicetur, non tamen in canone est.”

⁶ So Davidson, Introd. iii. p. 413 f.

⁷ See above, ch. i. § i. parr. 17 ff.

⁸ As a specimen of the fairness and scholarship of Dietlein’s book, take the following : “. . . Der nächstliegende Sinn der Worte des Origenes ist also : der unter den sogenannten katholischen Briefen befindliche Brief des Petrus. Ein eigentlicher Gegensatz gegen den Zweiten als nicht katholischen, liegt gar nicht darin : höchstens kann man sagen, er blicke daraus das hervor, daß es nicht ganz ebenso geläufig und unangefochten war, den zweiten Brief unter den sog. katholischen aufzuführen, wie dies beim ersten Statt hatte.”—p. 62.

Here the Latin expressions cause some little uncertainty, and can only be interpreted by conjecturing what they represent in the original Greek. Undue stress has been laid on the “igitur,” as if it were a ratiocinative conclusion from something preceding. But in all probability the sentence was a mere concluding notice, and ran thus, τοῦτο μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀγνωστόν, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστολὴ νεόθενται . . . : the latter word meaning, “is accounted spurious.”

11. Euseb. H. E. iii. 3, says, Πέτρου μὲν οὖν ἐπιστολὴ μία ἡ λεγομένη προτέρα ἀνωμολόγηται ταύτη δὲ καὶ οἱ πάλοι πρεσβύτεροι ὡς ἀναμφιλέκτω ἐν τοῖς σφῶν αὐτῶν κέχρηται συγγράμμασιν τὴν δὲ φερομένην αὐτοῦ δευτέραν οὐκ ἐνδιάθηκον μὲν εἶναι παρελήφμεν, ὅμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανέισα μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἐσπουδάσθη γραφῶν : and afterwards, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν ὀνομαζόμενα Πέτρου, ὧν μίαν μόνην γνησίαν ἔγνω ἐπιστολήν, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πάλοι πρεσβυτέροις ὁμολογουμένην, τοσαῦτα.

And in iii. 25, τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, ἡ τε Πέτρου δευτέρα ἐπιστολή⁹.

12. Jerome, *Script. eccl.* i., vol. ii. p. 827, says of St. Peter, “scripsit duas epistolas quæ catholicæ nominantur, quarum secunda a plerisque ejus esse negatur, propter styli cum priore dissonantiam.”

But this dissonance he elsewhere accounts for: “Habebat ergo (Paulus) Titum interpretem, sicut et beatus Petrus Marcum, cujus evangelium Petro narrante et eo scribente compositum est. Denique et duæ epistolæ quæ feruntur Petri stilo inter se et caractere discrepant, structuraque verborum. Ex quo intelligimus, pro necessitate rerum diversis eum usum interpretibus.”

13. After the time of Eusebius the Epistle appears to have been very generally received as canonical. We have however the statement of Gregory of Nazianzum, *Carm.* ii. 8, ver. 310, καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν | τινὲς μὲν ἐπτά φασιν, οἱ δὲ τρεῖς μόνας | χρῆναι δέχεσθαι :—and of Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topogr. christ.* lib. vii. (Migne, vol. lxxxviii. p. 292), παρὰ Σύροις δὲ εἰ μὴ αἱ τρεῖς μόναι αἱ προγεγραμμέναι οὐχ εὐρίσκονται, λέγω δὴ, Ἰακώβου καὶ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου. It confirms this notice to find, that this Epistle is not contained in the Peschito version. Ephrem Syrus notwithstanding received the whole seven catholic Epistles, and so the Philoxenian, or later Syriac version. Leontius of Byzantium¹ says that Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected our Epistle.

14. In the middle ages the Epistle was generally recognized and accounted canonical. At the time of the Reformation, the ancient doubts revived. Both Erasmus and Calvin express them. Cajetan, Grotius, Scaliger, Salmasius, question its genuineness. And in modern

⁹ See the testimony of Philastrius of Brescia in favour of our Epistle, above, ch. i. § i. 65.

¹ See above, ch. iii. § i. 11.

times, Semler, Neander, Credner, De Wette, Reuss, Mayerhoff, have ranged themselves on the same side.

15. On the other hand, there have not been wanting in our own days many defenders of the genuineness of the Epistle. The principal of these have been Michaelis, Pott, Augusti, Storr, Flatt, Dahl, Hug, Schmid, Lardner, Guericke, Windischmann, Thiersch. The same result is evidently to be supplied at the end of Brückner's notices, though he himself hesitates to affirm it. From what has already been said of Dietlein's book, it will be readily believed, that it is hardly worth quoting on this side. "Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis."

16. If we now come to review the course of ancient testimony, we shall find its tendency to be very much the same as we found it respecting the Epistle of St. James, with which indeed our Epistle is often classed among the *ἀντιλεγόμενα*. And as far as this portion of the subject of our present section is concerned, we might append to it the same conclusion as that with which we terminated the corresponding section on that Epistle, ch. ii. § v. 15.

17. But another department of evidence in this case requires consideration. Weighty objections have, and that from early times², been brought against the Epistle on internal grounds. Some of these I have already dealt with by anticipation, in speaking on its occasion and object, —on the probability as to the same readers being partly in view as those in the former Epistle,—on the kind of use made of the Epistle of St. Jude. If our preceding remarks, which I have endeavoured to make fairly, and not in the spirit of a partisan, have been warranted by fact, then on all these points we have been gathering reasons by which those objections to its genuineness from supposed internal disqualification may be so far met.

18. But they extend to several other points besides those above mentioned. For instance, it is said, that the kind of mention of the coming of our Lord in the two Epistles could not have proceeded from the same person. In the former Epistle it is simply introduced as one of the great comforting assurances for God's persecuted people: in the latter, it is defended against cavil and unbelief. Now would it not have been more just in this case to say, that the circumstances and persons in view cannot be the same, rather than that the Writers cannot? For surely there is nothing in this Epistle shewing a belief, on the part of the Writer himself, inconsistent with that professed in the other. Nay, it is evidently shewn by such passages as ch. iii. 8, 10, that the firm persuasion expressed in 1 Pet. iv. 5 was that of our Writer also.

19. It is said, that the peculiarities with regard to certain uncommon points which we find in the first Epistle (e. g. iii. 19, iv. 6, iii. 6, 21) are not found reproduced in the second. But, as Brückner has well

² Cf. Jerome, above, par. 12.

observed, the very fact, that it was characteristic of St. Peter to adduce these mysterious and outlying points, would also account in some measure for their appearing, not always, but in a scattered and irregular manner, as illustrations by the way: just as they do appear in this second Epistle also (e. g. iii. 5, 10). So that this is rather an argument for, than against the identity of the Writers. Besides which, it halts in two essential points. For 1) it is not altogether correct in its statement. We do find the Writer's view of ancient prophecy continued from one Epistle (1 Pet. i. 10—12) to the other (2 Pet. i. 19—21; iii. 2):—the new birth by the divine word, which in the first Epistle is alleged as a motive for putting off worldly lusts and passions (i. 22—ii. 2), reappears in the second in i. 4, *ἵνα διὰ τούτων* (God's *ἐπαγγέλματα*) *γένησθε θέας κοινωνοὶ φύσεως, ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθορᾶς*: the *ἀρεταί* of Him who hath called them, 1 Pet. ii. 9, reappear in the same peculiar form, 2 Pet. i. 3: if we read, 1 Pet. iv. 17, that judgment (*τὸ κρίμα*) is beginning at the house of God, and will proceed on to the disobedient, we read of the deceivers in the second Epistle, 2 Pet. ii. 3, that their judgment (*τὸ κρίμα*) is not idle. Other instances might be and have been produced³, shewing that the allegation will not hold. And 2) it is forgotten by the objectors, that it would be only in a spurious Epistle imitating the first, that we should find such reproductions carefully carried out: the occasion and object of a second genuine Epistle being totally different, forms a very sufficient reason why they should not be found to any considerable extent.

20. It is again objected, that whereas in the former Epistle the sufferings and death and resurrection of Christ were brought forward frequently and insisted on,—in this, these facts of Redemption are altogether put into the background, and only the exalted Christ is in the view of the Writer. But it is to be remembered that 1) in that first Epistle we found the exalted Person of our Lord mainly before the Apostle's eyes⁴: that 2) the differing occasion and object would tend to produce just the diversity found here, where there is no longer any purpose of comforting under persecution, but only of warning against error and building up in knowledge: that 3) in the first Epistle, where *σωτηρία* was so conspicuous with its facts and consequences, our Lord is commonly found as *χριστός* simply (i. 11, 19; ii. 21; iii. 15 (*κυρ. τὸν χρ.*), 16, 18; iv. 1, 13 (*τοῦ χρ.*), 14; v. 1 (*τοῦ χρ.*)), or *Ἰησοῦς χρ.* (i. 1, 2, 3, 7, 13; ii. 5; iii. 21; iv. 11), or *χρ. Ἰησοῦς* (v. 10); whereas in the second, where *σωτηρία* hardly appears (iii. 15), He is ordinarily *ὁ κύριος* (or *θεὸς*?) *ἡμῶν καὶ σωτὴρ* *Ἰ. χρ.* (i. (1), 11; ii. 20; iii. 18), or *ὁ κύριος ἡμ. Ἰ. χρ.* (i. 2 (*Ἰησ. τ. κ. ῆ.*), 8, 14, 16): but never simply *χριστός*, *ὁ χρ.*, *Ἰησ. χρ.*, or *χρ. Ἰησ.* This, which has been also alleged as against the identity of writers, is, I submit, strikingly

³ See Brückner, pp. 127 f.

⁴ See above, ch. iii. § vi. 4.

characteristic of the different realms of thought of the two Epistles. In the first, it is community of suffering and glorification with Him, which is to give encouragement: His lordly and glorious titles are dropped, and His office (*χριστός*) or combined Person and office (*Ἰησ. χρ.* or *χρ. Ἰησ.*) is ever brought forward. But in this second, where warning, and caution against rebellion are mainly in view, we are ever reminded of His lordship by *κύριος*, and of what He did for us by *σωτήρ*: and without the former, or both titles, He never appears.

21. Another objection has been found in the apparent anxiety of the Writer to shew that he is the Apostle Peter, thereby betraying that he was not that Apostle. But here again, we may surely say just as fairly, that this is in manifest consistency with the character and design of the Epistle, which cautions against, and stigmatizes, false teachers. Thus we find St. Paul, in those Epistles where his object is the same, most strongly asserting his Apostleship, and his personal qualification as a teacher and ruler of the church. Were the Epistle genuine, this is just what we might expect⁵.

22. The supposed objection, that in the reference to an apostolic command, ch. iii. 2, the Writer seems to sever himself from the Apostles, loses all weight by the reflection, that the words most naturally mean, as explained in the note on the passage, *the Apostles who preached to you*, much as in 1 Pet. i. 12: the Writer himself forming one only of that class, and thus preferring to specify it as a class⁶. Besides, I submit that such an objection is suicidal, when connected with that last mentioned. If the object of the (apocryphal) Writer was, elaborately to represent himself as St. Peter, how can the same view of the Epistle be consistent in finding in it a proof, by his own deliberate shewing, that he is not an Apostle? Forgers surely do not thus designedly overthrow their own fabrics.

23. The last objection which I shall notice is, the reference to St. Paul's Epistles in ch. iii. 15, 16, as indicating a later date than is consistent with the genuineness of our Epistle. They are there evidently adduced as existing *in some number*: and as *forming part of the recognized Scriptures* (*τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς*). No doubt, these undeniable phænomena of our Epistle are worthy of serious consideration; and they present to us, I am free to confess, a difficulty almost insuperable, if the common traditions respecting the end of St. Peter's life are to be received as matters of fact. But we are not bound by those traditions, though inclined to retain them in deference to ancient testimonies: we are at all events free to assume as great a latitude in their dates as the phænomena of the sacred writings seem to require. All therefore that we can say of this reference to the writings of

⁵ See the instances gone into in detail by Brückner, p. 118.

⁶ See also note on Jude 17, 18.

St. Paul, is that, believing on other grounds this Epistle to be written by St. Peter, this seems to require for it a later date than is consistent with the usually received traditions of his death, and that our reception of such traditions must be modified accordingly.

24. At the same time it must be borne in mind, that it is an entirely unwarranted assumption, to understand by *πᾶσαι ἐπιστολαί* here, an entire collection of St. Paul's Epistles as we now have them, seeing that the words can only represent as many of them as the Writer had seen⁷: and that it is equally unjustifiable to gather from what follows, that the sacred canon of the N. T. was at that time settled. Those words cannot imply more than that there were certain writings by Christian teachers, which were reckoned as on a level with the O. T. Scriptures, and called by the same name (see note there). And that that was the case, even in the traditional lifetime of St. Peter, it would be surely unreasonable to deny⁸.

25. The diversity of style in the two Epistles has been frequently alleged⁹. But on going through all that has been said, I own I cannot regard it, considerable as it undoubtedly is, as any more than can well be accounted for by the total diversity of subject and mood in the two Epistles, and by the interweaving into this second one of copious reminiscences from another Epistle. Some of the differences we have already spoken of, when treating of the titles and names of our Lord appearing in the two Epistles; and have found them amply accounted for by the above reasons. The same might be said of the terms used for the coming of our Lord,—*ἀποκάλυψις* and *ἀποκαλύπτειν* in the first Epistle, *παρουσία*, *ἡμέρα κυρίου*, *ἡμέρα κρίσεως* in this¹: the same again of the prevalence of *ἐλπίς* in the former Epistle, and of *ἐπίγνωσις* in this. Some of the objections adduced on this head are without foundation in fact, e. g. that which Davidson admits, that whereas “in the first Epistle the Writer makes considerable use of the O. T., incorporating its sentiments and diction into his own composition; in the second there is hardly a reference to the Jewish Scriptures.” What then are

⁷ See note in loc.; as also on the omission of the art. before *ἐπιστολαί*.

⁸ The rest of the objections of this kind, which are not so important as those dealt with in the text, will be seen discussed in Brückner; and in Davidson, vol. iii. pp. 418 ff.

⁹ See Jerome, above, par. 12; and the principal particulars treated in Davidson, pp. 430 ff., and Brückner.

¹ Davidson, p. 433, treats this answer as insufficient, “because the phraseology is not confined to that part of the Epistle which is directed against the false teachers, and the Epistle was not wholly or chiefly written to threaten the enemies of the truth with the dreadful day of the Lord. It was the writer's object to establish and comfort, as well as to terrify.” But surely we may fairly say, that the spirit in which the Writer set himself to compose his Epistle, which is evident from the ruling tone of it being warning and denunciatory, would of necessity modify the terms in which he introduced those doctrines and expectations which formed the ground of his exhortation or prophecy.

we to say of ch. i. 19—21; ii. 1, 5, 6, 7 f., 15 f., 22; iii. 2, 4, 5 f., 8, 13? May not it be said that although the second Epistle, from the nature of the case, does not require so many references to the new-begetting word, yet the mind of the Writer was equally full of its facts and sentiments?

26. Some of the points of resemblance between the two Epistles have been very fairly stated by Davidson (p. 434), and by Brückner (p. 130): and the latter writer has corrected the over-statements of Dietlein. Of these coincidences, ἀρετή, as applied to God, has been already noticed. Others are, ἀλώμον κ. ἀσπίλου, 1 Pet. i. 19, compared with ἀσπιλοι κ. ἀλώμνητοι, 2 Pet. iii. 14; which is the more striking from its independence in the connexion, being used in an entirely different reference. The sound of these two words again occurs in the midst of the adaptation from St. Jude, ii. 13, σπίλοι κ. μῶμοι. Again the use of the word ἴδιος, 1 Pet. iii. 1, 5, cf. 2 Pet. i. 3; ii. 16; iii. 17: the omission of the article, as before βασιλεῖ in 1 Pet. ii. 13, compared with that before θελήματι in 2 Pet. i. 21, before ἀγγέλων ii. 4, ὄγδοον and κόσμον ib. 5, δίκαιον Δώτ ib. 7, are points of similarity, which may be put in the balance against others of discrepancy.

27. It may be allowed us to remark some notes of genuineness which are found in our Epistle, which, though at first sight of small import, and lying beneath the surface, yet possess considerable interest. In ch. i. 17, 18, we have a reference to the presence of the Writer at the transfiguration of our Lord. It is a remarkable coincidence, that close to that reference, and in the verses leading on to it, two words should occur, both of which are connected with the narrative of the Transfiguration in the Gospels. In ver. 13 we have ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμὶ ἐν τούτῳ τῷ σκηνώματι: let us remember that it was Peter who at the Transfiguration said ποιήσωμεν σκηνὰς τρεῖς. In ver. 15 μετὰ τὴν ἑμὴν ἔξοδον. At the Transfiguration Moses and Elias ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ ἣν ἐμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

28. We have also very noticeable coincidences of another kind. Compare the use of λαχοῦσιν, ch. i. 1, with ἔλαχε in Peter's speech, Acts i. 17: εὐσέβειαν, ch. i. 3, 6, 7, with Acts iii. 12, where, in Peter's speech, it is only found, except in the Pastoral Epistles: θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἡνέχθη, ch. i. 21, with βουλῇ . . τοῦ θεοῦ . . ἀνείλατε, Acts ii. 23: ἐγκατοικῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς, ch. ii. 8, with τὸ μνῆμα αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἐν ἡμῖν, Acts ii. 29: ἀνόμοις ἔργοις, ibid., with διὰ χειρῶν ἀνόμων, Acts ii. 23: εὐσεβεῖς, ch. ii. 9, with Acts x. 2, 7, an account doubtless derived from St. Peter, —the only places where the word occurs in the N. T.: κολαζομένους, ibid., with Acts iv. 21, another Petrine account, and also the only places where the word occurs: the double genitive ch. iii. 2, τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν ἐντολῆς τοῦ κυρίου, with a very similar one, Acts v. 32, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν αὐτοῦ μάρτυρες τῶν ρημάτων τούτων: ἡμέρα κυρίου, ch. iii.

10, with the citation Acts ii. 20, where only it occurs, except 1 Thess. v. 21. Such things are not to be despised, in estimating the probability of our Epistle being a supposititious document.

29. Our general conclusion from all that has preceded must be in favour of the genuineness and canonicity of this second Epistle: acknowledging at the same time, that the subject is not without considerable difficulty. That difficulty however is lightened for us by observing that on the one hand, it is common to this Epistle with some others of those called Catholic, and several of the later writings of the New Testament: and on the other, that no difference can be imagined more markedly distinctive, than that which separates all these writings from even the earliest and best of the post-apostolic period. Our Epistle is one of those latter fruits of the great outpouring of the Spirit on the Apostles, which, not being entrusted to the custody of any one church or individual, required some considerable time to become generally known: which when known, were suspected, bearing as they necessarily did traces of their late origin, and notes of polemical argument: but of which, as apostolic and inspired writings, there never was, when once they became known, any general doubt; and which, as the sacred Canon became fixed, acquired, and have since maintained, their due and providential place among the books of the New Testament.

SECTION V.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. These can only be set down conjecturally, in accordance with views and considerations previously advanced. Assuming the genuineness of the Epistle, St. Peter wrote it in his old age, when he was expecting his death². This, agreeably to what was said on the first Epistle, would be somewhere about the year 68 A.D., and the place of writing would be Rome, or somewhere on the journey thither from the East.

2. But all this is far too uncertain, and too much beset with chronological difficulties, to be regarded as any thing more than a hypothetical corollary, contingent on our accepting the tradition of St. Peter's Roman martyrdom.

3. Several matters, which have formed the subject of sections in our other chapters, such as the character and style of the Epistle, have been already incidentally discussed.

² This inference is not made from the word *ταχινή* in ch. i. 14 (see note there), but from the general spirit of that passage.

*Readings of the Codex Vaticanus in the text of this Volume (both parts),
ascertained by the Editor's inspection of the MS., Rome, Feb. 1861.*

- Heb. vii. 4. θεωρεῖτε δε, not δη, as Mai, edn. 2.
viii. 10. καρδια εαντων is all 1. m., not, as stated in Mai, edn. 2,
"ex mendo secundæ manus." The ε is in the pale ink
of the original scribe.
11. not ιδουσιν, as Mai, edn. 2, but ειδουσιν, the ησ being a
correction by the first hand, and so assigned by
Tischdf. to his B².
James ii. 13. κατακαυχατε, as Bentley.
iii. 5. μεγαλα αυχει, not μεγαλαυχει, as Mai, edn. 1.
1 Pet. i. 7. πολυτειμοτερον, not -μωτερον, as Mai.
iii. 1. κερδηθησονται, not -ωνται, as Mai.
6. υπηκουεν, not -ουσεν, as Mai.
8. φιλαδελφοι, not φυλ-, as Mai, edn. 2.
13. υμας ει, not εαν, as Muralto.
iv. 13. του χριστου, not χριστου, as Bentley.
1 John ii. 2. ειλασμος εστιν, not εστιν ειλ., as Tischendorf (N. T. ed. 7).
27. αυτου χρεισμα, not αυτο, as Mai, Tischendorf (N. T. ed. 7),
and all before the inspection above mentioned.
iii. 6. εορακεν is a 1. m., εωρ. a 2. m., not as Mai.
18. αλλ εν εργω, not αλλ εργω, as Mai.
iv. 4. νενικ. is a 1. m., νενικ. a 2. m., not as in Mai.
10. εν τουτω, not εν τουτο, as Mai.
21. τον θεον αγαπα και is in marg. a 1. m. (B² Tischdf. ; see
above on Heb. viii. 11).
v. 16. εστιν αμαρτια ποος θανατον is not repeated, as in Mai,
edn. 2.
18. αλλα, not αλλ', as Mai.
Subscr. α is not omitted, as Bentley.
2 John 8. απολεσητε, not ται, as Birch.
3 John 14. ευθεωσ σε, not ευθεωσ, as Mai.
Jude 5. οτι ις λαον is in the MS.
12. εισιν οι εν, not εισιν εν, as Mai.
ib. παραφερομενοι, not -ναι, as Bentley and Birch.

CHAPTER V.

1 JOHN.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE internal testimony furnished by this Epistle to its Author being the same with the Author of the fourth Gospel is, it may well be thought, incontrovertible. To maintain a diversity of Authorship would betray the very perverseness and exaggeration of that school of criticism which refuses to believe, be evidence never so strong.

2. It will be well however not to assume this identity, but to proceed in the same way as we have done with the other books of the New Testament, establishing the Authorship by external ecclesiastical testimony.

Polycarp, ad Philipp. c. 7, p. 1012, writes : *πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστιν*. Seeing that this contains a plain allusion to 1 John iv. 3, and that Polycarp was the disciple of St. John, it has ever been regarded as an indirect testimony to the genuineness, and so to the Authorship of our Epistle. Lücke, in his *Einleitung*, p. 3 f., has dealt with and defended this testimony of Polycarp.

3. It is said of Papias by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 39, *κέχρηται δ' ὁ αὐτὸς μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου προτέρας ἐπιστολῆς, καὶ τῆς Πέτρου ὁμοίως*. And be it remembered that Irenæus says of Papias that he was *Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δ' ἑταῖρος*.

4. Irenæus frequently quotes this Epistle, as Eusebius asserts of him, H. E. v. 8. In his work against heresies, iii. 16. 5, p. 206, after citing John xx. 31, with “*quemadmodum Joannes Domini discipulus confirmat dicens*,” he proceeds “*propter quod et in Epistola sua sic testificatus est nobis : Filioli, novissima hora est*,” &c. 1 John ii. 18 ff. In iii. 16. 8, p. 207, he says, “*quos et Dominus nobis cavere prædixit, et discipulus ejus Johannes in prædicta epistola fugere nos præcepit dicens Multi seductores exierunt*, &c. (2 John 7, 8 : so that “in prædicta epistola” seems to be a lapse of memory) : *et rursus in epistola ait Multi pseudo-prophetæ exierunt*,” &c. (1 John iv. 1—3.)

In this last quotation it is that Irenæus supports the remarkable reading, *ὁ λύει τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, “*qui solvit Jesum*.”

And just after, he proceeds, *διὸ πάλιν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ φησί Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς χριστός ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*, 1 John v. 1.

5. Clement of Alexandria repeatedly refers to our Epistle as written

by St. John. Thus in his Strom. ii. 15 (66), p. 464 P., φαίνεται δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ τὰς διαφορὰς τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἐκδιδάσκων ἐν τούτοις· εἰάν τις ἰδῇ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτάνοντα, κ.τ.λ., 1 John v. 16.

In Strom. iii. 4 (32), p. 525 P., he quotes 1 John i. 6 f. with φησὶν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ. In iii. 5 (42), p. 530, 1 John iii. 3, with φησὶν only. In iv. 16 (102), p. 608, 1 John iii. 18, 19, iv. 16, 18, v. 3, with Ἰωάννης, τελείους εἶναι διδάσκων

6. Tertullian, adv. Marcion. v. 16, vol. ii. p. 511: "ut Johannes apostolus, qui jam antichristos dicit processisse in mundum, præcursores antichristi spiritus, negantes Christum in carne venisse et solventes Jesum . . ." (1 John iv. 1 ff.)

Adv. Praxean. c. 15, p. 173: "Quod vidimus, inquit Johannes, quod audivimus," &c. (1 John i. 1.)

Ib. c. 28, p. 192 f.: "Johannes autem etiam mendacem notat eum qui negaverit Jesum esse Christum, contra de Deo natum omnem qui crediderit Jesum esse Christum (1 John ii. 22, iv. 2 f., v. 1): propter quod et hortatur ut credamus nomini filii ejus Jesu Christi, ut scilicet communio sit nobis cum Patre et filio ejus Jesu Christo" (1 John i. 7).

See also adv. Gnosticos, 12, p. 147: and other places, in the indices.

7. Cyprian in Ep. 25 (24 or 28), p. 289, writes: "Et Joannes apostolus mandati memor in epistola sua postmodum ponit: In hoc inquit, intelligimus quia cognovimus eum, si præcepta ejus custodiamus," &c. (1 John ii. 3, 4.)

And de orat. dom. ad Demetr. 14, p. 529, "in epistola sua Joannes quoque ad faciendam Dei voluntatem hortatur et instruit dicens: Nolite diligere mundum," &c. (1 John ii. 15—17.)

Also de opere et eleemos. 3, p. 604: "iterum in epistola sua Joannes ponat et dicat: Si dixerimus quia peccatum non habemus," &c. (1 John i. 8.)

De bono patientiæ, 9, p. 628: "per Christi exempla gradiamur, sicut Joannes apostolus instruit dicens: Qui dicit se in Christo manere, debet quomodo ille ambulavit et ipse ambulare" (1 John ii. 6).

8. Muratori's fragment on the canon states, "Joannis duæ in catholica habentur."

And the same fragment cites 1 John i. 1, 4: "quid ergo mirum, si Joannes tam constanter singula etiam in epistolis suis proferat, dicens in semetipso Quæ vidimus oculis nostris et auribus audivimus et manus nostræ palpaverunt in hæc scripsimus." Cf. Routh, reliq. sacr. i. p. 395.

9. The Epistle is found in the Peschito, whose canon in the catholic Epistles is so short.

10. Origen (in Euseb. vi. 25), beginning the sentence τί δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἀναπεσόντος λέγειν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰωάννου . . . , and proceeding as cited in the Prolegg. to the Apocalypse, § i. par. 12, says,

καταλέλοιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνυ ὀλίγων στίχων· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην, ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασὶ γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας· πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν. And he continually cites the Epistle as St. John's: e. g., in Ev. Jo. tom. xiii. 21, vol. iv., p. 230, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον, παρὰ δὲ τῷ Ἰωάννῃ φῶς· ὁ θεὸς γάρ, φησί, φῶς ἐστὶ καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεμία. Numerous other places may be found in the indices.

11. Dionysius of Alexandria, the scholar of Origen, recognizes the genuineness of the Gospel and Epistle as being written by the Apostle John, by the very form of his argument against the genuineness of the Apocalypse. For (see his reasoning at length in the Prolegomena to the Revelation, § i. par. 48) he tries to prove that it was not written by St. John, on account of its diversity in language and style from the Gospel and Epistle; and distinctly cites the words of our Epistle as those of the Evangelist: ὁ δὲ γε εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ ἀπερίττως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς θείας ἀποκαλύψεως ἤρξατο· ὁ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὁ ἑοράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν.

12. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 24, says, τῶν δὲ Ἰωάννου συγγραμμάτων πρὸς τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ ἡ προτέρα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν παρὰ τε τοῖς νῦν καὶ τοῖς ἔτ' ἀρχαίοις ἀναμφίλεκτος ὁμολόγηται. And in iii. 25, having enumerated the four Gospels and Acts and the Epistles of Paul, he says, αἷς ἐξῆς τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν . . . κυρωτέον.

13. After the time of Eusebius, general consent pronounced the same verdict. We may terminate the series of testimonies with that of Jerome, who in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers (c. 9, vol. ii. p. 845) says of St. John, "Scripsit autem et unam epistolam, cujus exordium est, Quod fuit ab initio, &c., quæ ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur."

14. The first remarkable contradiction to this combination of testimony is found in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes, in the sixth century. He ventures to assert (lib. vii. p. 292, in Migne, Patr., vol. lxxxviii.¹), that none of the earlier Christian writers who have treated of the canon, makes any mention of the Catholic Epistles as canonical; οὐ γὰρ τῶν ἀποστόλων φασὶν αὐτοὺς οἱ πλείους, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων τινῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀφελεστέρων. He then proceeds in a somewhat confused way to state that Irenæus does mention 1 Peter and 1 John, as apostolic, ἕτεροι δὲ οὐδὲ αὐτὰς λέγουσιν εἶναι ἀποστόλων, ἀλλὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων· πρώτη γὰρ καὶ δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου γέγραπται, ὡς δῆλον ἐνὸς προσώπου εἶναι τὰς τρεῖς. But it is evident from the chain of testimonies given above, that Cosmas can have been but ill informed on the subject.

15. It is probable that the Alogi mentioned by Epiphanius as reject-

¹ See the passage at length, with Lücke's remarks, in his Einleitung, pp. 5, 6, note.

ing the Gospel and Apocalypse, included the Epistles in this rejection. Still Epiphanius does not assert it ; he only says, *τάχα δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς, συνάδουσι γὰρ καὶ αὗται τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ καὶ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει*. Hæer. li. c. 34, vol. i. p. 456. But their repudiation of the Epistle would be of no account.

16. Its rejection by Marcion is of equally little consequence. He excluded from the canon all the writings of St. John, as not suiting his views.

17. Lücke closes his review of ancient authorities, which I have followed and expanded, by saying, "Incontestably then our Epistle must be numbered among those canonical books which are most strongly upheld by ecclesiastical tradition."

18. But the genuineness of the Epistle rests not, as already observed, on external testimony alone. It must remain an acknowledged fact, until either the Gospel is proved not to be St. John's, or the similarity between the two is shewn to be only apparent. Lücke has well observed, that neither Gospel nor Epistle can be said to be an imitation : both are original, but both the product of the same mind : so that considered only in this point of view, we might well doubt which was written first.

19. However, its genuineness has been controverted in modern times. First we have a rash and characteristic saying of Jos. Scaliger's : "*tres epistolæ Joannis non sunt apostoli Joannis*." The first who deliberately and on assigned grounds took the same side, was S. Gottlieb Lange ; who, strange to say, receiving the Gospel and the Apocalypse, yet rejected the Epistle.

20. His argument, as reported by Lücke, is as follows : The entire failure in the Epistle of any individual, personal, and local notices, betrays an author unacquainted with the personal circumstances of the Apostle, and those of the churches where he taught. The close correspondence of the Epistle with the Gospel in thought and expression begets a suspicion that some careful imitator of John wrote the Epistle. Lastly, the Epistle, as compared with the Gospel, shews such evident signs of enfeeblement of spirit by old age, that if it is to be ascribed to John, it must have been written at the extreme end of his life, after the destruction of Jerusalem ; whereas, from no allusion being made to that event even in such a passage as ch. ii. 18, the Epistle makes a shew of having been written before it. The only solution in Lange's estimation is that some imitator wrote it, as St. John's, it may be a century after his time.

21. To this Lücke replies that Lange is in fourfold error. For 1, it is not true that the Epistle contains no individual and personal notices. These it is true are rather hinted at and implied than brought

to the surface: a characteristic, not only of a catholic epistle as distinguished from one locally addressed, but also of the style of St. John as distinguished from that of St. Paul. As to the fact, the Writer designates himself by implication as an apostle, and seems to allude to his Gospel in ch. i. 1—4: in ch. ii. 1, 18, he implies an intimate relation between himself and his readers: in ch. ii. 12—14, he distinguishes his readers according to their ages: in ch. ii. 18, 19, iv. 1—3, the false teachers are pointed at in a way which shews that both Writer and readers knew more about them: and the warning, ch. v. 21, has a local character, and reminds the readers of something well known to them.

22. Secondly, it is entirely denied, as above remarked, that there is the slightest trace of slavish imitation. The Epistle is in no respect the work of an imitator of the Gospel. Such a person would have elaborated every point of similarity, and omitted no notice of the personal and local circumstances of the Apostle: would have probably misunderstood and exaggerated St. John's peculiarities of style and thought. All such attempts to put off one man's writing for that of another carry in them the elements of failure as against a searching criticism. But how different is all we find in this Epistle. By how wide a gap is it separated from the writings of Ignatius, Clement, Barnabas, Polycarp. Apparently close as it is upon them in point of time, what a totally different spirit breathes in it. This Epistle written after them, written among them, would be indeed the rarest of exceptional cases—an unimaginable anachronism, a veritable *ὑστέρων πρότερον*.

23. Thirdly: it is certainly the strangest criticism, to speak of the weakness of old age in the Epistle. If this could be identified as really being so, it would be the strongest proof of authenticity. For it is altogether inconceivable, that an imitator could have had the power or the purpose to write as John might have written in his old age. But where are the traces of this second childishness? We are told, in the repetitions, in the want of order, in the uniformity. Certainly there is an appearance of tautology in the style: more perhaps than in the Gospel. Erasmus, in the dedication of his paraphrase of St. John's Gospel, characterizes the style of the Gospel as a "*dicendi genus ita velut ansulis ex sese cohærentibus contexens, nonnumquam ex contrariis, nonnumquam ex similibus, nonnumquam ex iisdem subinde repetitis,—ut orationis quodque membrum semper excipiat prius, sic, ut prioris finis initium sit sequentis.*" The same style prevails in the Epistle. It is not however an infirmity of age, but a peculiarity, which might belong to extreme youth just as well.

24. The greater amount of repetition in the Epistle arises from its

being more hortatory and tender in character. And it may also be attributed to its more Hebraistic form, in which it differs from the Grecian and dialectic style of St. Paul: abounding in parallels and apparent arguings in a circle. The epistolary form would account for the want of strict arrangement in order, which would hardly be observed by the youngest any more than by the oldest writer.

25. And the appearance of uniformity, partly accounted for by the oneness of subject and simplicity of spirit, is often produced by want of deep enough exegesis to discover the real differences in passages which seem to express the same. Besides, even granting these marks of old age, what argument would they furnish against the genuineness? St. John was quite old enough at and after the siege of Jerusalem for such to have shewn themselves: so that this objection must be dealt with on other grounds, and does not affect our present question.

26. Fourthly, it is quite a mistake to suppose that if the Epistle was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, that event must necessarily have been intimated in ch. ii. 18. It cannot be proved, nor does it seem likely from the notices of the *παρουσία* in the Gospel, that St. John connected the *ἔσχατη ὥρα* with the destruction of Jerusalem. It does not seem likely that, writing to Christians of Asia Minor who probably from the first had a wider view of our Lord's prophecy of the end, he should have felt bound to make a corrective allusion to the event, even supposing he himself had once identified it with the time of the end. *They* would not require to be told, why the universal triumph of Christianity had not followed it, seeing they probably never expected it to do so.

27. So that Lange's objections, which I have reported freely from Lücke, as being highly illustrative of the character of the Epistle, certainly do not succeed in impugning the verdict of antiquity, or the evidence furnished by the Epistle itself.

28. The objections brought by Bretschneider, formed on the doctrine of the *logos* and the antidocetic tendency manifest both in the Epistle and the Gospel, and betraying both as works of the second century, have also been shewn by Lücke, Einl. pp. 16—20, to be untenable. The doctrine of the *logos*, though formally enounced by St. John only, is in fact that of St. Paul in Col. i. 15 ff., and that of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews i. ff., and was unquestionably prepared for Christian use long before, in the Alexandrine Jewish theology. And though Docetism itself may have been the growth of the second century, yet the germs of it, which are opposed in this Epistle, were apparent long before. A groundless assumption of Bretschneider is, that seeing the three Epistles are by the same hand, and the writer of the second and third, where there was no ground for concealing him-

self, calls himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος,—the first Epistle, where, wishing to be taken for the Apostle, he does not name himself, is also by John the Presbyter. The answer to which is, that we can by no means consent to the assumption that the so-called Presbyter John was the author of the second and third Epistles: see the Prolegomena to 2 John, § i. 2, 12 ff.

29. The objections brought against our Epistle by the modern Tübingen school are dealt with at considerable length by Düsterdieck, in his *Einleitung*, pp. xxxix—lxxv. It is not my purpose to enter on them here. For mere English readers, it would require an introduction far longer than that which Düsterdieck has devoted to it, at all to enable them to appreciate the nature of those objections and the postulates from which they spring. And when I inform such English readers that the first of those postulates is the denial of a personal God, they will probably not feel that they have lost much by not having the refutation of the objections laid before them. Should any regret it, they may find some of them briefly noticed in Dr. Davidson's Introduction, vol. iii. pp. 454 ff.: and they will there see how feeble and futile they are.

30. Whether then we approach the question of the authorship of this Epistle (and its consequent canonicity) from the side of external testimony, or of internal evidence, we are alike convinced that its claim to have been written by the Evangelist St. John, and to its place in the canon of Scripture, is fully substantiated.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS IT WAS WRITTEN.

1. This question, in the case of our Epistle, might be very easily and briefly dealt with, were it not for one apparent mistake, which complicates it.

In Augustine's *Quæst. Evang.* ii. 39, vol. iii. p. 1353, we read, "*secundum sententiam hanc etiam illud est quod dictum est a Joanne in epistola ad Parthos;*" and then follows 1 John iii. 2. This appears to be the only place in Augustine's writings where he thus characterizes it. The "*ad Parthos*" has found its way into some of the Benedictine editions in the title of the Tractates on the Epistle: but it seems not to have been originally there. It has been repeated by some of the Latin fathers, e. g. by Vigilius Tapsensis (or Idacius Clarus?) in the 5th century in his treatise against Varimadus the Arian²: by Cassiodorus³:

² Lib. i. c. 5, p. 367; in Migne, *Patr. Lat.* vol. lxi.

³ *De institut. divin. Script.* c. 14, vol. ii. p. 546.

by Bede, who in a prologue to the seven catholic Epistles⁴, says, “multi scriptorum ecclesiasticorum, in quibus est sanctus Athanasius, Alexandrinæ præsul ecclesiæ, primam ejus (Joannis) epistolam scriptam ad Parthos esse testantur.” These two latter notices involve the matter in more obscurity still. For Cassiodorus thus designates not only the first, but also the second and third Epistles; and, seeing that no Greek writer ever seems to give this title, it is hardly conceivable that the statement of Bede regarding Athanasius can be correct. Düsterdieck suspects, and apparently with reason, that the prologue cannot be from Bede’s own hand, seeing that he so uniformly keeps to Augustine.

2. Some, but very few writers, have assumed as a fact that the Epistle was really written to the Parthians. Paulus and Baur made use of the assumption to impugn the apostolicity of the Epistle. Grotius, who was followed by Hammond, and partially by Michaelis and Baumgarten-Crusius, gives a curious reason, in connexion with this idea, for the omission of all address and personal notices: “vocata olim fuit epistola ad Parthos, i. e. ad Judæos Christum professos, qui non sub Romanorum, sed sub Parthorum vivebant imperio in locis trans Euphratem, ubi ingens erat Judæorum multitudo, ut Neardæ, Nisibi et aliis in locis. Et hanc causam puto cur hæc epistola neque in fronte nomen titulumque Apostoli, neque in fine salutationes apostolici moris contineat, quia nimirum in terras hostiles Romanis hæc epistola per mercatores Ephesios mittebatur, multumque nocere Christianis poterat, si deprehensum fuisset hoc, quanquam innocens, litterarum commercium.” This is absurd enough, especially as the Epistle is evidently not addressed to Jews at all as such, but mainly to Gentile readers: see below, par 5. And ecclesiastical tradition knows of no mission of St. John to the Parthians, St. Thomas being supposed to have carried the Gospel to them.

3. This being so, it would appear, as hinted before, that the supposed address “ad Parthos” rests upon some mistake. But if so, on what mistake? A conjecture is quoted from Serrarius that in the original text of Augustine it stood “ad Pathmios:” another from Semler, that “adapertius” is the reading, Augustine wishing to contrast St. John’s writings with those of St. Paul, as the plainer and more explicit of the two⁵. A more probable conjecture has been, that the word *παρθένος* has some concern in the mistake: not however in the manner supposed by Whiston⁶, that the original address was *πρὸς παρθένας*, i. e. to “young

⁴ Vol. iv. p. 1, Migne, from Cave, Script. eccles. histor. liter. pp. 179, 296.

⁵ Other conjectures have derived it from ‘*ad sparsos*,’—‘*ad pantas*.’ “*Ad Spartos*” is asserted by Scholz (biblische-kritische Reise, p. 67) to be found in many Latin mss., but Lücke doubts this.

⁶ Comm. on the 3 catholic Epistles of St. John, Lond. 1719, p. 6: cited by Lücke and Düsterdieck.

Christians yet uncorrupted both as to fleshly and spiritual fornication." Hug supposes that the *πρὸς παρθένους* came from a superscription of the second Epistle, found in the cursive mss. 89 (Cent. xi.) and 30 (Cent. xiii.) of Griesbach, and alluded to by Clem. Alex., in a fragment of his *Adumbrations* on 2 John, ed. Potter, p. 1011, "*secunda Joannis epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta, simplicissima est.*" And this is very possible. Another supposition is that of Gieseler, *Kirchenge schichte*, i. p. 139, that it has arisen out of the circumstance of the name *παρθένος* being given to the Apostle himself. This name certainly occurs in a superscription of the Apocalypse cited by Lücke from ms. 30 of Griesbach (Cent. xii.) *τοῦ ἁγίου ἐνδοξοτάτου ἀποστόλου καὶ εὐαγγελιστοῦ παρθένου ἡγαπημένου ἐπιστηθίου Ἰωάννου θεολόγου*. Lücke gives various other notices, from which it appears that this character was attributed to St. John⁷.

4. At all events we may fairly assume, that the Epistle was not written to the Parthians. Nor is there more probability in the notion of Benson that it was addressed to the Jewish Christians in Judæa and Galilee, who had seen the Lord in the flesh: nor in that of Lightfoot, who sends it to the Church at Corinth, supposing the Gaius to whom the third Epistle is addressed, identical with him of Acts xix. 29; 1 Cor. i. 14, and the *ἔγραψα* of 3 John 9 to refer to this first Epistle.

5. Setting aside these, and falling back on the general opinion, we believe the Epistle to have been written not to any one church, but to a cycle of churches, mainly consisting of Gentile converts. This last seems shewn by the warning of ch. v. 21, combined with the circumstance that so little reference is made to O. T. sayings or history.

6. It evidently also appears, that the Apostle is the spiritual teacher of those to whom he is writing. He knows their circumstances and various advances in the faith: the whole tone is that of their father in the faith. Such a relation, following as we surely must the traces furnished by ancient tradition, can only be found in the case of St. John, by believing the readers to have been members of the churches at and round Ephesus, where he lived and taught.

7. The character of the Epistle is too general to admit a comparison between it and the Ephesian Epistle in the Apocalypse, which some have endeavoured to institute. Our Epistle contains absolutely no materials on which such a comparison can proceed.

⁷ See the (Ps.?) Ignatius, ad Philad. c. 4, p. 824; Tertullian de monogam. c. 17, vol. ii. p. 952; Cyr. Alex. Orat. de Maria virgine, p. 380

SECTION III.

ITS RELATION TO THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN.

1. As introductory to this enquiry, it will be well to give an account of opinions respecting the *epistolary form* of this canonical book.

2. This was always taken for granted, seeing that definite readers and their circumstances are continually present, and that the first and second persons plural are constantly used^s,—until Michaelis⁹ maintained that it is rather a treatise, or a book, than a letter; and only so far a letter, as any treatise may be addressed to certain readers, e. g. the Acts to Theophilus. Accordingly, he holds this to be a second part of the Gospel.

3. As Lücke remarks, it is of great importance whether we consider the writing as an Epistle or not. Our decision on this point affects both our estimate of it, and our exposition. Surely, however, the question is not difficult to decide. We may fairly reply to the hypothesis which supposes the Epistle to be a second part of the Gospel, that the Gospel is complete in itself and requires no such supplement; see John xx. 30, 31, where the practical object also of the Gospel is too plainly asserted, for us to suppose this to be its practical sequel.

4. To view it again as a preface and introduction to the Gospel, as Hug, seems not to be borne out by the spirit of either writing. The Gospel requires no such introduction: the Epistle furnishes none such. They do not in a word stand in any external relation to one another, such as is imagined by every one of these hypotheses.

5. Hug fancied he found a trace of the Epistle having once been attached to the Gospel, in the Latin version attached to the Codex Bezae. There, on the back of the leaf on which the Acts of the Apostles begin, the copyist has written the last column of 3 John, with this subscription: "Epistolæ Johannis iii. explicit incipit Actus Apostolorum." But first, this proves too much, seeing that the second and third Epistles of St. John (and the rest of the catholic epistles?) are included, and surely Hug does not suppose these Epistles to have been also sequels to the Gospel: and secondly, this very circumstance, the inclusion of all three Epistles, shews a possible reason of the arrangement, viz. to place together the writings of the same Apostle.

6. The writing then is to be regarded as an Epistle, as it usually has been: and no closer external relation to the Gospel must be sought for.

But, this being premised, a very interesting question follows. The two writings are internally related, in a remarkable manner. Do the

^s Cf. ch. ii. 1, 7, 13, 14, 18, 28; iii. 18, 21; iv. 1, 7, 11, &c.

⁹ Introd. to N. T., Marsh's transl., vol. iv. p. 400.

phænomena of this relation point out the Gospel, or the Epistle, as having been first written?

7. And to this question there can I think be but one answer. The Epistle again and again assumes, on the part of its readers, an acquaintance with the facts of the Gospel narrative. Lücke well remarks, that “as a rule, the shorter, more concentrated expression of one and the same writer, especially when ideas peculiar to him are concerned, is the *later*, while the more explicit one, which first unfolds and puts in shape the idea, is the *earlier* one.” And he finds examples of this in the abbreviated formulæ of ch. i. 1, 2, as compared with John i. 1 ff.; iv. 2, compared with John i. 14.

8. Other considerations connected with this part of our subject will be found treated in the next section.

SECTION IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. On both of these, opinions have been much divided; no sure indications being furnished by the Epistle itself. If however we have been right in assigning to it a date subsequent to that of the Gospel, we shall bring that date, by what has been said in the Prolegomena to Vol. 1. ch. v. § iv. (where fifteen years, A.D. 70—85, are shewn to have marked the probable limits of the time of the writing of the Gospel), within a time not earlier than perhaps about the middle of the eighth decade of the first century: and extending as late as the traditional age of the Apostle himself.

2. Some have imagined that the Epistle betrays marks of the extreme old age of the writer. But such inferences are very fallacious. Certainly the repeated use of *τεκνία*, more frequently than any other term of endearing address, seems to point to an aged writer: but even this is insecure.

3. Again it has been fancied that the *ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν* of ch. ii. 18, furnishes a note of time; and must be understood of the approaching destruction of Jerusalem. But as Lücke replies, this expression is used simply in reference to the appearance of antichristian teachers, and the apprehension thence arising that the coming of the Lord was at hand. So that we have no more right to infer a note of time from it, than from similar expressions in St. Paul, e. g. 1 Tim. iv. 1; 2 Tim. iii. 1

4. As to the place of writing, we are just as much in uncertainty. The Gospel (Vol. I. Prolegg. ch. v. § iv.) is said by Irenæus to have been written at Ephesus. And ancient tradition, if at least represented by the subscriptions to the Epistle, seems to have placed the writing of the Epistle there also. Further, it is impossible to say.

SECTION V.

CONTENTS AND ARRANGEMENT.

1. This Epistle, from its aphoristic and apparently tautological character, is exceedingly difficult to arrange as a continuous contextual whole. Some indeed from this have been induced to believe that there is no such contextual connexion in the Epistle. So Calvin¹, Episcopus², and others. And this seems, up to the beginning of the last century, to have been the prevailing view. About that time, Sebastian Schmid, in his commentary on the Epistle, maintained, but only tentatively and timidly, that there is a logical and contextual arrangement. The same side was taken up with more decision by Oporinus of Göttingen, in a treatise entitled “De constanter tenenda communione cum Patre et Filio ejus Jesu Christo, i. e. Joannis Ep. i. nodis interpretum liberata et luci vere innectæ suæ restituta, Goett. 1741.”

2. But the principal advocate of this view in the last century was Bengel. In his note in the Gnomon³ on the famous passage, ch. v. 7, he gives his contextual system of the Epistle, as cited below⁴. It will

¹ “Doctrinam exhortationibus mistam continet. Disserit enim de æterna Christi deitate, simul de incomparabili quam mundo patefactus secum attulit gratia, tum de omnibus in genere beneficiis ac præsertim inæstimabilem divinæ adoptionis gratiam commendat atque extollit. Inde sumit exhortandi materiem, et nunc quidem in genere pie et sancte vivendum admonet, nunc de caritate nominatim præcipit. Verum nihil horum continua serie facit. Nam sparsim docendo et exhortando varius est, præsertim vero multus est in urgenda caritate. Alia quoque breviter attingit, ut de cavendis impostoribus, et similia.” Argum. Epist. 1 Joh. vol. vii. p. 107.

² “Modus tractandi arbitrarius est, neque ad artis regulas adstrictus . . . sine rhetorico artificio aut logica accurata methodo institutus.” Lectiones sacræ in Ep. Joh. Amst. 1665, ii. p. 173.

³ Vol. ii. p. 568, ed. Steudel. Tübingen and London, 1850.

⁴ “Partes sunt tres:

EXORDIUM, c. i. 1—4.

TRACTATIO, c. i. 5—v. 12.

CONCLUSIO, c. v. 13—21.

“In EXORDIO apostolus ab apparitione verbi vitæ constituit auctoritatem prædicationi et scriptioni suæ, et scopum (*Id est, ut, ver. 3*) exserte indicat: *exordio* respondet CONCLUSIO, eundem scopum amplius explanans, instituta gnorismatum illorum recapitulans per triplex *novimus*, c. v. 18, 19, 20.

“TRACTATIO habet duas partes, agens

“I. speciatim

a) de communione cum DEO in luce, c. i. 5—10.

β) de communione cum FILIO in luce, c. ii. 1 f. 7 f., subjuncta applicatione propria ad patres, juvenes, puerulos, vv. 13—27. Innectitur hic adhortatio ad *manendum* in eo, c. ii. 28—iii. 24, ut fructus ex *manifestatione* ejus in carne se porrigat ad *manifestationem* gloriosam.

be observed that this arrangement is made in the interest of the disputed verse, and tends to give it an important place in the context of the Epistle. It is moreover highly artificial, and the Trinitarian character, which is made to predominate, is certainly far from the obvious key to the real arrangement, as given us by the Epistle itself⁵.

3. Nearer to our own time, differing arrangements of the Epistle have been proposed, by Lücke, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. I shall take these three in order.

4. Lücke professes to have gained much, in drawing up his arrangement, from the previous labours of Knapp⁶ and Rickli⁷. He holds the proper theme of the Epistle, the object, ground, and binding together of all its doctrinal and practical sayings, to be this proposition: "As the ground and root of all Christian fellowship is, the fellowship which each individual has with the Father and the Son in faith and in love, so this latter necessarily unfolds and exhibits itself in that former, viz. in the fellowship with the brethren." Having laid this down, he divides the Epistle into many sections, all unfolding in various ways this central truth. Thus, e. g., ch. i. 5—ii. 2, speaks of fellowship with God through Jesus Christ. God is light: fellowship with Him is walking in light: all pretence to it without such walking, is falsehood. And striving after such purity is the condition under which only Christian fellowship subsists, and under which the blood of Christ cleanses from sin. For even the Christian state is a striving, and not free from sin, but proceeding ever in more detection and confession of it: which leads not to a compromise with sin, but to its entire annihilation.

5. This may serve for a specimen of Lücke's setting forth of the connexion of the Epistle: in which, as Düsterdieck observes, he does not attempt to grasp the master thoughts which account for the development, but merely follows it step by step. For this, however, Lücke does not deserve the blame which Düsterdieck imputes to him. His is obviously the right way to proceed, though it may not have been carried far enough in his hands: far better than the *à priori* assumption of a Trinitarian arrangement by Bengel. He has well given the

γ) de corroboracione et fructu mansionis illius per SPIRITUM, capite iv. toto, ad quod aditum parat c. iii. ver. 24 conferendus ad c. iv. 12.

"II. Per Symperasma sive Congeriem, de Testimonio Patris et Filii et Spiritus, cui fides in Jesum Christum, generatio ex Deo, amor erga Deum et filios ejus, observatio præceptorum, et victoria mundi innititur, c. v. 1—12."

⁵ Bengel's arrangement has been adopted in the main by Sander, in his Commentary on the Epistle.

⁶ Script. var. argum. p. 177 f.

⁷ Johannis erster Brief erklärt und angewendet in Predigten, Luzern 1828.

sequence of thought, *as it stands*: but he has not *accounted for it*. The complete statement of the disposition of the matter of the Epistle must tell us not only *how* the train of thought proceeds, but *why* it thus proceeds.

6. A nearer approximation to this has been made by De Wette^s. His plan may be thus described. The great design of the Epistle is to confirm the readers in the Christian life as consisting in purity (love) and faith, and to this end to waken and sharpen the moral conscience by reminding them of the great moral axioms of the Gospel, by reminding them also of the inseparableness of morality and faith, to keep them from the influence of those false teachers who denied the reality of the manifestation of Jesus Christ in the flesh, and to convince them of the reality of that manifestation. The Epistle he arranges under 1. An introduction, ch. i. 1—4: 2. Three exhortations; *a*) i. 5—ii. 28, begins with reminding them of the nature of Christian fellowship, as consisting in walking in light, in purity from sin and keeping of God's commandments (i. 5—ii. 11): then proceeds by an earnest address to the readers (ii. 12—14), a warning against the love of the world (ii. 15—17), against false teachers, and an exhortation to keep fast hold of Christ (ii. 18—57), and concludes with a promise of confidence in the day of judgment.

β) He again reminds them of the fundamental moral axioms of the Gospel. The state of a child of God rests on the conditions of righteousness and purity from sin: he who commits sin belongs to the devil. Especially is the distinction made between those who belong to God and those who belong to the devil, by Love and Hate: and therefore must we ever love in deed and in truth (ii. 29—iii. 18). The Apostle adds a promise of confidence towards God and answer to prayer, and exhorts them to add to love, faith in the Son of God (iii. 19—24): which leads him to a second express warning against the false teachers (iv. 1—6).

γ) In this third exhortation, the Apostle sets out with the simple principle of Love, which, constituting the essence of God Himself, and being revealed in the mission of Christ, is the condition of all adoption into God's family and all confidence towards God (iv. 7—21). But a co-ordinate condition is faith in the Son of God, as including in itself Love, and the keeping of God's commandments, and the strength requisite thereto. And the voucher for this faith is found in the historical facts and testimonies of baptism, of the death of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, and in eternal life which He gives (v. 1—13). At

^s Handbuch, vol. i. ed. Bruckner, Leipz. 1846. The Gospel and Epistles of St. John are treated together.

the conclusion of the exhortation, we have the repeated promise of confidence towards God and the hearing of prayer, in this case intercessory prayer for a sinning brother, yet with a limitation, and a reminding that strictly speaking, Christians may not sin: ending with a warning against idolatry (v. 14—21).

7. To this division Düsterdieck objects that the terms *exhortation*, *reminding*, &c., are of too superficial a kind to suffice for designating the various portions of the Epistle, and that De Wette is in error in supposing a new train of thought to be begun in ch. iv. 7—21: rather does the leading axiom of ch. ii. 29 proceed through that portion, and in fact even farther than that.

8. His own division, which has been in the main followed in my Commentary, is as follows. Regarding, as the others, ch. i. 1—4 as the Introduction, in which the writer lays down the great object of apostolic preaching, asserts of himself full apostolicity, and announces the purpose of his writing,—he makes *two* great divisions of the Epistles: the first, i. 5—ii. 28, the second, ii. 29—v. 5: on which follows the conclusion, v. 6—21.

9. Each of these great divisions is ruled and pervaded by one master thought, announced clearly in its outset; which we may call its *theme*. These themes are impressed on the readers both by positive and negative unfolding, and by polemical defence against erroneous teachers: and, this being done, each principal portion is concluded with a corresponding promise. And both principal portions tend throughout to throw light on the great subject of the whole, viz. **FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD THE FATHER AND THE LORD JESUS CHRIST.**

10. The theme of the *first* portion is given ch. i. 5, “*God is Light, and in Him is no darkness.*” Consequently, fellowship with Him, on which depends our joy in Christ (i. 3, 4), belongs only to him who walks in light (i. 6). To walk thus in light as God is light (i. 6 ff., ii. 8 ff.), and to flee from darkness, in which there can be no fellowship with God (ii. 11 ff.), forms the first subject of the Apostle’s Exhortation. To this end, after shewing the relation which this proposition, “*God is light,*” has to us in regard of our fellowship with God and with one another through Jesus Christ (i. 6, 7), he unfolds *first positively* (i. 8—ii. 11) *wherein* our walking in light *consists*: viz. in free recognition and humble confession of our own sinfulness: the knowledge and confession of our own darkness being in fact the first breaking in on us of the light, in which we must walk: viz. fellowship with God through Christ, whose blood is to cleanse us from all our sin.

11. This our walking in light, whose first steps are the recognition, confession, and cleansing of sin, further consists in keeping the commandments of God, which are all summed up in one great command-

ment of *Love* (ii. 3—11). Hence only we know that we know God (ii. 3), that we love Him (ii. 5), that we are and abide in Him (ii. 6), in a word that we have fellowship with Him (cf. i. 3, 5 ff.), when we keep His commandments, when we walk (ii. 6, cf. i. 6) as “He,” i. e. Christ, walked.

12. This summing up of all God’s commands in love by the example of Christ as perfect love (Joh^a xiii. 34) brings in the *negative* side of the illustration of the proposition “God is light.” Hate is darkness: is separation from God: is fellowship with the world. So begins then a polemical designation of and warning against the love of and fellowship with the world (ii. 15—17), and against those false teachers (ii. 18—26), who would bring them into this condition: and an exhortation to abide in Christ (ii. 24—28). All this is grounded on the present state and progress of the various classes among them in fellowship with God in Christ (ii. 12—14, 27). See each of these subdivisions more fully specified in the Commentary.

13. The *second* great portion of the Epistle (ii. 29—v. 5) opens, as the other, with the announcement of its theme: “*God is righteous*” (ii. 29), and “he who doeth righteousness, is born of Him.” And as before, “God is Light” made the condition of fellowship with God to be, walking in light as “He” walked in light, so now “God is righteous” makes the condition of “sonship” on our part to be that we be righteous, as “He,” Christ, was holy. And as before also, so now: it must be shewn wherein this righteousness of God’s children consists, in contrast to the unrighteousness of the children of the world and of the devil. And so we have in this second part also a twofold exhortation, a *positive* and a *negative*: the middle point of which is the fundamental axiom “God is righteousness, and therefore we His children must be righteous:” and thus it also serves the purpose of the Epistle announced in i. 3 f. to confirm the readers in fellowship with the Father and the Son, and so to complete their joy: for this fellowship is the state of God’s children.

14. This however, as on the one side it brings in all blessed hope and our glorious inheritance (iii. 2, 3), so on the other it induces the moral necessity of that righteousness on which our fellowship with the Father and the Son, our abiding in Him, rests, grounded on His Love (iii. 8, 9, 10 ff.: iv. 7 ff. &c.). Both sides of the birth from God, that which looks forward and that which looks backward, are treated together by the Apostle. Because we are born of God, not of the world, because we are God’s children, not the devil’s (because we know Him,—because we are of the truth,—because His Spirit is in us,—which are merely parallel enunciations of the same moral fact), therefore we sin not, therefore we practise righteousness, as God our Father is just and holy:

and thus sanctifying ourselves, thus doing righteousness, thus abiding in Him and in His love, as His children, even thus we may comfort ourselves in the blessed hope of God's children to which we are called, even thus we overcome the world.

15. It will be well to examine more in detail the order in which the exhortation proceeds in this second portion of the Epistle.

16. First after the enunciation of the theme in ii. 29, the Apostle takes up the *forward* side of the state of God's children, that hope which is full of promise (iii. 1, 2); then proceeds to the condition of this hope, purifying ourselves even as "He" is pure (iii. 3). This purifying consists in fleeing from sin, which is against God's command (iii. 4), and presupposes abiding in Him who has taken away our sins (iii. 5, 6): the Apostle thus grounding sanctification in its condition, justification.

17. Having laid down (iii. 7) the positive axiom, "*He that doeth righteousness is righteous even as 'He' is righteous,*" he turns to the other and negative side (iii. 8 ff.), contrasting the children of God and the children of the devil. And this leads us to an explanation how the abiding in the love of God necessarily puts itself forth in the love of the brethren (iii. 11.—18). Hate is the sure sign of not being from God (iii. 10); love to the brethren a token of being from Him (iii. 18, 19): and being of the truth (ib.): and is a ground of confidence towards God (iii. 20, 21), and of the certainty of an answer to our prayers (iii. 22).

18. This confidence towards Him is summed up in one central and decisive pledge—the Spirit which He has given us (iii. 24): and thus the Apostle is led on to warn us against false spirits which are not of God (iv. 1 ff.), and to give us a certain test whereby we may know the true from the false. He sets the two in direct opposition (iv. 1—6), and designates the false spirit as that of antichrist: making its main characteristic the denial of Christ having come in the flesh. This he concludes with a formula parallel to that in the first part, iii. 10: "*Hereby know we the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.*"

19. After this (iv. 7 ff.) follows a fuller positive description of that which is born of God. Its very essence is love: for God is Love: Love to God grounded on His previous love to us (iv. 7—21) in sending His Son: love to one another, resting on the same motive, and moreover (v. 1—5) because our brethren, like ourselves, are born of Him. And seeing that our love to God and to one another is grounded on God having given us His Son, we come to this, that faith in the Son of God is the deepest ground and spring of our love in both its aspects: and is the true test of being born of God as distinguished from being of the world (iv. 1—6), the true condition of life (iv. 9: cf. v. 13, i. 3, 4), of

blessed confidence (iv. 14 ff.), of victory over the world (iv. 4, v. 4 f.). And thus the Apostle's exhortation converges gradually to the one point against which the lie of antichrist is directed, viz, true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ manifested in the flesh (v. 5). On this faith rests the righteousness of those who are born of God, as on the other hand the antichristian character of the children of the world consists in the denial of Christ having come in the flesh. For this faith works by righteousness and sanctification, as God the Father, and as the Lord Jesus Christ, is righteous and holy: seeing that we, who are born of and abide in the love with which God in Christ hath first loved us, keep His commandments, viz. to practise love towards God and towards the brethren.

20. So that we see on the one side the simple parallelism of both parts, suggested by the nature of the subject: and on the other, how both parts serve the general purpose of the whole work. The righteousness of those that are born of God, who is righteous, is simply the walking in light as God is light: the keeping God's commandments which all converge into one, the commandment of *love*. And this love has its ground and its source in a right faith in the Son of God manifested in the flesh. On our fellowship therefore with this our Lord, depends our fellowship with the Father and with one another (i. 3, 7, ii. 23, iii. 23, iv. 7 ff.), and consequently our joy (i. 4), our confidence (ii. 28), our hope (iii. 3), our life (iii. 15, v. 13; cf. 1. 2), our victory over the world (ii. 15 ff., iii. 7 ff., v. 5).

21. The CONCLUSION of the Epistle begins with v. 6. It is in two portions, v. 6—12 and v. 13—21. Both of these serve to bring the subject of the whole to its full completion, and, so to speak, to set it at rest. "Jesus is the Son of God." This is the sum and substance of the apostolic testimony and exhortation. In the opening of the Epistle it was rested on the testimony of eye and ear witnesses: now, it is rested on witness no less secure, viz. on the religious life and experience of the readers themselves. Between these two testimonies comes in the Epistle itself with all its teaching, exhortation, and warning. This last testimony that Jesus is the Son of God is threefold: the water of baptism, the blood of reconciliation, the Spirit of sanctification (v. 6—8). These, in threefold unity, form God's own witness for His Son (v. 9). Only in faith on the Son of God (v. 10) do we receive and possess this witness of God, the true substance of which is eternal life, bestowed on us in Christ through water, blood, and the Spirit. So that he that hath the Son hath life.

22. And thus we have reached the true goal of all the Apostle's exhortation: the *ταῦτα ἔγραψα* (v. 13) answering to the *ταῦτα γράφομεν* of i. 4. And it is this—that our fellowship with the Father, and with one another, rests on our fellowship with the Lord Jesus Christ the Son of

God; on which also depends our confidence, our hope, our joy, seeing that we have eternal life in faith in the Son of God. As in ch. iii. 22, so here again, he illustrates this confidence by its exercise with regard to the answer of our prayers. And of this he takes occasion to adduce one particular example, viz. intercession for a sinning brother; and to place it in its true moral light, viz. as then availing when the sin in question has not excluded him totally from the family of life and from holy fellowship with God. Then follow a few solemn sentences, gathering up the whole instruction of the Epistle: the living contrast between the sinner and the child of God: between the family of God and the world: the consciousness on the part of God's children of their standing and dignity in Christ, the true God and life eternal. And he ends by summing up in one word all his warnings against falsehood in doctrine and practice, "*Little children, keep yourselves from idols.*"

23. Such is a free rendering of the account given by Düsterdieck of his division of the Epistle: which, for the reason stated above, I have inserted here almost at length. The points wherein I have differed from it will be easily recognized in the Commentary.

24. It has this decided advantage over the others, that it not only arranges, but accounts for the arrangement given: and without any straining of the material of the Epistle to suit a preconceived view, brings to light its inner structure and parallelisms in a way which leaves on the mind a view of it as an intelligently constructed and interdependent whole.

SECTION VI.

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

1. The questions of language and style, which in other sections of the Prolegomena have required independent treatment, have in this case been already discussed by implication under other heads. Still it will be well to devote a few paragraphs to the separate consideration of these.

2. The style of the Epistle has been often truly described as aphoristic and repetitive. And in this is shewn the characteristic peculiarity of St. John's mode of thought. The connexion of sentence with sentence is slightly, if at all, pointed out. It depends, so to speak, on roots struck in at the bottom of the stream, hidden from the casual observer, to whom the aphorisms appear unconnected, and idly floating on the surface. Lücke well describes this style as indicating a contemplative spirit, which is ever given to pass from the particular to the general, from differences to the unity which underlies them, from the

outer to the inner side of Christian life. Thus the Writer is ever working upon certain fundamental themes and axioms, to which he willingly returns again and again, sometimes unfolding and applying them, sometimes repeating and concentrating them: so that we have side by side the simplest and clearest, and the most condensed and difficult sayings: the reader who seeks merely for edification is attracted by the one, and the "scribe learned in the Scriptures" is satisfied, and his understanding surpassed and deepened by the other.

3. The logical connexion is not as in the Epistles of St. Paul, indicated by the whole superficial aspect of the writing, nor does it bear onward the thoughts till the conclusion is reached. The logic of St. John moves, as Düsterdieck has expressed it, rather in circles than straight onward. The same thought is repeated as seen from different sides: is transformed into cognate thoughts and thus put into new lights, is unfolded into assertion and negation, and the negation again closed up by the repeated assertion (ch. i. 6 f., 8f., ii. 9 f., &c.). Thus there arise numerous smaller groups of ideas, all, so to speak, revolving round some central point, all regarding some principal theme; all serving it, and circumscribed by the same bounding line. Thus the Writer is ever close to his main subject, and is able to be ever reiterating it without any unnatural forcing of his context: the train of thought is ever reverting back to its central point.

4. Now if we regard the actual process of the Epistle with reference to these characteristics, we find that there is one great main idea or theme, which binds together the whole and gives character to its contents and aim; viz. that fellowship with God the Father and our Lord Jesus Christ, in which our joy is complete; in other words, that right faith in the Son of God manifest in the flesh, in which we overcome the world, in which we have confidence in God, and eternal life.

5. This idea, which pervades the whole Epistle, is set forth in two great circles of thought, which have been already described as the two portions of the Epistle. These two, both revolving round the one great theme, are also, in their inner construction, closely related to each other. God is light:—then our fellowship with Him depends on our walking in the light: God is righteous:—then we are only manifested as children of God, abiding in His love and in Himself, if we do righteousness. But for both—our walking in light, and our doing righteousness, there is one common term,—Love: even as God is Love, as Christ walked in Love, out of Love became manifest in the flesh, out of Love gave Himself for us. On the other side,—as the darkness of the world, which can have no fellowship with God, who is Light, denies the Son of God and repudiates Love,—so the unrighteousness of the children of the world manifests itself in that hatred which slays brethren, because love

to brethren cannot be where the love of God in Christ is unknown and eternal Life untasted.

6. Such a style and character of the Epistle, not bound by strict dialectic rules, not hurrying onward to a logical conclusion, but loving to tarry, and to repeat, and to limit itself in smaller circles of thought, shews us the simple heart of a child, or rather the deep spirit of a man who, in the richest significance of the expression, has entered the kingdom of heaven as a little child, and, being blessed in it himself, yearns to introduce his brethren further and further into it, that they may rejoice with him. In his Epistle Christian truth, which is not dialectic only but essentially moral and living, is made to live and move and feel and act. When he speaks of knowledge and faith, it is of a moral existence and possession: it is of love, peace, joy, confidence, eternal life. Fellowship with God and Christ, and fellowship of Christians with one another in faith and love, each of these is personal, real; so to speak, incarnate and embodied.

7. And this is the reason why our Epistle appears on the one hand easy intelligible to the simplest reader, if only his heart has any experience of the truth of Christ's salvation,—and on the other hand unfathomable even to the deepest Christian thinker: but at the same time equally precious and edifying to both classes of readers. It is the most notable example of the foolishness of God putting to shame all the wisdom of the world.

8. But as the matter of our Epistle is rich and sublime, so is it fitted, by its mildness and consolatory character, to attract our hearts. Such is the power of that holy love, so humble and so gentle, which John had learned from Him in whom the Father's love was manifested. He addresses all his readers, young and old, as his little children: he calls them to him, and with him to the Lord: he exhorts them ever as his brothers, as his beloved, to that love which is from God. The Epistle itself is in fact nothing else than an act of this holy love. Hence the loving, attracting tone of the language; hence the friendly character and winning sound of the whole. For the Love which wrote the Epistle is but the echo, out of the heart of a man, and that man an Apostle, of that Love of God which is manifested to us in Christ, that it may lead us to the everlasting Fount of Love, of joy and of life.

9. I may conclude this description, so admirably worked out by Düsterdieck, with the very beautiful words of Ewald, which he also cites: speaking of the "unruffled and heavenly repose" which is the spirit of the Epistle, he says, "it appears to be the tone, not so much of a father talking with his beloved children, as of a glorified saint, speaking to mankind from a higher world. Never in any writing has the doctrine of heavenly Love, of a love working in stillness, a love ever unwearied,

never exhausted, so thoroughly proved and approved itself, as in this Epistle."

SECTION VII.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

1. The Apostle himself has given us an account of the object of his Epistle : *ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη*, ch. i. 4 : and again at the close, v. 13 : *ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ*. In almost the same words does he sum up the main purpose of his Gospel, John xx. 31. He assumes readers who believe on the Son of God : he writes to them to certify them of the truth and reality of the things in which they believe, and to advance them in the carrying out of their practical consequences, in order that they may gain from them confidence, peace, joy, life eternal.

2. This, and no polemical aim, is to be assigned as the main object of the Epistle. As subservient to this main object, comes in the warning against those persons who, by denying that Jesus Christ was come in the flesh, imperilled all these blessed consequences, by seducing men from the faith on which they rested.

3. The fact of these false teachers having come forward in the church was most probably the occasion which suggested the writing of the Epistle. Such seems to be the reference, hinted at in the background by the repeated *οἱ* in ch. ii. 12—14. The previous instruction, settlement, and achievements in the faith of the various classes of his readers, furnished him with a reason for writing to each of them : it being understood, that some circumstances had arisen, which made such writing desirable. And what those circumstances were, is not obscurely pointed at in the verses following, ii. 18—25 : cf. especially ver. 21.

CHAPTER VI.

2 & 3 JOHN.

SECTION I.

AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE question of the authorship of both Epistles is one which will require some discussion. On one point however there never has been the slightest doubt: viz., that both were written by one and the same person. They are, as it has been said, like twin sisters: their style and spirit is the same: their conclusions agree almost word for word. I shall therefore treat of them together in all matters which they have in common.

2. *Were the two Epistles written by the author of the former and larger Epistle?* This has been answered in the affirmative by some critics who do not believe St. John to have written the first Epistle: e. g. by Bretschneider and Paulus. Their arguments for the identity of the writer of the three will serve, for us who believe the apostolicity of the former, a different purpose from that which they intended. But the usual opinion of those who have any doubts on the Authorship has taken a different form. Ascribing the first Epistle to St. John, they have given the two smaller ones to another writer; either to the Presbyter John⁹, or to some other Christian teacher of this name, otherwise unknown to us. Another exception is found to this in the modern critics of the Tübingen school, Baur and Schwegler, whose method of proceeding I have briefly noticed in the Prolegomena to the former Epistle (§ i. par. 29), and need not further characterize.

3. It will now be my object to enumerate the ancient authorities, and to ascertain on which side they preponderate: whether for, or against, the authorship by the Apostle John.

Irenæus, adv. Hær. i. 16. 3, p. 83, says: Ἰωάννης δὲ ὁ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητὴς ἐπέτεινε τὴν καταδίκην αὐτῶν, μηδὲ χαίρειν αὐτοῖς ὑφ' ἡμῶν λέγεσθαι βουληθεῖς· ὁ γὰρ λέγων αὐτοῖς, φησί, χαίρειν, κοινωνεῖ κ.τ.λ. (2 John 10, 11.)

And in iii. 16. 8, p. 207: "Et discipulus ejus Joannes in prædicta epistola fugere eos præcepit dicens Multi seductores," &c.

It is true that in the case of this latter citation Irenæus has fallen into the mistake of supposing it to be taken from the first Epistle: but this very circumstance shews him to have had no suspicion that the two were written by different persons.

4. Clement of Alexandria, in a passage already cited above (ch. v. § i.

⁹ So Erasmus, Grotius, Dodwell, Harenberg, Beck.

par. 5), cites the first Epistle thus, Ἰωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ . . . thereby showing that he knew of more Epistles by that Apostle.

And again in the fragments of the Adumbrations, p. 1001 P., he says, "Secunda Joannis Epistola, quæ ad virgines scripta simplicissima est: scripta vero est ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine, significat autem electionem ecclesiæ sanctæ."

5. Dionysius of Alexandria, in a passage (Eus. H. E. vii. 25) quoted at length below in the Prolegg. to the Apocalypse (§ i. par. 48), noting that John never names himself in his writings, says, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένη Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καίτοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστὶ πρόκειται, ἀλλὰ ἀωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται. Whence it appears that Dionysius found no offence in the appellation ὁ πρεσβύτερος, but rather a trace of St. John's manner not to name himself. No argument can be raised on the expression φερομένη Ἰωάννου, that Dionysius doubted the genuineness of the two Epistles. Eusebius calls the first Epistle τὴν φερομένην Ἰωάννου προτέραν. All we can say of the expression is, that it gives the general sense of tradition.

Alexander of Alexandria cites 2 John 10, 11 with ὡς παρήγγειλεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης. (Socrates, H. E. i. 6.) And the subsequent Alexandrian writers shew no doubt on the subject.

Cyprian, de hæ. baptiz., in Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. iii. p. 1099, in relating the opinions of the various bishops in the council at Carthage, has: "Aurelius a Chullabi dixit: Joannes Apostolus in epistola sua posuit dicens, Si quis ad vos venit," &c. 2 John 10.

He does not in his own writings cite either Epistle, nor does Tertullian. But the above testimony shews that they were received as apostolic and canonical in the North African church.

6. The Muratorian fragment on the canon speaks enigmatically, owing partly to some words in the sentence being corrupt: "Epistola sane Jude et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur et sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta." Routh, Rel. Sacr. i. p. 396.

Lücke, Huther, al., find here a testimony for the Epistles: Düsterdieck on the contrary understands the sentence (reading *ut sapientia*) as meaning that they were not written by John, just as the Wisdom was not written by Solomon.

Most probably the Peschito did not contain either Epistle. Cosmas Indicopleustes (Cent. vi.) says (lib. vii. p. 292, in Migne, Patr., vol. lxxxviii.) that in his time the Syrian church acknowledged but three catholic Epistles, 1 Peter, 1 John, and James. Still Ephrem Syrus quotes the second Epistle, as also 2 Peter (see Prolegg. to 2 Pet. § iv. 13) and Jude: possessing them probably, as he did not understand Greek, in another Syriac version.

7. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 25, reckons both Epistles among the antilego-

mena : saying, τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγόμενων . . . ἡ ὀνομαζομένη δευτέρα καὶ τρίτη Ἰωάννου, εἴτε τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ τυγχάνουσαι, εἴτε καὶ ἑτέρου ὁμωνύμου ἐκείνῳ.

Still, Eusebius's own opinion may be gathered from his *Demonstratio Evangelica*, iii. 5, vol. iv. p. 120, where he says of St. John, ἐν μὲν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ οὐδὲ μνήμην τῆς οἰκίας προσηγορίας ποιείται, ἢ πρεσβύτερον ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει, οὐδαμοῦ δὲ ἀπόστολον οὐδὲ εὐαγγελιστήν. Whence it would appear that he received the two smaller Epistles as genuine.

8. Origen mentions them with a similar expression of doubt (Eus. H. E. vi. 25): καταλέλουπε (Ἰωάννης) δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὴν πάνν ὀλίγων στίχων· ἔστω δὲ καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην· ἐπεὶ οὐ πάντες φασι γνησίους εἶναι ταύτας· πλὴν οὐκ εἰσὶ στίχων ἀμφότεραι ἑκατόν.

9. Theodore of Mopsuestia, if we are thus to interpret Leontius of Byzantium (see above, ch. iii. § i. 11), rejected these in common with the other catholic Epistles.

10. Theodoret makes no mention of them.

11. In a Homily on Matt. xxi. 23 ascribed to Chrysostom, but written probably by some Antiochene contemporary of his, we read τὴν δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην οἱ πατέρες ἀποκαλονίζονται.

12. Jerome (*Vir. Illustr.* c. 9, vol. ii. p. 845) says, “*Scriptis Joannes et unam epistolam, . . . quæ ab universis ecclesiasticis et eruditis viris probatur: reliquæ autem duæ, quarum principium . . . ‘Senior,’ . . . Joannis presbyteri asseruntur, cujus et hodie alterum sepulchrum apud Ephesios ostenditur.*”

13. In the middle ages there seems to have been no doubt on the authenticity of the Epistles, till Erasmus revived the idea of their being the work of John the Presbyter. This view, grounded on the fact that the Writer names himself πρεσβύτερος, has been often maintained since : e. g. by Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, al.

14. If we take into strict account the import of this appellation, it will appear, as Lücke, Huther, and Düsterdieck have maintained, to make rather for than against the authorship by St. John. For in the first place, assuming, which is very doubtful, the existence of such a person as John the Presbyter, this name could only have been given him by those who wished to distinguish him from the Apostle, and would never have been assumed by himself as a personal one, seeing that he bore it in common with many others his co-presbyters.

15. Again, such an appellation is not without example as used of Apostles, and might bear two possible senses, either of which would here be preferable to the one just impugned. In the very fragment of Papias (Eus. H. E. iii. 39), from which the existence of the presbyter John is inferred, he several times uses the term πρεσβύτερος of Apostles and apostolic men as a class. He tells ὅσα παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἔμαθον:

he says that if he met with any one who had conversed with τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, he enquired about τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λόγους. Here it is certain that πρεσβύτερος must not be taken officially, but of priority in time and dignity: it bears that meaning from which its official sense was derived, not that official sense itself¹.

16. And this leads us to the other meaning, that of the old age of the writer². St. Paul in Philem. 9, calls himself Παῦλος ὁ πρεσβύτερος in this sense: and πρεσβύτερος is but another form of the same word, though a form carrying a different possible meaning.

17. It is impossible to decide for which of these reasons the Apostle might choose thus to designate himself, or whether any other existed of which we are not aware. But we may safely say that inasmuch as St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 1), writing to the πρεσβύτεροι, calls himself their συμπρεσβύτερος, there was no reason why St. John might not thus have designated himself. And we may hence lay down that the occurrence of such a word, as pointing out the Writer of these Epistles, is no reason against their having been written by that Apostle.

18. On the whole then we infer from the testimony of the ancient Fathers, and from the absence of sufficient reason for understanding the title πρεσβύτερος, of any other person than the Apostle himself, that these two smaller Epistles were written by St. John the Apostle and Evangelist.

SECTION II.

FOR WHAT READERS WRITTEN.

1. The third Epistle leaves no doubt on this question. It is addressed to one Γάιος (Caius). Whether this Caius is identical with Gaius of Macedonia (Acts xix. 29), with Gaius of Corinth (1 Cor. i. 14; Rom. xvi. 23), or with Gaius of Derbe (Acts xx. 4), it is impossible to say. The name was one of the commonest: and it is possible, as Lücke remarks, that the persons of St. John's period of apostolic work in Asia may have been altogether different from those of St. Paul's period. A Caius is mentioned in the Apostolic Constitutions, vii. 46, Migne, Patr. Gr., vol. i. p. 1052, as bishop of Pergamus: and Mill and Whiston believe this person to be addressed in our Epistle.

¹ Cognate to this sense is that taken by Lyra: "qui tunc regebant ecclesias senes vel seniores dicebantur ratione discretionis vel maturitatis in moribus: inter rectores vero ecclesiarum qui tunc erant in Asia, Joannes erat principalior:" by Bartholomæus Petrus, understanding that John designates himself as Bishop, and Primate of Asia: by Corn.-a-lapide, taking the word as equivalent to Senior, Seigneur, Signore: by Beza, Whitby, Mill, Bertholdt, Baumgarten-Crusius, Lücke, Huther, &c.

² This is taken by Piscator, Erasm.-Schmid, Hermann, G. C. Lange, Wolf, Rosenmüller, Benson, Carpov, Augusti, al. Some of the above, and Aretius and Guericke, unite the two.

2. It is not so plain to whom the *second* Epistle was written. The address is ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς: τὰ τέκνα σου are mentioned in ver. 4: κυρία in the vocative occurs ver. 5: τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς are mentioned as sending greeting, ver. 13.

3. On these data the following doubts arise. Is it an individual lady who is addressed? And if so, is either of the two words a proper name ἐκλεκτή or κυρία, and which? Or is it a church, thus called figuratively? And if so, is it some particular body of Christians, or the Church universal?

4. These questions were variously answered even in ancient times. The Scholiast (ii.) says, ἡ πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν ἢ πρὸς τινα γυναῖκα διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν ἐντολῶν τὴν ἑαυτῆς οἰκίαν οἰκονομοῦσαν πνευματικῶς. We have also in Œcumenius and Theophylact, as a comment on the last verse of the Epistle, βούλονται τινες διὰ τοῦτο βεβαιοῦν ὡς οὐ πρὸς γυναῖκα ἢ ἐπιστολῇ αὐτῇ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐκκλησίαν· περὶ οὗ οὐδὲν τῷ βουλομένῳ διενεχθεῖν. The *individual* hypothesis was held in its various forms by Lyra, Cappellus, Wetstein, Grotius, Middleton (taking Ἐκλεκτή for the proper name); Benson, Heumann, Bengel, G. C. Lange, C. F. Fritzsche, Carpzov, Jachmann, Paulus, De Wette, Lücke, al. (taking Κυρία as the proper name³); by Luther, Piscator, Beza, Aretius, Heidegger, Bart.-Petrus, Corn.-a-lap., Joachim Lange, Wolf, Baumg.-Crusius, Sander, al. (taking neither word as a proper name,—“to the elect woman, a lady”): Corn.-a-lap. giving a tradition that she was named Drusia or Drusiana: Carpzov, a conjecture that she was Martha the sister of Lazarus and Mary. Another conjecture has been, that she was Mary, the mother of our Lord⁴.

5. On the other hand, the *ecclesiastical* hypothesis has been held by Jerome, Ep. 123 ad Ageruchiam, vol. i. p. 909, taking the words as meaning the whole Christian church: so also perhaps Clem.-Alex., as cited above, § i. par. 4. The Scholiast i. in Matthiæ says, ἐκλεκτὴν κυρίαν λέγει τὴν ἐν τινι τόπῳ ἐκκλησίαν, ὡς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλίαν ἀκριβῆ φυλάττουσαν. And so Cassiodorus, Calov., Hammond, Michaelis, Hofmann⁵, Mayer, Huther, al. Some have carried conjecture so far as to designate the particular church; e. g. Serrarius, supposing the Caius of the third Epistle to have belonged to this church, and that it consequently was at Corinth: Whiston, arguing for Philadelphia: Whitby, for Jerusalem, as being κυρία, the mother of all churches: Augusti, for the same, as being κυρία, founded by our Lord Himself.

6. In now proceeding to examine these various opinions, we will first dispose of a grammatical point. It has been insisted by Huther and

³ So too Athanasius apparently, γράφει κυρία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς.

⁴ Kraner, in the Stud. u. Krit. for 1833, part 2, pp. 452 ff.

⁵ Schriftbeweis, i. 301.

others, that were *Κυρία* a proper name, St. John would have written not *ἐκλεκτῇ κυρία*, but *Κυρία τῇ ἐκλεκτῇ*, as *Γαίῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ*, 3 John 1. But this argument seems to me not to hold: and that principally on account of the peculiar nature of the name. *Κυρία*, like *Κύριος*, often in the LXX and N. T., is really an anarthrous appellation, abbreviated from *ἡ κυρία*, as that from *ὁ κύριος*. This being so, it follows, even when used as a proper name, the rules of anarthrous nouns in general. Thus we have 1 Cor. x. 21, *ποτήριον κυρίου, τραπέζης κυρίου*, whereas in 1 Cor. xi. 27. we have *τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ κυρίου, τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου*: cf. also ib. xvi. 19; 2 Cor. iii. 18 bis, and the expression *κύριος παντοκράτωρ*, 2 Cor. vi. 18, whereas when *ὁ θεός* follows it is *κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, Rev. iv. 8, xv. 3 al. So that no argument can be fairly founded on this. If *κυρία* was a proper name, it still retained in the mind of the Writer its power as an anarthrous substantive, and caused the adjective following to drop its distinctive article.

7. In weighing the probability of either hypothesis, the following considerations are of importance. It would seem, as I have remarked in my note in loc., as if the salutation in ver. 13 rather favoured the idea of a church being addressed, because we have no mention there of the elect sister herself, but only of her children. But then we must set against this the fact, that in the process of the Epistle itself, the *κυρία* herself does distinctly appear and is personally addressed. It would be, to say the least, strange, to address the whole church in the one case, and not to send greeting from the whole church in the other.

8. Again, would it have been likely that the salutation should have run *ἀσπάζεται σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου*, if the *κυρία* had been a mere abstraction? Does not this personal address, as well as that in ver. 5, *καὶ νῦν ἐρωτῶ σε, κυρία*, imply personal reality of existence?

9. Let us, again, compare the address of this Epistle with that of the third, confessedly by the same Writer. The one runs *ὁ πρεσβύτερος (Γαίῳ τῷ ἀγαπητῷ) ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*. The other *ὁ πρεσβύτερος (ἐκλεκτῇ κυρία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῆς) οὓς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*. Can any one persuade us that the well-known simplicity of St. John's character and style would allow him thus to write these two addresses, word for word the same, and not to have in the words enclosed in brackets a like reference to existing persons in both cases?

10. Besides, as Lücke has well observed, we are not justified in thus attributing to St. John a mystic and unaccountable mode of expression, not found in any other writer of the apostolic age, nor indeed even in the apocryphal writings which followed it.

11. St. Peter's expression, *ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή*, 1 Pet. v. 13, even if understood of a church, which I have questioned in my note in loc., would not justify a like interpretation of *κυρία* here:

though in the use of ἐκλεκτή the passages are closely connected. If a person be addressed here, it is highly probable that we must understand a person there also: if a church be conceded to be addressed there, we have still the strange and unaccountable κυρία to deal with here⁶.

12. On all these grounds I believe that an individual and not a church is addressed. And if so, first, is *either* of the words ἐκλεκτή or κυρία a proper name? We may safely answer this in the affirmative, on account of the anarthrousness of κυρία and ἐκλεκτῇ in ver. 1, which I submit could only be occasioned by one or other of the words being a proper name.

13. Then if so, *which* of the two words is the proper name? Here again there can be little doubt, if we compare ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία with τῆς ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς. Both sisters were ἐκλεκταί: but both had not the same name. Hence it would appear, unless we are to understand τῆς ἐκλεκτῆς in ver. 13 to be a mere play on the name of the person addressed, that ἐκλεκτή is not the name, but an epithet. And if so, then Κυρία is the name, and ought perhaps to be substituted for the rendering "lady," in the notes. The name is elsewhere found: so in Gruter, inscriptt. p. 1127, No. xi., φένιππος καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ κυρία: and in other examples given by Lücke, p. 351, note 2.

14. This Kyria then appears to have been a Christian matron generally known and beloved among the brethren, having children, some of whom the Apostle had found (at a previous visit to her?) walking in the truth. She had a sister, also a Christian matron, whose children seem to have been with the Apostle when he wrote this Epistle.

15. In the third Epistle, mention is made of Demetrius with praise, and of Diotrephes with blame, as a turbulent person, and a withstander of the Apostle's authority. But it is quite in vain to enquire further into the facts connected with these names. We know nothing of them, and conjectures are idle.

16. Of the occasion and object of these Epistles, it is hardly needful to remark. Both are too plainly declared in the letters themselves, to require further elucidation.

SECTION III.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. It is impossible to lay down either of these with any degree of certainty. From the similarity in style of both Epistles, it is probable

⁶ It appears certain that Clem.-Alex. must have confused the two passages in his memory, when he stated (see above, § i. par. 4) that this Epistle was written "ad quandam Babyloniam Electam nomine."

that the times of writing were not far apart. The journeys mentioned in 2 John 12 and 3 John 10, 14, may be one and the same. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 23, relates that the Apostles, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανοῦ τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς . . ἀπῆει παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ πλησιόχωρα τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὅπου μὲν ἐπισκόπους καταστήσων, ὅπου δὲ ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀρμόσων, ὅπου δὲ κλήρω ἓνα γέ τινα κληρώσων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος σημαινομένων. It may have been in prospect of this journey that he threatens Diotrephes in 2 John 10. If so, both Epistles belong to a very late period of the Apostle's life: and are probably subsequent to the writing of the Apocalypse. See below in the Prolegomena to that book, § ii. par. 7.

2. With regard to the *place* of writing, probability points to Ephesus: especially if we adopt the view suggested by the passage of Eusebius just cited.

CHAPTER VII.

JUDE.

SECTION I.

ITS AUTHORSHIP.

1. THE author of this Epistle calls himself in ver. 1, Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δοῦλος, and ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου. The former of these appellations is never thus barely used, in an address of an epistle, to designate an Apostle. It is true that in Phil. i. 1 we have Παῦλος καὶ Τιμόθεος δούλοι χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ: but a designation common to two persons necessarily sinks to the rank of the inferior one. In every other case where an Apostle names himself δοῦλος, it is in conjunction with ἀπόστολος; see Rom. i. 1; Tit. i. 1; 2 Pet. i. 1⁷. That I see no exception to this in James i. 1, is plain to the readers of my Prolegomena to that Epistle.

2. That an Apostle *may* have thus designated himself, we of course cannot deny; but we deal with analogy and probability in discussing evidence of this kind.

3. The second designation, ἀδελφὸς Ἰακώβου, still further confirms the view that the Writer is not an Apostle. Whoever this Ἰάκωβος may be, it is extremely improbable, that an Apostle of the Lord should have put forward in the opening of an Epistle of solemn warning and exhortation,

⁷ St. Paul in Philem. 1 calls himself merely δέσμιος χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ; but obviously both the name and the circumstances are widely different.

not his exalted commission from Christ himself, but his mere earthly relationship to one who was better known than himself.

4. But this is met by some with the allegation, that we have elsewhere the Apostle Judas called the brother of James, Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13. Even were this so (and it is uncertain whether we are making the right supplement, see note on Matt. x. 2 ff.), that designation must stand on its own independent ground, and being mere matter of conjecture, cannot claim to enter as evidence here. If the considerations arising from this Epistle itself tend to shew that the Jude who wrote it was not an Apostle, then either we must 1) otherwise fill up the ellipsis in that Ἰούδας Ἰακώβου, or 2) leave that difficult appellation in entire uncertainty. From the nature of the case, this must rule that other, not that other, this.

5. The question for us is, How would the probability arise, that any one should call himself "brother of James?" and the reply to this will depend somewhat on the personal dignity of the James here mentioned. If this person be assumed to be the well-known bishop of the church at Jerusalem, then there will be no difficulty in the Writer of this Epistle thus designating himself.

6. And this has been the general supposition. Those who see in that James, the Apostle James, son of Alphæus, regard our Writer as the Apostle Jude, also the son of Alphæus: the "Judas not Iscariot" of John xiv. 22. Those, on the other hand, who see in that James, not one of the Twelve, but the actual (maternal) brother of our Lord, the son of Joseph and Mary, regard our Writer as the Judas of Matt. xiii. 55, another brother of our Lord, and a younger son of Joseph and Mary.

7. The reader will at once gather from what has been said in the Prolegomena to the Epistle of James, that this latter is the view here taken. The other seems to me to be beset with insuperable difficulties: involving us as it does in the wholly unjustifiable hypothesis, that those who are called in Scripture the brethren of our Lord were not his brethren, but his cousins, sons of Alphæus (Clopas).

8. It may be asked, if this Writer were indeed the brother of James, and thus the brother of the Lord Himself, should we not rather expect that he would give himself this high character, stating his relationship to Jesus, rather than that to James? But surely such a question would shew great ignorance of the true spirit of the apostolic writers. It would be the last thing I should expect, to find one of the brethren of the Lord asserting this relationship as a ground of reception for an Epistle. Almost all agree that the Writer of the Epistle of James was the person known as the brother of the Lord. Yet there we have no such designation. It would have been in fact altogether inconsistent with the true spirit of Christ (see Luke xi. 27, 28), and in harmony

with those later and superstitious feelings with which the next and following ages regarded His earthly relatives. Had such a designation as ἀδελφὸς τοῦ κυρίου been found in the address of an Epistle, it would have formed a strong à priori objection to its authenticity.

9. I have before remarked in the Prolegomena to 2 Peter that such expressions as that in our ver. 17, *μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ*, cannot be fairly alleged as evidence of the apostolicity or non-apostolicity of a writer⁸.

10. Of this Judas, one of the Lord's brethren, we know nothing from early ecclesiastical tradition. The only trace of him is found in an interesting story which Eusebius gives from Hegesippus (H. E. iii. 20) of Domitian, in jealousy of the survivors of the family of David, sending for and examining two grandsons of this Judas (ἀπὸ γένους τοῦ κυρίου υἱωνοὶ Ἰούδα, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα λεγομένου αὐτοῦ ἀδελφοῦ), and dismissing them, on finding that they were poor working men, and hearing that the kingdom of Christ which they expected was not to be in this present world.

11. In this defect of our knowledge of the personal history of the Writer, we can only say that he, like his greater brother St. James, did not believe on our Lord during His ministry, but became a convert after the resurrection, and, as in Acts i. 14, consorted usually with the Apostles and followers of Jesus. All else respecting him is left to be gathered from the spirit and style of this Epistle: and will be found treated in the section devoted to that part of our subject.

SECTION II.

AUTHENTICITY.

1. Eusebius reckons our Epistle, as indeed all the Catholic Epistles except 1 John and 1 Peter, among the ἀντιλεγόμενα. Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγόμενων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὁμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα . . . H. E. iii. 25.

And again, H. E. ii. 23, οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἐπτα λεγομένων καθολικῶν ὁμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιουμένας ἐκκλησίαις.

2. Tertullian however cites it as authentic, and attributes it to the apostle Jude: "Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet." . . . De cultu fæmin. i. 3, vol. i. 1308.

3. Clement of Alexandria gives citations from it as from Scripture:

⁸ See above, Prolegg. to 2 Pet. § iv. 22: also the notes, in loc., and on 2 Pet. iii. 2.

ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἵρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκεῖναι . . . (citing our vv. 8, 17) Strom. iii. 2 (11), p. 515 Potter.

And again: εἰδέναι γὰρ ὑμᾶς, φησὶν ὁ Ἰούδας, βούλομαι, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀπαξ ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου τὸν λαὸν σώσας, κ.τ.λ. (ver. 5, 6) Pæd. iii. 8 (44), p. 280 P.

And Eusebius says of Clement, H. E. vi. 14, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι, ξυνελόντα εἰπεῖν, πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποιήται διηγήσεις, μηδὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγόμενας παρελθόν, τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς, τὴν τε Βαρνάβα καὶ τὴν Πέτρου λεγομένην ἀποκάλυψιν.

4. The Muratorian fragment speaks of the Epistle as genuine and canonical: "Epistola sane Judæ, et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur." Routh, Rel. Sacr. i. p. 396.

5. Origen, Comm. on Matt. xiii. 55, tom. x. 17, vol. iii. p. 463, says: Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μὲν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανοῦ χάριτος ἐρῶμένων λόγων, ὅστις ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ εἶρηκεν, Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δούλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώβου.

And again, on Matt. xxii. 23, tom. xvii. 30, p. 814: εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσκοιτις ἐπιστολὴν, ὁράτω τί ἔπεται τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας κ.τ.λ.

And again, on Matt. xviii. 10, tom. xiii. 27, p. 607: καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰούδα ἐπιστολῇ, τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἡγαπημένοις κ.τ.λ.

See also pp. 692 f., where he argues on Jude, ver. 6: and several other places in the Latin remains of his works, cited in Davidson, Introd. vol. iii. p. 498. In two of these latter he calls the Writer of the Epistle "Judas apostolus."

6. Jerome, Catalog. script. eccles. 4, vol. ii. p. 834 f., says: "Judas frater Jacobi parvam quidem quæ de septem catholicis est epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur: tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, ut inter sacras Scripturas computetur."

7. In the older copies of the Peschito the Epistle is wanting: but Ephrem Syrus recognized its authenticity.

8. In later times, the Epistle has been generally received as authentic. The circumstance that the Writer does not call himself an Apostle, has ensured for it a more favourable reception than some other books of the N. T., with those who are fond of questioning the genuineness of the Epistles. Even De Wette thinks there is no reason why we should suspect it to be spurious. He is willing to pass over the phenomena in it which have appeared stumbling-blocks to others: its citation of the book of Enoch, its probable acquaintance with the Epistle to the Romans, its difficult but apparently Greek style.

9. Schwegler, on the other hand, though acknowledging its very simple and undeveloped character in point of doctrine, yet draws from vv. 17, 18 a proof that it belongs to the post-apostolic times. He thinks

that the forger prefixed the name of Jude, brother of James, in order to give his writing the weight of connexion, in point of doctrine and spirit, with this latter great name.

10. But as Huther well remarks, had this been so ;—in other words, for so the hypothesis seems to imply, had the Epistle been written in the interests of Judaizing Christianity against Pauline, we should surely have found more indications of this in it : and as to the superscription we may reply, that a forger would hardly have attributed his composition to a man otherwise so entirely unknown as Jude was

11. The fact that doubts were entertained respecting the authenticity of the Epistle in early times, and that we do not find many traces of its use in the primitive Fathers, may easily be accounted for from its shortness, from its special character, from its presumed reference to apocryphal sources from its apparently not being written by an Apostle.

SECTION III.

FOR WHAT READERS AND WITH WHAT OBJECT WRITTEN.

1. The readers are addressed merely as Christians : perhaps, as De Wette suggests, because the matters mentioned in the Epistle are little to their credit. The evil persons stigmatized in it do not seem to have been heretical teachers, as commonly supposed⁹, but rather *libertines*, practical unbelievers (vv. 4, 8), scoffers (ver. 18), whose pride and wantonness (vv. 8, 10, 12 f.), whose murmuring, and refractory and party spirit (vv. 11, 16, 19), threatened to bring about the destruction of the church. In 2 Peter, as I have already observed above, ch. iv. § iii. 4, these persons are developed into false teachers: one of the circumstances from which I have inferred the posteriority of that Epistle.

2. It is mainly to warn his readers against these, that St. Jude writes the Epistle: “to exhort them that they should contend earnestly for the faith once,” and once for all, “delivered to the saints.”

3. When we come to ask whether the readers formed a circumscribed circle of Christians, and if so, where, we find ourselves left to mere speculation for an answer. There does certainly appear to be a speciality about the circumstances of those addressed, but it is difficult exactly to define it. They seem to have been Jews, from the fact of the altogether Judaic spirit of the Epistle: from its appeal to Jewish traditions, and perhaps to Jewish books. They evidently dwelt among

⁹ Even by Dorner, *Lehre v. der Person Christi* i. 104; and Huther, *Einleit.* § 2.

an abundant and a wicked population, probably of a commercial character. Hence some have thought of Corinth as their abode : some of Egypt, to which land it is said the physical phænomena are suitable (vv. 12 ff.) : some of a commercial city in Syria, seeing that Palestine, where St. Jude dwelt, must at the time of writing the Epistle have been in a state of commotion, to which there is no allusion in it.

SECTION IV.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

1. On the former of these it is impossible to speak with any degree of certainty. Our principal indications are, the state of the church which may be inferred from the Epistle, the apparent use made in it of the apocryphal book of Enoch, and the reference made to the previous teaching of the Apostles.

2. The state of the church indicated is one not far advanced in historical development. Those errors which afterwards expanded into heresies were as yet in their first stage. The evil men were as yet mixed with the church, rocks of danger in their feasts of love. They had not yet been marked off and stigmatized : for this very purpose the Epistle is written, that they might no longer be latent in the bosom of the church. All this points to an early date.

3. The datum furnished by the apparent allusion to the apocryphal book of Enoch, guides us to no certain result. It is even yet matter of uncertainty, when that book was written¹. So that this consideration brings us no nearer to our desired result.

4. The fact that St. Jude (ver. 17) refers his readers to previous teaching by the Apostles, is hardly of more value for our purpose. On the one hand the imperfect tense *ἔλεγον* (ver. 18) seems to speak of the Apostles as if their work was done and they were passed away,—“they used to tell you:” on the other hand, it might fairly be used of men who were dispersed and carrying on their work in other parts. Then again, the language seems necessarily to imply that the readers had for themselves heard the Apostles. No safe inference can be drawn from the words that they were written *after* the apostolic age : nay, the natural inference is rather the other way. They appear to point to a time when the agency of the Apostles themselves had passed away from the readers, but the impress of their warning words had not faded from their memories.

5. Another note of time has been imagined to lie in the circumstance,

¹ See below, § v. par. 8.

that the destruction of Jerusalem is not mentioned in the Epistle. It has been replied, that there was no reason why any allusion should have been made to that event, as the immediate subject before the Writer did not lead him to it. Still I cannot help feeling that the reply is not wholly satisfactory. Considering that St. Jude was writing to Jews, and citing signal instances of divine vengeance, though he may not have been led to mention the judgment of the Flood,—I can hardly conceive that he would have omitted that which uprooted the Jewish people and polity.

6. So that on the whole, as De Wette, himself often sceptical on the question of the genuineness and antiquity of the N. T. writings, confesses, there is no reason why we should place our Epistle later than the limit of the apostolic age. That it was anterior to the second Epistle of Peter, I have already endeavoured to prove (see above, ch. iv. § iii. 3 ff.).

7. Of the place where this Epistle was written, absolutely nothing is known. From its tone and references, we should conjecture that the Writer lived in Palestine: but even thus much must be uncertain.

SECTION V.

ON THE APOCRYPHAL WRITINGS APPARENTLY REFERRED TO IN THIS EPISTLE.

1. In ver. 14 we have a reference to a prophecy of Enoch, the seventh from Adam. This has by many been supposed to indicate an acquaintance on the part of the Writer with the existing apocryphal “book of Enoch.” It becomes desirable therefore that we should briefly put the student in possession of the history and nature of that document. In so doing I shall take my matter partly from Mr. Westcott’s article in Dr. Smith’s Biblical Dictionary, partly from a notice by Prof. Volkmar (see below): to which sources the reader is referred for further details.

2. The book appears to have been known to the early fathers, Justin, Irenæus, Clem. Alex., and Origen, and we have numerous references to it in the “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs.” Tertullian (*de Cult. Fæm.* i. 3, vol. i. p. 1308; a passage well worth the reader’s perusal) quotes it as a book not admitted into the Jewish canon, but profitable, and indeed to be received by Christians on the ground that “*nihil omnino rejiciendum est quod pertineat ad nos*” and that “*legimus, omnem scripturam ædificationi habilem divinitus inspirari*.” Augustine was acquainted with it, as also was an anonymous writer whose work is printed among those of Jerome: but during the middle ages it was known to the Western Church only through the (presumed) quotations in our

Epistle. The Eastern Church possessed considerable fragments of it, incorporated into the *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus (cir. 792).

3. About the close of the last century, the traveller Bruce brought from Abyssinia the Æthiopic translation of the entire book. An English version of this translation was published by Archbishop Lawrence in 1821; and the Æthiopic itself in 1838. Since then a more complete edition has been published in Germany (*Das Buch Henoch*, von Dr. A. Dilmann, Leipzig, 1853), which is now the standard one, and has given rise to the Essays, among others, of Ewald and Hilgenfeld².

4. The Æthiopic version appears to have been made from the Greek; as, though wanting a considerable passage quoted by Syncellus, it yet agrees in the main with the citations found in the early Fathers. But it is probable that the Greek itself is but a version of a Hebrew original. The names of the angels and of the winds betray an Aramaic origin: and a Hebrew book of Enoch was known and used by the Jews as late as the thirteenth century.

5. The book consists of revelations purporting to have been given to Enoch and to Noah: and its object is, to vindicate the ways of Divine Providence: to set forth the terrible retribution reserved for sinners, whether angelic or human: and to "repeat in every form the great principle that the world, natural, moral and spiritual, is under the immediate government of God."

6. "In doctrine," says Mr. Westcott in the article above mentioned, "the book of Enoch exhibits a great advance of thought within the limits of revelation in each of the great divisions of knowledge. The teaching on nature is a curious attempt to reduce the scattered images of the O. T. to a physical system. The view of society and man, of the temporary triumph and final discomfiture of the oppressors of God's people, carries out into elaborate detail the pregnant images of Daniel. The figure of the Messiah is invested with majestic dignity, as 'the Son of God,' 'whose name was named before the sun was made,' and who existed 'aforetime in the presence of God.' And at the same time his human attributes as the 'son of man,' 'the son of woman,' 'the elect one,' 'the righteous one,' 'the anointed,' are brought into conspicuous notice. The mysteries of the spiritual world, the connexion of angels and men, the classes and ministries of the hosts of heaven, the power of Satan, and the legions of darkness, the doctrines of resurrection, retribution, and eternal punishment, are dwelt upon with growing earnestness as the horizon of speculation was extended by intercourse with Greece. But the message of the book is emphatically one of faith and truth: and while the Writer combines and repeats the thoughts of Scripture,

² See however its merits discussed in an article referred to below, par. 8.

he adds no new element to the teaching of the prophets. His errors spring from an undisciplined attempt to explain their words, and from a proud exultation in present success. For the great characteristic by which the book is distinguished from the latter apocalypse of Esdras is the tone of triumphant expectation by which it is pervaded."

7. The date of the book has been matter of great uncertainty. Abp. Lawrence, and Hofmann, suppose it to have been compiled in the reign of Herod the Great: and with this view Gfrörer, Wieseler, and Gieseler agree. Lücke (Einl. in d. Offenb. Joh. pp. 89 ff.) goes very fully into the question, and determines that it consists of an earlier and a later portion: the former written early in the Maccabæan period, the latter in the time of Herod the Great. It is from the former of these that the quotation in our Epistle is taken.

8. But the whole question of the date has been recently discussed by Prof. Volkmar, of Zurich, in the "*Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft*" for 1860. He undertakes to prove the book a production of the time of the sedition of Barchochebas (A.D. cir. 132), and to have been written by one of the followers of Rabbi Akiba, the great upholder of that impostor. And certainly, as far as I can see, his proof seems not easy to overthrow. In that case, as he remarks (p. 991), the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin. But this one point in the progress of his argument seems to me debateable. He assumes that the words cited in our Epistle as a prophecy of Enoch are of necessity taken from the apocryphal book, and regards it as an inevitable sequence, that if the book of Enoch is proved to be of the first half of the second century, the Epistle of Jude must be even later. In order however for this to be accepted, we need one link supplied, which, it seems to me, Prof. Volkmar has not given us. We want it shewn, that the passage cited is so interwoven into the apocryphal book as necessarily to form a part of it, and that it may not itself have been taken from primitive tradition, or even from the report of that tradition contained in our Epistle.

9. The account of the matter hence deduced would be, that the book, in its original groundwork, is of purely Jewish origin, but that it has received Christian interpolations and additions. "It may be regarded," remarks Mr. Westcott, "as describing an important phase of Jewish opinion shortly before the coming of Christ." If we accept the later date, this must of course be modified accordingly.

There never has been in the church the slightest doubt of the apocryphal character of the book of Enoch. The sole maintainer of its authority seems to have been Tertullian³: it is plainly described as apocryphal

³ l. c. above; cf. also de Idololatr. c. 4, vol. i. p. 665, where, after quoting the second commandment, he adds, "Antecesserat prædicens Enoch . . .:" and id. c. 15, p. 684,

by Origen⁴, Augustine⁵, and Jerome⁶, and is enumerated among the apocryphal books in the Apostolical Constitutions (vi. 16, Migne Patr. Gr. vol. i. p. 953)⁷.

10. The other passage in our Epistle which has been supposed to come from an apocryphal source, viz. the reference to the dispute between the archangel Michael and the devil concerning the body of Moses (ver. 9), has been discussed in the notes ad loc., and held more likely to have been a fragment of primitive tradition.

11. But it yet remains, that something should be said concerning the fall of the angels spoken of vv. 6, 7. In the notes on those verses, I have mentioned the probability, in my view, that the narrative in Gen. vi. 2 is alluded to. This impression has been since then much strengthened by a very able polemical tract by Dr. Kurtz, the author of the "*Geschichte des alten Bundes*," in which he has maintained against Hengstenberg the view taken by himself in that work. It seems to me that Dr. Kurtz has gone far to decide the interpretation as against any reference of Gen. vi. 2 to the Sethites, or of our vv. 6, 7 to the fall of the devil and his angels. The exegesis of Hengstenberg and those who think with him depends on the spiritual acceptation, in this case, of the word *ἐκπορνεύσασαι*, which Kurtz completely disproves. The facts of the history of the catastrophe of the cities of the plain render it quite out of the question: and LXX usage, which Hengstenberg cites as decisive on his side, is really against him⁸. And this point being disposed of,

"Hæc igitur ab initio prævidens spiritus sanctus . . . præcinit per antiquissimum prophetam Enoch." In Apolog. c. 22 (vol. i. p. 405; but the reference may be to the citation by St. Jude, not to the original from which it was taken) he speaks even more definitely, apparently numbering the book among the *litteræ sanctæ*.

⁴ Cont. Cels. v. 54; vol. i. p. 619: ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἐνώχ γεγραμμένων, ἅτινα οὐδ' αὐτὰ φαίνεται ἀναγνοῦς, οὐδὲ γνωρίσας ὅτι ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις οὐ πᾶν φέρεται ὡς θεῖα τὰ ἐπιγεγραμμένα τοῦ Ἐνῶχ βιβλία. Cf. also Hom. xxviii. in Numeros, § 2, vol. ii. p. 384: and Spencer's note on l. c.

⁵ De Civ. Dei, xv. 23. 4, vol. vii. p. 470: "Omittamus igitur earum scripturarum fabulas, quæ apocryphæ nuncupantur, eo quod earum occulta origo non claruit patribus, a quibus usque ad nos auctoritas veterum Scripturarum certissima et notissima successione pervenit. . . . Scripsisse quidem nonnulla divina Enoch illum septimum ab Adam negare non possumus, cum hoc in epistola canonica Judas apostolus dicat. Sed non frustra non sunt in eo canonice Scripturarum qui servabatur in templo Hebræi populi succedentium diligentia sacerdotum, nisi quia ob antiquitatem suspectæ fidei judicata sunt, nec utrum hæc essent quæ ille scripsisset, poterat inveniri, non talibus proferentibus, qui ea per seriem successionis reperientur rite servasse."

⁶ In the catalogue of ecclesiastical writers: see the passage cited above, § ii. par. 6.

⁷ For more, and very interesting information on the book of Enoch, see the article of Volkmar's above alluded to.

⁸ He alleges that Gen. xxxviii. 24 is the only place where *ἐκπορνεύειν* is used of carnal fornication: whereas there are at least six other places, viz. Lev. xxi. 9; xix. 29 (bis); Num. xxv. 1; Deut. xxii. 21; Ezek. xvi. 33. See these discussed, and the meaning established, in Kurtz, Die Söhne Gottes, u. s. w. p. 47.

the whole fabric falls with it: Hengstenberg himself confessing that *τούτοις*, in ver. 7, must refer to *ἄγγελοι* above.

12. That the particulars related in 2 Pet. and our Epistle of the fallen angels are found also in the book of Enoch⁹, is again no proof that the Writers of these Epistles took them from that book. Three other solutions are possible: 1, that the apocryphal Writer took them from our Epistles: 2, that their source in each case was ancient tradition: 3, that the book of Enoch itself consists of separate portions written at different times.

CHAPTER VIII.

REVELATION.

SECTION I.

AUTHORSHIP, AND CANONICITY.

1. THE Author of this book calls himself in more places than one by the name John, ch. i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8. The general view has been, that this name represents St. John the son of Zebedee, the Writer of the Gospel and the three Epistles, the disciple whom Jesus loved.

2. This view rests on external, and on internal evidence. I shall first specify both these, and then pass on to other views respecting the authorship. And in so doing, I shall at present cite merely those testimonies which bear more or less directly on the *authorship*. The most ancient are the following:

3. Justin Martyr, Dial. 81, p. 179 (written between A.D. 139 and 161):
καὶ . . . παρ' ἡμῖν ἀνὴρ τις, ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωάννης, εἰς τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ
χριστοῦ, ἐν ἀποκαλύψει γενομένη αὐτῷ χίλια ἔτη ποιήσῃ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ
τοὺς τῷ ἡμετέρῳ χριστῷ πιστεύσαντας προεφήτευσε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν
καθολικὴν καὶ συνελόντι φάναι αἰώνιον ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἅμα πάντων ἀνάστασιν
γενήσεσθαι καὶ κρίσιν.

We may mention by the way, that this testimony of Justin is doubly important, as referred to by Eusebius, himself no believer in the apostolic authorship: H. E. iv. 18: μέμνηται δὲ καὶ τῆς Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως σαφῶς τοῦ ἀποστόλου αὐτὴν εἶναι λέγων.

The authenticity and value of the passage of Justin has been discussed at considerable length and with much candour by Lücke, Einl.

⁹ Cf. Kurtz, *ibid.* pp. 51, 52.

pp. 548—56. He, himself a disbeliever in St. John's authorship, confesses that it is a genuine and decided testimony in its favour.

4. Melito, bishop of Sardis (+ cir. 171), is said by Euseb. H. E. iv. 26, to have written treatises (or a treatise, but the plural is more likely : and so Jer. Catal. 24, vol. ii. p. 867 : “*de diabolo librum unum, de Apocalypsi Joannis librum unum*”) on the devil, and on the Apocalypse of John : *καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῦ διαβόλου, καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου*. It is fairly reasoned that Eusebius would hardly have failed to notice, supposing him to have seen Melito's work, any view of his which doubted the apostolic origin : and that this may therefore be legitimately taken as an indirect testimony in its favour. See Lücke, p. 564 ; Stuart, p. 258 ; Davidson, Introd. iii. 540.

5. Of a similar indirect nature are the two next testimonies. Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (+ cir. 180), whose *Libri ad Autolyceum* are still extant, is said by Euseb. iv. 24 to have written a book *πρὸς τὴν αἵρεσιν Ἑρμογένους τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχον, ἐν ᾗ ἐκ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰωάννου κέχρηται μαρτυρίαις*.

6. And similarly Eusebius, H. E. v. 18, says of Apollonius (of Ephesus ? so in the treatise *Prædestinatus*, cent. v. : see Lücke, p. 567), who flourished in Asia Minor at the end of cent. ii., and wrote *against* the Montanists, thereby making his testimony more important : *κέχρηται δὲ καὶ μαρτυρίαις ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωάννου ἀποκαλύψεως καὶ νεκρὸν δὲ δυνάμει θείᾳ πρὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν τῇ Ἐφέσῳ ἐγγεῖρθαι ἱστορεῖ*. From this latter sentence there can be no doubt that Apollonius regarded the Apocalypse as the work of John the Apostle.

7. We now come to the principal second century witness, Irenæus (+ cir. 180). Respecting the value of his testimony, it may suffice to remind the student that he had been a hearer of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John. And this testimony occurs up and down his writings in great abundance, and in the most decisive terms. “*Joannes domini discipulus*” is stated to have written the Apocalypse in Hær. iv. 20. 11 ; 30. 4 ; v. 26. 1 ; 35. 2, pp. 256, 268, 323, 336 : and “*Joannes*” in iv. 21. 3 ; v. 36. 3, pp. 258, 337. And this John can be no other than the Apostle : for he says, iii. 1. 1, p. 174, *Ἰωάννης ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου* (in the Latin, as above) *ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ ἀναπεσὼν, καὶ αὐτὸς ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἐν Ἐφέσῳ τῆς Ἀσίας διατρίβων*. But the most remarkable testimony, and one which will come before us again and again during the course of these Prolegomena, is in v. 30. 1—3, pp. 328 ff. There, having given certain reasons for the number of Antichrist's name being 666, he proceeds, *τούτων δὲ οὕτως ἐχόντων, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς σπουδαίοις καὶ ἀρχαίοις ἀντιγράφοις τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τούτου κειμένων, καὶ μαρτυρούντων αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατ' ὄψιν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐωρακότων*. . . . Then, after some remarks, and stating two names current as suiting the number, he concludes, *ἡμεῖς*

οὖν οὐκ ἀποκινδυνεύομεν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ ἀντιχριστοῦ, ἀποφαινόμενοι βεβαιωτικῶς· εἰ γὰρ ἔδει ἀναφανδὸν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ κηρύττεσθαι τοῦτομα αὐτοῦ δι' ἐκείνου ἃν ἐρρέθη τοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακός. οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς.

This is beyond question the most important evidence which has yet come before us. And we may observe that it is in no way affected by any opinion which we may have formed respecting Irenæus's exegetical merits, nor by any of his peculiar opinions. He here merely asserts what, if he were a man of ordinary power of collecting and retaining facts, he must very well have known for certain.

8. Keeping at present to the direct witnesses for the authorship by St. John, we next come to Tertullian (+ cir. 220). His testimonies are many and decisive.

Adv. Marcion. iii. 14, vol. ii. p. 340: "Nam et apostolus Johannes in apocalypsi ensem describit ex ore Domini prodeuntem. . . ."

Ib. 24, p. 356: "Hanc (cœlestem civitatem) et Ezekiel novit, et apostolus Joannes vidit."

De Pudicitia 19, p. 1017: "Sed quoniam usque de Paulo, quando etiam Joannes nescio quid diversæ parti supplaudere videatur, quasi in apocalypsi manifeste fornicationi posuerit pœnitentiæ auxilium, ubi ad angelum Thyatirenorum," &c.

See also de Resurr. 27, p. 834; de Anima, 8, p. 658; adv. Judæos, 9, p. 620; de Cor. Militis, 13, p. 96; adv. Gnosticos, 12, p. 147.

9. The fragment on the Canon called by the name of Muratori, and written cir. 200, says, "et Joannes enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit . . .," where the context shews that the Apostle John must be intended.

10. Hippolytus, bishop of Ostia (Portus Romanus), cir. 240, in his writings very frequently quotes the Apocalypse, and almost always with Ἰωάννης λέγει. Whom he meant by Ἰωάννης is evident from one passage, De antichristo, c. 36, Migne, Patr. Gr., vol. x. p. 756: λέγε μοι, μακάριε Ἰωάννη, ἀπόστολε καὶ μαθητὰ τοῦ κυρίου, τί εἶδες καὶ ἤκουσας περὶ Βαβυλῶνος. And then he proceeds to quote ch. xvii. 1—18. Multitudes of other citations will be found by consulting the index to Lagarde's edition¹. And one of his principal works, as specified in the catalogue found inscribed on his statue, was ἀπολογία (or τὰ, for the word has become obliterated, only Α being now legible) ὑπὲρ τοῦ κατὰ Ἰωάννην εὐαγγελίου καὶ ἀποκαλύψεως: mentioned also by Jerome, Catal. 61, vol. ii. p. 901.

11. Clement of Alexandria (cir. 200), in his Strom. vi. 13 (106), p.

¹ See also his lately-discovered Refutatio omnium hæresium, lib. vii. § 36, p. 408, ed. Duncker.

793 P., says of the faithful presbyter, οὗτος πρεσβύτερος . . . ἐν τοῖς εἰκοσι καὶ τέσσαρσι καθεδεῖται θρόνοις, ὡς φησιν ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει Ἰωάννης. And elsewhere he fixes this name as meaning the Apostle, by saying in his *Quis dives salv.* § 42, p. 959: ἄκουσον μῦθον, οὐ μῦθον ἀλλ' ὄντα λόγον, περὶ Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου παραδεδομένον . . . ἐπεὶ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐφεσον. . . : and then he proceeds to tell the well-known story of St. John and the young robber.

12. Origen, the scholar of Clement (+ cir. 233), who so diligently enquired into and reported any doubts or disputes about the canonicity and genuineness of the books of the N. T., appears not to have known of any which regarded the Apocalypse. In a passage of his Commentary on St. Matt. preserved by Euseb. H. E. vi. 25, he says, τί δέι περὶ τοῦ ἀναπεσόντος λέγειν ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, Ἰωάννου, ὃς εὐαγγέλιον ἐν καταλέλοιπεν, ὁμολογῶν δύνασθαι τοσαῦτα ποιήσῃν ἃ οὐδὲ ὁ κόσμος χωρῆσαι ἐδύνατο; ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν, κελευσθεὶς σιωπῆσαι καὶ μὴ γράφαι τὰς τῶν ἐπὶ τὰ βροντῶν φωνάς.

We have also this remarkable testimony in his Commentary on Matt. tom. xvi. 6, vol. v. p. 719 f.: καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐβαπτίσθησαν οἱ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου υἱοί, ἐπεὶ περ Ἡρώδης μὲν ἀπέκτεινεν Ἰάκωβον τὸν Ἰωάννου μαχαίρᾳ, ὁ δὲ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς, ὡς ἡ παράδοσις διδάσκει, κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νήσον. διδάσκει δὲ τὰ περὶ τοῦ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννης, μὴ λέγων τίς αὐτὸν κατεδίκασε, φάσκων ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει ταῦτα, Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης . . . τοῦ θεοῦ (Rev. i. 9), καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. καὶ ἔοικε τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τεθεωρηκέναι.

And Origen again repeatedly cites the Apocalypse without the least indication of doubt as to its author: as may be seen by consulting any of the indices to the editions. His procedure in this case forms a striking contrast to that in the case of the Epistle to the Hebrews: see Prolegg. to this vol. ch. i. § i. 16—23.

13. Still keeping to those Fathers who give definite testimony as to the *authorship*, we come to Victorinus, bishop of Pettau in Pannonia, who suffered martyrdom under Diocletian in 303. His is the earliest extant commentary on the Apocalypse. On ch. x. 4, he says (see Migne, *Patr. Lat.*, vol. v. p. 333), “Sed quia dicit se scripturum fuisse (Joannes) quanta locuta fuissent tonitrua, id est, quæcunque in veteri testamento erant obscura prædicata, vetatur ea scribere sed relinquere ea signata, quia est Apostolus. . . .”

And afterwards, on “oportet autem te iterum prophetare,” “Hoc est, propterea quod quando hæc Joannes vidit, erat in insula Pathmos, in metallo damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare. Ibi ergo vidit Apocalypsin: et cum jam senior putaret se per passionem accepturum receptionem, interfecto Domitiano omnia judicia ejus soluta sunt, et Joannes de metallo

dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Deo Apocalypsin."

14. Ephrem Syrus (+ cir. 378), the greatest Father in the Syrian church, repeatedly in his numerous writings cites the Apocalypse as canonical, and ascribes it to John: see the reff. in Stuart's Introduction, p. 271. In the Greek translation of his works, we read in the second Homily on the Second Advent of the Lord, *καθὼς ἀκούομεν τοῦ ἀποστόλου λέγοντος*, and then he quotes Rev. xxi. 4, 5: vol. ii. p. 248, ed. Assem. See Lücke, Einl. p. 598, note.

Now these citations are the more remarkable, because the old Syriac or Peschito version does not contain the Apocalypse: as neither indeed apparently did the later or Philoxenian version originally, nor its republication by Thomas of Harkel (see Lücke, p. 598). It may fairly be asked then, How came Ephrem by his Syriac version of the Apocalypse (for he seems not to have been acquainted with Greek)? And, How came the Peschito to want the Apocalypse, if it was held to be written by the Apostle?

15. It would exceed the limits of these Prolegomena to enter into the answers to these questions, which have been variously given: by Hug and Thiersch, that the Peschito originally contained the book, and that it only became excluded in the fourth century through the influence of the schools of Antioch and Nisibis: by Walton and Wichelhaus, that the Peschito was made in the first century, when as yet the Apocalypse had not won its way among the canonical books: by Hengstenberg, that the Peschito was not made till the end of the third century, after the objections against the apostolicity of the book had been raised by Dionysius of Alexandria².

16. These answers are all discussed by Lücke, Einl. pp. 597—605, and severally rejected. His own solution is by no means satisfactory as to the former of the two questions,—how Ephrem came by his Syriac version. The latter he answers by postponing the date of the reception of the Apocalypse into the canon till after the publication of the Peschito, i. e. as now generally acknowledged, the end of the second century.

17. Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis in Cyprus at the end of the fourth century, cites the Apocalypse as written by the Apostle. In combating the Alogi, who rejected the gospel of John and the Apocalypse, he speaks much and warmly of that book, and says among other things (Hær. li. 35, p. 457), *οἱ τε ἅγιοι προφῆται καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι ἀπόστολοι, ἐν οἷς καὶ ὁ ἅγιος Ἰωάννης διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν καὶ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἐκ τοῦ αὐτοῦ χαρίσματος τοῦ ἁγίου μεταδέδωκε*: and ib. 32, p. 455,

² See below, parr. 47 ff.

having cited 1 Cor. xv. 52, he proceeds, *συνέδοντας τοίνυν τοῦ ἀποστόλου τῷ ἀγίῳ ἀποστόλῳ Ἰωάννῃ ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει, ποία τις ὑπολείπεται ἀντιλογία;*

18. Basil the Great (+ 378), *adv. Eunomium* ii. 14, vol. i. p. 249, says, *τὰ παρὰ τοῦ ἀγίου πνεύματος διὰ τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου λαληθέντα ἡμῖν, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος κ.τ.λ.*, and afterwards, *ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐν ἐτέρῳ λόγῳ, τοῦ τοιούτου ἦν τὸ σημαινόμενον ἔδειξεν, εἰπὼν, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ*, Rev. i. 8.

19. Hilary of Poitiers (+ 368), in his Prologue to the Psalms, says (c. 6, vol. i. p. 5), "*ita beati Johannis Apocalypsi docemur: et angelo Philadelphie Ecclesie scribe.*" So also in his *Enarratio* in Ps. i. 12, p. 26, "*sanctus Joannes in Apocalypsi testatur, dicens*, Rev. xxii. 2." Stuart cites from p. 891 of the Paris edn. of 1693,—"et ex familiaritate Domini revelatione celestium mysteriorum dignus Johannes³."

20. Athanasius (+ 373) in his *Orat. i. contra Arianos*, § i. 11, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 327, cites John i. 1, and then says, *καὶ ἐν ἀποκαλύψει τάδε λέγει, ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος*.

21. Gregory of Nyssa, brother of Basil the Great (+ 395), in his discourse, "*In suam ordinationem*," vol. iii. p. 546, Migne, says, *ἤκουσα τοῦ εὐαγγελιστοῦ Ἰωάννου ἐν ἀποκρύφους πρὸς τοὺς τοιούτους δι' αἰνίγματος λέγοντος ὡς δεὸν ἀκριβῶς ζέειν μὲν πάντως τῷ πνεύματι, κατεψύχθαι δὲ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ: ὄφελον γὰρ ἡσθᾶ φησι ψυχρὸς ἢ ζεστός, κ.τ.λ.* Rev. iii. 15. Of course this cannot mean that the Revelation is what we now commonly know as an apocryphal book, or, as Lücke remarks, the sentence would contradict itself: but *ἀποκρυφα* here is equivalent to *μυστικά* or *προφητικά*: in the same way as Dion. Areop. *De Eccl. Hierarch.* iii. 4, vol. i. p. 287, calls the book *τὴν κρυφίαν καὶ μυστικὴν ἐποψίαν τοῦ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ θεσπεσίου*.

22. Didymus (+ 394) in his *Enarr. in Epist. i. Joann.* iv. 1, 2, p. 1795, says, "*Et in apocalypsi frequenter Joannes (the writer of the Epistle) propheta vocatur.*"

23. Ambrose (+ 397) constantly cites the Apocalypse as the work of the Apostle John: e. g. *De virginitate* 14 (86), vol. iii. p. 234: "*Quomodo igitur adscendamus ad cœlum, docet Evangelista qui dicit Et duxit me Spiritus in montem magnum, &c.*" Rev. xxi. 10: and *De Spiritu Sancto* iii. 20 (153), p. 697, "*Sic enim habes, dicente Johanne evangelista Et ostendit mihi flumen aquæ vivæ, &c.*" Rev. xxii. 1 ff.

24. Augustine (+ 430) uses every where the Apocalypse as a genuine production of the Apostle and Evangelist John. Thus we have, *Ep. lv. (cxix.)* 6 (10), vol. ii. p. 209, "*Joannes apostolus in apocalypsi:*" *De Civ. Dei* xx. 7. 1, vol. vii. p. 666, "*Joannes Evangelista in libro qui dicitur apocalypsis.*" In *Joan. Tract. xxxvi.* 5, vol. iii.

³ I have sought in vain for this citation in the Paris edition of 1631, and in its index and have not access to the edn. of 1693.

p. 1665,—“in Apocalypsi ipsius Joannis cujus est hoc evangelium :” see also Tract. xiii. 2, p. 1493 ; De peccat. mer. ii. 7 (8), vol. x. p. 156 ; de Trinit. ii. 6 (11), vol. viii. p. 852, &c.⁴

25. Jerome (+ 420), adv. Jovin. i. 26, vol. ii. p. 280, speaks of the Apostle John as also being a prophet, “vidit enim in Pathmos insula, in qua fuerat, a Domitiano principe ob Domini martyrium relegatus, apocalypsin, infinita futurorum mysteria continentem.” And then follows, as also in his Catal. 9, vol. ii. p. 845, see below, § ii. par. 12, Irenæus’s account of the place and time of writing the book.

We shall have to adduce Jerome again in treating of the canonicity. And now that we have arrived at the beginning of the fifth century, the latter question becomes historically the more important of the two, and indeed the two are henceforth hardly capable of being treated apart.

26. Before we pass to the testimonies *against* the authorship by the Apostle and Evangelist St. John, let us briefly review the course of evidence which we have adduced in its favour. It will be very instructive to compare its character with that of the evidence for the Pauline authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as collected in the Prolegomena to that Epistle.

27. There we found that, while there prevailed in the great majority of the more ancient Fathers a habit, when they are speaking loosely, or ad populum, of citing the Epistle as the work of St. Paul,—on the one hand, all attempts fail to discover any general ecclesiastical tradition to this effect : and on the other, the greatest and ablest of these writers themselves, when speaking guardedly, throw doubt on the Pauline authorship, while some of them set it aside altogether. In course of time, we there also found, the habit of citing the Epistle as St. Paul’s became more general : then sprung up assertion, more and more strong, that it veritably was his : till at last it was made an article of faith to believe it to be so. So that the history of opinion in that case may be described as the gradual growing up of a belief which was entirely void of general reception in the ancient church.

28. We are not yet prepared to enter on the whole of the corresponding history of opinion in this case : but as far as we have gone, it may be described as the very converse of the other. The apostolic authorship rests on the firmest traditional ground. We have it assured to us by one who had companied with men that had known St. John himself : we have it held in continuous succession by Fathers in all

⁴ It hardly appears fair in Lücke to lay a stress on such expressions as this “ipsius Joannis cujus est,” as implying that Augustine thought it necessary to protest by implication against the opposite view. There is nothing in the expression which he might not very well have said in speaking of the Acts as related to the Gospel of St. Luke : in which case there was no doubt.

parts of the church. Nowhere, in primitive times, does there appear any counter-tradition on the subject. We have nothing corresponding to the plain testimonies of Tertullian in favour of Barnabas, or of Origen that there was an *ιστορία* come down that Clement of Rome or St. Luke had written the Epistle. In subsequent paragraphs we shall see how variation of opinion was first introduced, and why.

29. But before doing so, it will be well to complete this portion of our enquiry, by mentioning those early writings and Fathers which, though they do not expressly state who was the author of the book, yet cite it as canonical, or at all events shew that they were acquainted with and approved it.

30. Among these the very earliest have been matter of considerable question. The supposed allusions in Polycarp, for instance, though strongly maintained by Hengstenberg, are really so faint and distant, that none but an advocate would ever have perceived them. Such are, e. g. the expression in Polyc. ad Phil. c. 1, p. 1005, Μιγε, ἔλεος ὑμῖν κ. εἰρήνη παρὰ θεοῦ παντοκράτορος, seeing that ὁ παντοκράτωρ is as a N. T. word confined to the Apocalypse, being in 2 Cor. vi. 18 cited from the O. T.:—in p. 1012, c. 8, μιμηταὶ οὖν γενώμεθα τῆς ὑπομονῆς αὐτοῦ, because in Rev. we find ἡ ὑπομονὴ [Ἰησοῦ], (i. 9, rec.) iii. 10. But so do we in 2 Thess. iii. 5: indeed it need not be an allusion at all, being a very obvious expression. And Hengstenberg's next instance, which he calls as good as an express citation of the Apocalypse as an inspired writing, c. 6, p. 1012, οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης εὐλαβείας, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο, καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελιστάμενοι ὑμᾶς ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, is in reality no instance at all, the citation being from Heb. xii. 28, and the following words being just as applicable to St. James and St. Jude, as to St. John. Nay, Hengstenberg's argument has two edges: for if the allusion here be to the Apocalypse, then we have a most important early witness to its not having been written by an Apostle.

31. The passages which Hengstenberg brings from the Epistle of the Church of Smyrna on the martyrdom of Polycarp, are even more uncertain and far-fetched⁵. Such advocacy is much to be lamented: it tends to weaken instead of strengthening the real evidence.

⁵ They are these: in c. 2, p. 1032, Migne, we read, προσέχοντες τῇ τοῦ χριστοῦ χάριτι τῶν κοσμικῶν κατεφρόνουν βασάνων, διὰ μιᾶς ὥρας τὴν αἰώνιον κόλασιν ἐξαγοραζόμενοι καὶ τὸ πῦρ ἢν αὐτοῖς ψυχρόν, τὸ τῶν ἀπηνῶν βασανιστῶν, πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν γὰρ εἶχον φνγεῖν τὸ αἰώνιον καὶ μηδέποτε σβεννύμενον πῦρ, supposed to be an allusion to Rev. xiv. 9—11. But why not to Mark ix. 44 ff. and parallels? In c. 17, p. 1041, ὁ δὲ ἀντίζηλος καὶ βάσκανος καὶ πονηρός, ὁ ἀντικείμενος τῷ γένει τῶν δικαίων, ἰδὼν τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ τῆς μαρτυρίας, καὶ τὴν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀνεπίληπτον πολιτείαν, ἐστεφανωμένον τε τῷ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας στεφάνῳ . . ., supposed to refer to Rev. ii. 10, but why not to 1 Cor. ix. 25? There *might* be a reference, which H. has not noticed, in ὁ ἀντικείμενος

32. The next testimony produced is however of a very different kind. It is that of Papias, of whom Iren., *Hær.* v. 33. 4, p. 333, in adducing the traditional words of our Lord respecting the millennial abundance of the earth, says, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Παπίας Ἰωάννου μὲν ἀκουστής, Πολυκάρπου δὲ ἐταῖρος γεγωνός, ἀρχαῖος ἀνὴρ, ἐγγράφως ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ ἐν τῇ τετάρτῃ τῶν αὐτοῦ βιβλίων· ἔστι γὰρ αὐτῷ πέντε βιβλία συντεταγμένα. It is well known that Eusebius, in his famous chapter, *H. E.* iii. 39, attempts to set aside this Ἰωάννου ἀκουστής by citing from Papias himself his assertion that he set down in his work what he had heard as the sayings of the Apostles, naming St. John among them. But there is nothing to prevent his having united both characters,—that of a hearer, and that of a collector of sayings: and Irenæus, the scholar of Polycarp, is hardly likely to have been mistaken on such a point. Now regarding Papias, as a witness for the Apocalypse, we have a scholium of Andreas, of Cappadocia, at the end of the fifth century (see Lücke, p. 525 note), printed in substance in Cramer's *Catena*, p. 176, at the beginning of the commentaries on the Apocalypse: περὶ μὲν τοῦ θεοπνεύστου τῆς βίβλου περιττὸν μὴ κύνειν τὸν λόγον ἡγοούμεθα, τῶν μακαρίων Γρηγορίου φημὶ τοῦ Θεολόγου καὶ Κυρίλλου, προσέτι τε καὶ τῶν ἀρχαιοτέρων Παππίου, Εἰρηναίου, Μεθοδίου καὶ Ἰππολύτου ταύτῃ προσμαρτυρούντων τὸ ἀξιόπιστον· παρ' ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πολλὰς λαβόντες ἀφορμὰς εἰς τοῦτο ἐληλύθαμεν, καθὼς ἐν τισὶ τόποις χρήσεις τούτων παρεθέμεθα. And accordingly, on *Rev.* xii. 7—9, he expressly cites Papias's work: Παππίας δὲ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως⁶, κ.τ.λ.

33. There seems to be ample proof here that Papias did maintain, as from what we otherwise know we should expect, the inspiration, i. e. the canonicity of the book. All that has been argued on the other side seems to me to fail to obviate the fact, or to weaken the great importance of this early testimony. See the whole discussed at length in Stuart, pp. 250—254: Lücke, pp. 524—546: Hengstenberg, pp. 101—116. I may be permitted to say, that both the last-mentioned Commentators have suffered themselves to be blinded as to the real worth of the evidence by their zeal to serve each his own hypothesis.

34. The Epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne to the churches of Asia and Phrygia concerning the persecution which befell them under Marcus Aurelius, A.D. 177, is preserved by Eusebius, *H. E.* v. 1, 2. The citations in it from the Apocalypse are unmistakable. In speak-

τῷ γένει τῶν δικαίων, to *Rev.* xii. 17: but it is at best uncertain. In c. 20, p. 1044, Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος, μεγαλωσύνη, εἰς αἰῶνας, ἀμήν, which, H. says, is from *Rev.* v. 13. This really is not worth an answer.

⁶ Surely this expression, ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως, meets Lücke's very improbable notion (p. 530 f.) that the extract which follows had no reference to the passage in the text of the Apocalypse.

ing of the martyr, Vettius Epagathus, they say, ἦν γὰρ καὶ ἔστι γνήσιος χριστοῦ μαθητῆς ἀκολουθῶν τῷ ἁρνίῳ ὅπου ἂν ὑπάγῃ (Rev. xiv. 4). They account for the rage of the Pagans against the Christians by its being the fulfilment of Rev. xxii. 11, ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ, ὁ ἄνομος ἀνομησάτω ἔτι καὶ ὁ δίκαιος δικαιοθῇτω ἔτι⁷. They call Christ ὁ πιστὸς κ. ἀληθινὸς μάρτυς, and ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, expressions manifestly taken from Rev. i. 5, iii. 14. See Lücke, pp. 567, 568.

35. The testimony of Polycrates of Ephesus, in Euseb. H. E. v. 24, concerning the burial of St. John in Ephesus, has been pressed by Hengstenberg into the service of the canonicity of the Apocalypse, but is far too uncertain in meaning to be fairly introduced⁸. See Hengstb., pp. 125—129: and Lücke, pp. 568—571.

36. Cyprian (cir. 250) repeatedly refers to the Apocalypse, and unhesitatingly treats it as part of Holy Scripture. In Ep. xiii. 1, p. 260, he says, “maxime cum scriptum sit Memento unde cecideris, et age pœnitentiam,” Rev. ii. 5; see also Ep. xxviii. 1, p. 300, lii. (ad Antonianum Ep. x., Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. iii.) 22, p. 787. In Ep. xxvi. 4, p. 293, he cites the Apocalypse as on a level with the Gospels: “tuba Evangelii sui nos excitat Dominus dicens, Qui plus diligit patrem, &c. . . . et iterum, Beati qui persecutionem passi fuerint, &c. . . . et, Vincenti dabo sedere super thronum meum, &c.” Rev. iii. 21.

In Ep. lii. ubi supra, “pœnitentiam non agenti Dominus comminatur; Habeo, inquit, adversus te multa, &c.” Rev. ii. 20.

De lapsis, c. 27, p. 488, “ipse quoque Dominus præmoneat et præstruat dicens Et scient omnes ecclesiæ, &c. . . .” Rev. ii. 23.

De opere et eleem. c. 14, p. 611, “Audi in Apocalypsi Domini tui vocem Dicis, inquit, dives sum, &c. . . .” Rev. iii. 17. The opening chapters of the treatise, De Exhortatione Martyrii, consist of Scripture testimonies strung together. In them he cites the Apocalypse

⁷ Some think this refers to Dan. xii. 10. But the words there are very different, and not in this grammatical construction: and as the Epistle undeniably quotes the Apocalypse elsewhere, it is far more natural to believe them to come from it. This being so, the words ἵνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ are very important. Lücke himself acknowledges this; supposing however that Irenæus and the Asiatic Greeks who came over into Gaul, brought with them the belief of the canonicity into the Gallican churches. Such a concession is not to be despised.

⁸ Hengstb. maintains that in the words, Ἰωάννης ὁ ἐπὶ τὸ στήθος τοῦ κυρίου ἀναπεσὼν, ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκῶς καὶ μάρτυς καὶ διδάσκαλος, the μάρτυς alludes to the μαρτυρία of Rev. i. 9, and the ἱερεὺς κ.τ.λ. to his having penetrated the Apocalyptic mysteries. It is obvious that nothing can be more unsafe than to reason on such hypotheses. Lücke's view which refers the μάρτυς to the exile at Patmos, and the other to St. John's position as patriarch of the Asiatic churches, is just as likely. Nay, with regard to μάρτυς, is not a third view more likely still? For if he was banished to Patmos, διὰ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ, the μαρτυρία preceded and occasioned the exile, and means his preaching and testimony in Ephesus or elsewhere.

as Scripture, c. 2, 3, 8, pp. 657 f., 661 ("e. in Apocalypsi eadem loquitur divinæ prædicationis hortatio dicens"), 10, 11, 12. The same is the case in the Libri Testimoniorum.

Besides these places Stuart quotes from his works, p. 168, "Aguas namque populos significare in Apocalypsi Scriptura divina declarat, dicens, Aquæ, &c." Rev. xvii. 15.

37. Athanasius⁹ (+ cir. 373) gives in his 23rd ἐπιστολὴ ἐορταστική, Opp. Pars ii. vol. ii. p. 156, a list of the books of the sacred canon, dividing them into three classes: the first of these being the *canonical*, which are the sources of salvation: in which only is the true doctrine of religion declared, to which no man can add, and from which none can take away: the second *ecclesiastical*—such as may be read in the church for edification, but are not inspired: the third, *apocryphal*, written by heretics, and supposititious. In the first class he places the Apocalypse: and in his writings accordingly he refers to it frequently¹.

38. In Chrysostom's own works we have no comments on the Apocalypse, nor any distinct references to it as Scripture. That he was acquainted with it, plainly appears from such passages as that in Hom. i. on Matt. § 8, vol. vii. p. 23, ed. Migne, where in speaking of the heavenly city, he says, καταμάθωμεν οὖν αὐτῆς τὰ θεμέλια, τὰς πύλας τὰς ἀπὸ σαπφείρου καὶ μαργαριτῶν συγκειμένας.

Suidas says under Ἰωάννης, δέχεται δὲ ὁ Χρυσόστομος καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῦ τρεῖς, καὶ τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν.

39. I recur again to Jerome's testimony². In his letter to Paulinus, Ep. liii., he gives the whole sacred canon. And in including the Apocalypse in it, he remarks, § 8, vol. i. p. 280, "Apocalypsis Joannis tot habet sacramenta quot verba. Parum dixi pro merito voluminis. Laus omnis inferior est. In verbis singulis multiplices latent intelligentiæ." In his Comm. on Ps. cxlix., vol. vii. App. p. 1267, Migne, he says, "legimus in Apocalypsi Joannis, quæ in ecclesiis legitur et recipitur; neque enim inter apocryphas scripturas habetur, sed inter ecclesiasticas."

In his Ep. to Dardanus, § 3 (vol. i. p. 971), we have the passage cited at length in the Proleg. to the Epistle to the Hebrews, § i. par. 74, in which he says, "quod si eam (the Ep. to the Heb.) Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, nec Græcorum quidem ecclesiæ Apocalypsin Joannis eadem libertate suscipiunt. et tamen nos utramque suscipimus, nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, sed veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis, non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent, quippe qui et gentilium literarum raro utantur exemplis, sed quasi canonicis."

⁹ See above, par. 20.

¹ See contra Arianos, i. 11, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 327; iv. 28, p. 506 f.; Ep. ii. ad Serap. 2, p. 547, &c.

² See above, par. 25.

40. It is hardly worth while to cite later and less important authorities on this side. They will be found enumerated in Stuart, *Introd.* p. 276 : Davidson, p. 545 : and still more at length in Lücke, pp. 638 ff. Of the general tendency of later tradition I shall speak below, par. 63.

41. I now come to consider those ancient authorities which impugn the apostolicity and canonicity of the book.

42. First among these in point of time, though not of importance, are the Antimontanists or Alogi of the end of the second and beginning of the third century (see Epiphanius, *Hær.* li. 32 ff. pp. 455 ff.: Neander, *Kirchengesch.* i. 2, p. 907) who rejected the writings of St. John. οὐκ αἰδοῦνται δὲ πάλιν, says Epiphanius, οἱ τοιοῦτοι κατὰ τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου εἰρημένων ἐξοπλιζόμενοι, νομίζοντες μὴ πῇ ἄρα δύνωνται τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἀνατρέπειν φάσκουσι δὲ κατὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως τάδε χλευάζοντες Then follow their objections against the book, which are entirely of a subjective character : τί με ὠφελεῖ ἡ ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου, λέγουσά μοι περὶ ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἑπτὰ σαλπίγγων ; and again, φάσκουσιν ἀντιλέγοντες, ὅτι εἶπε πάλιν Γράψον τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῷ ἐν Θυατείροις· καὶ οὐκ ἔνι ἐκεῖ ἐκκλησία χριστιανῶν ἐν Θυατείρῃ. πῶς οὖν ἔγραφε τῇ μὴ οὔσῃ : &c. To these apparently Dionysius of Alexandria, presently to be cited, alludes, when he says (ut *infra*, par. 48), τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἠθέτησαν καὶ ἀνεσκεύασαν πάντα τὸ βιβλίον, καθ' ἕκαστον κεφάλαιον διευθύνοντες, ἄγνωστον τε καὶ ἀσυλλόγιστον ἀποφαίνοντες. ψευδεσθῆναι τε τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν, Ἰωάννου γὰρ οὐκ εἶναι λέγουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀποκάλυψιν εἶναι, τὴν σφόδρῳ καὶ παχεὶ κεκαλυμμένην τῷ τῆς ἀγνοίας παραπετάσματι· καὶ οὐχ ὅπως τῶν ἀποστόλων τινά, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὅλως τῶν ἁγίων ἢ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τούτου γεγονέναι ποιητὴν τοῦ συγγράμματος. Κήρηνθον δὲ τὸν καὶ ἀπ' ἐκείνου κληθεῖσαν Κηρινθιακὴν συστησάμενον αἵρεσιν, ἀξιώπιστον ἐπιφημίσαι θελήσαντα τῷ ἑαυτοῦ πλάσματι ὄνομα. τοῦτο γὰρ εἶναι τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ τὸ δόγμα, ἐπίγειον ἔσεσθαι τὴν τοῦ χριστοῦ βασιλείαν, καὶ ὃν αὐτὸς ὠρέγετο φιλοσώματος ὢν καὶ πάνυ σαρκικός, ἐν τούτοις ὀνειροπολεῖν ἔσεσθαι, γαστρὸς καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ γαστέρα πλησμοναῖς, τουτέστι σιτίοις καὶ πότοις καὶ γάμοις, καὶ δι' ὧν εὐφημότερον ταῦτα ψῆθη ποριεῖσθαι, ἑορταῖς καὶ θυσίαις καὶ ἱερέων σφαγαῖς.

43. I have considered it important to quote this passage at length, as giving an account of the earliest opponents to the authenticity of the Apocalypse and of the reason of their opposition. The student may further follow out the account of these Alogi in Epiphanius, l. c. They have been very lightly passed over by Lücke (p. 582) and others, who are not willing that their procession of opponents to the apostolic authorship should be led by persons whose character is so little creditable. But the fair enquirer will not feel at liberty thus to exclude them. They were perhaps more outspoken and thorough, perhaps also less learned and cautious than those who follow : but their motives of oppo-

sition were of the same kind: and it is especially to be noted, as a weighty point in the evidence, that, being hostile to the authority of the writings commonly received as those of the Apostle John, they in their time conceived it necessary to destroy the credit of the Apocalypse as well as that of the Gospel.

44. The Roman presbyter Caius, *λογιώτατος ἀνὴρ* according to Euseb. vi. 20, who lived in the Episcopate of Zephyrinus (i. e. 196—219), wrote a polemical dialogue against the Montanist Proclus, of which a fragment has been preserved by Eusebius iii. 28, speaking out still more plainly: *ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων τερατολογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει, λέγων μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἐπύχειον εἶναι τὸ βασίλειον τοῦ χριστοῦ· καὶ πάλιν ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ἡδοναῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ τὴν σάρκα πολιτευομένην δουλεύειν. καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπάρχων ταῖς γραφαῖς τοῦ θεοῦ, ἀριθμὸν χιλιονταετίας ἐν γάμφῳ ὀρθῆς θέλων πλανᾶν λέγει γίνεσθαι.*

45. Some, as Hug, al., have in vain endeavoured to persuade us that some other book is here meant, and not the Apocalypse of John. No such work is to be traced, though we have very full accounts of Cerinthus from Irenæus (Hær. i. 26, p. 105) and Epiphanius (Hær. xxviii. pp. 110 ff.): and neither the plural *ἀποκαλύψεων* (which is also used by Dionysius, as cited below, of *our* apocalyptic visions), nor the exaggerated account of the earthly Kingdom as promised (see the same in the objections of the Alogi as cited by Dionysius above) can have the least weight in inducing us to concur in such a supposition.

46. When Lücke sets aside Caius in the same category as the Alogi, as having equally little to do with ecclesiastical tradition, we cannot help seeing again the trick of a crafty partisan wishing to get rid of an awkward ally.

47. Undoubtedly the weightiest objector to the canonicity of the Apocalypse in early times is DIONYSIUS, the successor next but one to Origen in the presidency of the catechetical school of Alexandria, and afterwards bishop of that see (A.D. 247). This worthy scholar of Origen (see Neander, Kirchengesch. i. p. 1229 f.) remained ever attached to him, loving and honouring him: and wrote him a letter of consolation when he was thrown into prison in the Decian persecution. This Dionysius, as he himself tells us, had become a believer in the Gospel by a course of free investigation, and unbiassed examination of all known systems: and after his conversion, he remained true to this principle as a Christian and as a public teacher. He read and examined without bias all the writings of heretics, and did not reject them, until he was thoroughly acquainted with them, and was in a situation to confute them with valid arguments. While he was thus employed, one of the presbyters of his church warned him of the harm which his own

soul might take by so much contact with their impure doctrines. Of this danger, he says, he was himself too conscious: but while pondering on what had been said to him he was determined in his course by a heavenly vision (ὄραμα θεόπεμπτον προσελθὼν ἐπέβρωσέ με): and a voice distinctly said to him, “Read every thing that comes into thy hands: for thou art well able to judge and prove them all (πάσιν ἐντύγχανε οἷς ἂν εἰς χεῖρας λάβοις· διευθύνειν γὰρ ἔκαστα καὶ δοκιμάζειν ἱκανὸς εἶ): indeed such was at the first the source of thine own faith.” And, he says, “I received the vision as agreeing with the apostolic saying (ἀποστολικῇ φωνῇ) which says to the strong (τοὺς δυνατωτέρους) Γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπέζιται.”

48. The notices left us of Dionysius in the seventh book of Eusebius, entirely correspond with the above. And the judgment which he passes on the Apocalypse is characterized by sound discretion and moderation. I give it at length.

After the passage already cited in par. 42, he proceeds (Eus. H. E. vii. 25): “Καὶ γὰρ εἰ μὴ συνίημι, ἀλλ’ ὑπονοῶ γε νοῦν τινὰ βαθύτερον ἐγκείσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασιν. Οὐκ ἰδίῳ ταῦτα μετρῶν καὶ κρίνων λογισμῷ, πίσκει δὲ πλεον νέμων, ὑψηλότερα ἢ ὑπ’ ἐμοῦ καταληφθῆναι νενόμικα· καὶ οὐκ ἀποδοκιμάζω ταῦτα ἅ μὴ συνεώρακα, θαυμάζω δὲ μᾶλλον ὅτι μὴ καὶ εἶδον.” Ἐπὶ τούτοις τὴν ὅλην τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως βασανίσας γραφὴν, ἀδύνατον δὲ αὐτὴν κατὰ τὴν πρόχειρον ἀποδείξας νοεῖσθαι διάνοιαν, ἐπιφέρει λέγων “Συντελέσας δὴ πᾶσαν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τὴν προφητείαν, μακαρίζει ὁ προφήτης τοὺς τε φυλάσσοντας αὐτὴν, καὶ δὴ καὶ ἑαυτόν. Μακάριος γὰρ φησιν ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου· καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα. Καλεῖσθαι μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν Ἰωάννην, καὶ εἶναι τὴν γραφὴν Ἰωάννου ταύτην, οὐκ ἂν τερῶ. Ἁγίου μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τινος καὶ θεοπνευστου συναινῶ. Οὐ μὴν ῥαδίως ἂν συνθεῖμην τούτον εἶναι τὸν ἀποστολον, τὸν υἱὸν Ζεβεδαίου, τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου, οὗ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Ἰωάννην ἐπιγεγραμμένον, καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἡ καθολικὴ. Τεκμαίρομαι γὰρ ἔκ τε τοῦ ἡθους ἐκατέρων, καὶ τοῦ τῶν λόγων εἶδους, καὶ τῆς τοῦ βιβλίου διεξαγωγῆς λεγομένης, μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐαγγελιστὴς οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ παρεγγράφει, οὐδὲ κηρύσσει ἑαυτόν, οὔτε διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου, οὔτε διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς.” Εἰθ’ ὑποβάς, πάλιν ταῦτα λέγει, “Ἰωάννης δὲ οὐδαμοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ ὡς περὶ ἑτέρου· ὁ δὲ τὴν ἀποκαλύψιν γράψας, εὐθὺς τε ἑαυτὸν ἐν ἀρχῇ προτάσσει· Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ δεῖξαι τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ ἐν τάχει. Καὶ ἐσήμανεν ἀποστείλας διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννῃ, ὃς ἐμαρτύρησε τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ ὅσα εἶδεν. Εἶτα καὶ ἐπιστολὴν γράφει· Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἐπτά ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ, χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη. Ὁ δὲ γε εὐαγγελιστὴς, οὐδὲ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς προέγραψεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, ἀλλὰ ἀπερίττως ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τοῦ μυστηρίου τῆς θείας ἀποκαλύψεως ἤρξατο Ὁ ἦν ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὁ ἑώρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν. Ἐπὶ ταύτῃ γὰρ τῇ ἀποκαλύψει καὶ ὁ κύριος τὸν Πέτρον ἐμακάρισεν εἰπὼν Μακάριος εἶ Σίμων

βάρ Ἰωῆ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέ σοι, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ οὐράνιος. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φερομένη Ἰωάννου καὶ τρίτῃ, καίτοι βραχείαις οὔσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, ὁ Ἰωάννης ὀνομαστί πρόκειται, ἀλλὰ ἀνωνύμως ὁ πρεσβύτερος γέγραπται. Οὗτος δὲ γε οὐδὲ αὐταρκες ἐνόμισεν εἰσάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, διηγείσθαι τὰ ἐξῆς, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἀναλαμβάνει Ἐγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὑμῶν, καὶ συγκοινωνὸς ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ βασιλείᾳ καὶ ἐν ὑπομονῇ Ἰησοῦ, ἐγενόμεν ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένῃ Πάτμῳ, διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ. Καὶ δὴ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τέλει ταῦτα εἶπε Μακάριος ὁ τηρῶν τοὺς λόγους τῆς προφητείας τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου. Ἀγὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βλέπων καὶ ἀκούων ταῦτα. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν Ἰωάννης ἐστὶν ὁ ταῦτα γράφων, αὐτῷ λέγοντι πιστευτέον· ποῖος δὲ οὗτος, ἀδελφον. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ἑαυτὸν εἶναι, ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ πολλαχοῦ, τὸν ἡγαπημένον ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου μαθητὴν, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰακώβου, οὐδὲ τὸν αὐτόπτην καὶ αὐτήκοον τοῦ κυρίου γενόμενον. Εἶπε γὰρ ἂν τι τούτων τῶν προδεδηλωμένων, σαφῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐμφανίσαι βουλόμενος. Ἀλλὰ τούτων μὲν οὐδέν. Ἀδελφὸν δὲ ἡμῶν καὶ συγκοινωνὸν εἶπε καὶ μάρτυρα Ἰησοῦ, καὶ μακάριον ἐπὶ τῇ θείᾳ καὶ ἀκοῇ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων. Πολλοὺς δὲ ὁμωνύμους Ἰωάννη τῷ ἀποστόλῳ νομίζω γεγονέναι, οἱ διὰ τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνον ἀγάπην, καὶ τὸ θαυμάζειν καὶ ζηλοῦν, ἀγαπηθῆναι τε ὁμοίως αὐτῷ βούλεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὴν αὐτὴν ἡσπάσαντο. Ὡς περ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολὺς καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τοῖς τῶν πιστῶν παισὶν ὀνομάζεται. Ἔστι μὲν οὖν καὶ ἕτερος Ἰωάννης ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἐπικληθεὶς Μάρκος· ὃν Βαρνάβας καὶ Παῦλος ἑαυτοῖς συμπάρελαβον, περὶ οὗ καὶ πάλιν λέγει Εἶχον δὲ καὶ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην. Εἰ δὲ οὗτος ὁ γράψας ἐστίν, οὐκ ἂν φαίην· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀφίχθαι σὺν αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν γέγραπται· ἀλλὰ Ἀναρχέντες μὲν φησὶν ἀπὸ τῆς Πάφου οἱ περὶ Παῦλον, ἦλθον εἰς Πέργην τῆς Παμφυλίας. Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀποχωρήσας ἀπ' αὐτῶν, ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς Ἱερουσόλυμα. Ἄλλον δὲ τινα οἶμαι τῶν ἐν Ἀσίᾳ γενομένων· ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἐκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι. Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν νοσημάτων δὲ καὶ τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τῆς συντάξεως αὐτῶν, εἰκότως ἕτερος οὗτος παρ' ἐκείνον ὑπονοηθήσεται. Συνάδουσι μὲν γὰρ ἀλλήλοις τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ ἡ ἐπιστολή, ὁμοίως τε ἄρχονται. Τὸ μὲν φησὶν Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος· ἡ δὲ, Ὁ ἦν ἀπαρχῆς. Τὸ μὲν φησὶ Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός· ἡ δὲ τὰ αὐτὰ σμικρῶ παρηλλαγμένα, Ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἐωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἐφανερώθη. Ταῦτα γὰρ προανακρούεται διατεινόμενος, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἐδήλωσε πρὸς τοὺς οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ φάσκοντας ἐληλυθέναι τὸν κύριον· δι' ἃ καὶ συνήψεν ἐπιμελῶς Καὶ ὃ ἐωράκαμεν μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον, ἣτις ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἐφανερώθη ὑμῖν· ὃ ἐωράκαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν. Ἐχεται αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν προθέσεων οὐκ ἀφίσταται. Διὰ δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν κεφαλαίων καὶ ὀνομάτων πάντα διεξέρχεται· ὦν τινα μὲν ἡμεῖς συντόμως ὑπομνήσομεν. Ὁ δὲ προσεχῶς ἐντυγχάνων εὐρήσει ἐν

ἐκατέρῳ πολλὴν τὴν ζωὴν, πολὺ τὸ φῶς, ἀποτροπὴν τοῦ σκοτός, συνεχῇ τὴν ἀλήθειαν, τὴν χάριν, τὴν χαράν τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὸ αἷμα τοῦ κυρίου, τὴν κρίσιν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ, τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἡμᾶς ἀγάπης ἐντολήν, ὡς πάσας δεῖ φυλάσσειν τὰς ἐντολάς· ὁ ἔλεγχος τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ διαβόλου, τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἡ υἰοθεσία τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ διόλου πίστις ἡμῶν ἀπαιτουμένη, ὁ πατήρ καὶ ὁ υἱὸς πανταχοῦ· καὶ ὅλως διὰ πάντων χαρακτηρίζοντας, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν συνοραῖν τοῦ τε εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς χρῶτα πρόκειται. Ἀλλοιοτάτῃ δὲ καὶ ξένῃ παρὰ ταῦτα ἡ ἀποκάλυψις, μῆτε ἐφαπτομένη, μῆτε γειτνιώσα τούτων μηδεὶν σχεδόν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, μηδὲ συλλαβὴν πρὸς αὐτὰ κοινὴν ἔχουσα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μνήμην τινὰ οὐδὲ ἔννοιαν, οὔτε ἡ ἐπιστολὴ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἔχει· ἐῷ γὰρ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· οὔτε τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἡ ἀποκάλυψις· Παύλου διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ὑποφάναντός τι καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀποκαλύψεων αὐτοῦ, ἃς οὐκ ἐνέγραψε καθ' αὐτάς. Ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς φράσεως τὴν διαφορὰν ἐστὶ τεκμήρασθαι τοῦ εὐαγγελίου καὶ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς πρὸς τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἀπταίστως κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλήνων φωνήν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογώτατα ταῖς λέξεσι, τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῖς συντάξεσι τῆς ἐρμηνείας γέγραπται. Πολλοῦ γε δεῖ βάρβαρόν τινα φθόγγον, ἢ σολοικισμόν, ἢ ὅλως ἰδιωτισμὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς εὐρεθῆναι. Ἐκάτερον γὰρ εἶχεν, ὡς ἔοικε, τὸν λόγον, ἀμφοτέρα αὐτῷ χαρισμένου τοῦ κυρίου, τὸν τε τῆς γνώσεως, τὸν τε τῆς φράσεως. Τούτῳ δὲ ἀποκάλυψιν μὲν ἔωρακεῖν, καὶ γνῶσιν εἰληφέναι καὶ προφητεῖαν, οὐκ ἀντερῶ, διάλεκτον μέντοι καὶ γλῶσσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἑλληνίζουσιν αὐτοῦ βλέπω, ἀλλ' ἰδῶμασι μὲν βαρβαρικοῖς χρώμενον, καὶ πον καὶ σολοικίζοντα. Ἄπερ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον νῦν ἐκλέγειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπισκώπτων, μή τις νομίσῃ, ταῦτα εἶπον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὴν ἀνομοιότητα διευθύνων τῶν γραφῶν.”

49. It will be seen that while on the one hand he separates himself from those who disparaged the book and ascribed it to Cerinthus, on the other he distinctly repudiates all literal interpretations of it as impossible, and approaches the enquiry with a strong anti-chilastic bias. This more especially appears, from a previous chapter of the same book of Eusebius, in which is detailed the proceeding of Dionysius with regard to the schism of Nepos, an Egyptian bishop of chilastic views: Eus. H. E. vii. 24.

50. With regard to the whole character of Dionysius's criticism, we may make the following remarks :

a) its *negative* portion rests upon grounds common to him and ourselves, and respecting which a writer in the third century, however much we may admire his free and able treatment of his subject, has no advantage at all over one who writes in the nineteenth. It is as open to us as it was to him, to judge of the phænomena and language of the Apocalypse as compared with the Gospel and Epistles of St. John.

b) the *positive* result of his argument, if fairly examined, is worth absolutely nothing. The writer to whom he ascribes the book is, even

to himself, entirely unknown : more unknown than Silvanus as a conjectural author of the Epistle to the Hebrews : more unknown than even Aquila. The very existence, in his mind, of the other John, who wrote the Apocalypse, depends on the very shadowy words ἐπεὶ καὶ δύο φασὶν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου λέγεσθαι.

51. And this latter consideration is very important. It shews us that at all events, the idea of John the Presbyter having written the Apocalypse was, in the middle of the third century, wholly unknown to ecclesiastical tradition in the church of Alexandria : or else we should never have found this seeking about and conjecturing on the matter.

52. I shall treat, further on, the question raised by this criticism of Dionysius as to the internal probability of the authorship by the Apostle John. At present I advance with notices of those who impugned or doubted it in ancient times.

53. And of those we next come to Eusebius of Cæsarea, the well-known ecclesiastical historian. His opinion on the question is wavering and undecided. In his H. E. iii. 24, having asserted the genuineness of St. John's Gospel and First Epistle, and placed the other two Epistles among the ἀντιλεγόμενα, he proceeds, τῆς δ' ἀποκαλύψεως ἐφ' ἑκάτερον ἔτι νῦν παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς περιέλεται ἡ δόξα. ὁμως γε μὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀρχαίων μαρτυρίας ἐν οἰκείῳ καιρῷ τὴν ἐπὶ κρίσιν δέξεται καὶ αὕτη. Again in the next chapter, in giving a list of the ὁμολογούμεναι θεῖαι γραφαί, when he has mentioned the four Gospels and Acts and one Epistle of St. John and one of St. Peter, he says, ἐπὶ τούτοις τακτέον εἰ γε φανεῖν, τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν Ἰωάννου, περὶ ἧς τὰ δόξαντα κατὰ καιρὸν ἐκθροσόμεθα. And a little below, when he is speaking of the νόθα, he says, ἔτι τε ὡς ἔφην ἡ Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψις εἰ φανεῖν, ἣν τινες ὡς ἔφην ἀθετοῦσιν, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐγκρίνουσι τοῖς ὁμολογουμένοις.

54. In iii. 39, in adducing the well-known passage of Papias, εἰ δὴ πού καὶ παρηκολουθηκώς τις τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις ἔλθοι, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνέκρινον λόγους· τί Ἀνδρέας ἢ τί Πέτρος εἶπεν ἢ τί Φίλιππος ἢ τί Θωμᾶς ἢ Ἰάκωβος ἢ τί Ἰωάννης ἢ Ματθαῖος ἢ τις ἕτερος τῶν τοῦ κυρίου μαθητῶν, ἃ τε Ἀριστίων καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν, he says, ἔνθα καὶ ἐπιστῆσαι ἄξιον δις καταριθμοῦντι αὐτῷ τὸ Ἰωάννου ὄνομα, ὃν τὸν μὲν πρότερον Πέτρω καὶ Ἰακώβῳ καὶ Ματθαίῳ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἀποστόλοις συγκαταλέγει, σαφῶς δηλῶν τὸν εὐαγγελιστήν, τὸν δ' ἕτερον Ἰωάννην διαστείλλας τὸν λόγον ἑτέροις παρὰ τὸν τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀριθμὸν κατατάσσει, προτάξας αὐτοῦ τὸν Ἀριστίωνα· σαφῶς τε αὐτὸν πρεσβύτερον ὀνομάζει. ὥς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἀποδείκνυσθαι τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀληθῆ τῶν δύο κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ὁμονυμία κεκρήσθαι εἰρηκότων, δύο τε ἐν Ἐφέσῳ γενέσθαι μνήματα, καὶ ἑκάτερον Ἰωάννου ἔτι νῦν λέγεσθαι, οἷς καὶ ἀναγκάιον πέρος ἔχειν τὸν νοῦν. εἰκὸς γὰρ τὸν δεύτερον, εἰ μὴ τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον τὴν ἐπ' ὀνόματος φερομένην Ἰωάννου ἀποκάλυψιν ἑωρακεῖναι.

55. The student will observe how entirely conjectural, and valueless as evidence, is this opinion of Eusebius. Certainly Lücke is wrong in his very strong denunciations of Hengstenberg for describing Eusebius as studiously leaving the question open. For what else is it, when he numbers the book on one side among the undoubted Scriptures with an *εἰ φανεῖν*, and then on the other among the spurious writings with an *εἰ φανεῖν* also: while at the very moment of endorsing Dionysius's conjecture that the second John saw its visions, he interposes *εἰ μὴ τις ἐθέλοι τὸν πρῶτον*? That a man with the anti-chilastic leanings of Eusebius concedes thus much, makes the balance of his testimony incline rather to than away from the canonicity of the book. I would not press this, but simply take it as indicating that in Eusebius's time, as well as in that of Dionysius, there was no ecclesiastical tradition warranting the disallowing it as the work of the Evangelist. Adverse opinion there was, which found its fair and worthier employ in internal criticism, and issued in vague conjecture, resting on the mere fact of two persons named John having existed in Ephesus. Who and what the second John was, whether he had any right to speak of himself as the writer of the Apocalypse does, or to address with authority the seven churches of Asia,—on these and all such questions we are wholly in the dark.

56. Cyril of Jerusalem (+ 386) is a more decided witness for the exclusion of the Apocalypse from the Canon. In his *Catecheseis*, iv. 35, 36, pp. 68 f., having prefaced the account of the twenty-two canonical books of the O. T. with *πρὸς τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μὴδὲν ἔχε κοινόν*, he enumerates the canonical books of the N. T., the four Gospels, Acts, seven catholic epistles, fourteen of St. Paul, and concludes *τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πάντα ἔξω κείσθω ἐν δευτέρῳ. καὶ ὅσα ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγινώσκεται, ταῦτα μὴδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγίνωσκε, καθὼς ἤκουσας*. And it is to be observed that he appeals for this arrangement to ancient authorities: for he says to his catechumen, in the words alluded to in the last-cited clause, *ταύτας μόνας μελέτα σπουδαίως, ἃς καὶ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μετὰ παῤῥησίας ἀναγινώσκομεν. πολὺ σου φρονιμώτεροι καὶ εὐλαβέστεροι ἦσαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἐπίσκοποι οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας προστάται, οἱ ταύτας παραδόντες*.

57. Cyril nowhere mentions the Apocalypse by name. But he seems to use it, and even where he by inference repudiates it, to adopt its terms unconsciously. An instance of the former is found in *Cat. i. 4*, p. 18, where he says to his catechumen, speaking of his baptism, *καταφυτεύῃ εἰς τὸν νοητὸν παράδεισον λαμβάνεις ὄνομα καινόν* *Rev. ii. 7, 17*. Of the latter, in *Cat. xv. 13*, p. 230, where, professing to get his particulars respecting Antichrist from Daniel, and having said *ὀπίσω αὐτῶν ἀναστήσεται βασιλεὺς ἕτερος ὃς ὑπεροίσει κακοῖς πάντας τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν*,

he proceeds, καὶ τρεῖς βασιλεῖς ταπεινώσει, ὄφλον δὲ ὅτι ἀπὸ τῶν δέκα τῶν προτέρων, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν δέκα τούτων τοὺς τρεῖς ταπεινῶν πάντως ὅτι αὐτὸς ὄγδοος βασιλεύσει: this last particular being from Rev. xvii. 11. Again,—although, ib. c. 16, p. 232, he protests respecting the three and a half years of Antichrist's reign, οὐκ ἐξ ἀποκρύφων λέγομεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Δανιήλ,—in c. 27, p. 239, he alludes to the heresy of Marcellus of Ancyra in these words, τοῦ δράκοντός ἐστιν ἄλλη κεφαλὴ προσφάτως περὶ τὴν Γαλατίαν ἀναφυεῖσα (Rev. xii. 3). Indeed previously in c. 15, p. 232, he had written δευρὸν τὸ θηρίον, δράκων μέγας, ἀνθρώποις ἀκαταγώνιστος, ἔτοιμος εἰς τὸ καταπιεῖν, evidently from the same place in the Apocalypse.

58. Thus Cyril presents to us remarkable and exceptional phenomena: familiarity with the language of the book, so as to use it unconsciously as that of prophecy, combined with a repudiation of it as canonical, and a prohibition of its study. It would appear that there had been at some time a deliberate change of opinion, and that we have, in these evident references to the Apocalypse, instances of slips of memory, and retention of phraseology which belonged to his former, not to his subsequent views.

59. In the sixtieth canon of the synod of Laodicea, held between 343 and 381 (see Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, i. 721 ff.), an account of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments is given in which the Apocalypse is omitted. The genuineness of this canon has been doubted (Lücke, p. 361), but apparently without reason: see Hefele, ut supra, pp. 749 ff. We next come to the testimony of Gregory of Nazianzen (+ 390), who in his poem, περὶ τῶν γνησίων βιβλίων τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, vol. ii. (iii. Migne) p. 259 ff., gives the same canon as Cyril, and adds, πάσας ἔχεις· εἴ τι δὲ τούτων ἐκτός, οὐκ ἐν γνησίοις. But here again, as in Cyril's case, we are met by the phenomenon of reference to the book and citation of it as of theological authority. In Oratio xlii. 9, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 755, he says, speaking of the angels presiding over churches, πείθομαι μὲν ἅλλους ἄλλης προστατεῖν ἐκκλησίας, ὡς Ἰωάννης διδάσκει με διὰ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως. And in another place, Oratio xxix. 17, p. 536, he cites, in speaking of the Godhead of Christ, καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ᾗν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος καὶ ὁ παντοκράτωρ, adding, σαφῶς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ λεγόμενα.

Lücke suggests in explanation of this, that possibly the churches of Asia Minor, especially that of Cappadocia, had excluded the Apocalypse from public reading in the church, on account of the countenance which it had been made to give to the errors of Montanism, and placed it among the ἀπόκρυφα. This may have been so: but I cannot think his inference secure, that *therefore* we may infer the general fact, that the book rested on no secure ecclesiastical tradition.

60. In the Iambi ad Seleucum, printed in Gregory's works, ii. (iii.

Migne) p. 1104 f., ascribed by some to Gregory himself, but more usually to Amphilochius of Iconium, we have the Apocalypse mentioned by name: τὴν δ' ἀποκάλυψιν τὴν Ἰωάννου πάλιν τινὲς μὲν ἐγκρίνουσιν, οἱ πλείους δέ γε νόθον λέγουσιν. οὗτος ἀψευδέστατος κανὼν ἂν εἴη τῶν θεοπνεύστων γραφῶν.

But it is to be noticed, that in the scholium of Andreas cited above, par. 32, he enumerates Gregory among those who recognized the canonicity of the Apocalypse.

61. After this, it will be sufficient to give a general view of the antagonism to the authority of the book. It was maintained chiefly in the Eastern church; the Western, after the fifth century, universally recognizing the Apocalypse. It is remarkable that Sulpicius Severus (Hist. Sacr. ii. 31, Lücke) says the Apocalypse is “a plerisque aut stulte aut impie” rejected. But as Lücke observes, he must have found these “plerique” in the Greek, not in the Latin church. Pope Gelasius (Migne Patr. Lat. vol. cxxx. p. 984) in his decree “de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis” (500) gives the book its place in the Canon of the Catholic Church, between the Epistles of St. Paul and the Catholic Epistles. Primasius and Cassiodorus, in the sixth century, expound it as apostolic and canonical. But Junilius the African, the friend of Primasius, says, De partib. leg. div. i. 4, in Migne Patr. Lat. vol. lxxviii. p. 18, that only seventeen books, viz. the O. T. prophets and the book of Psalms, contain the Scripture prophecy: “cæterum,” he continues, “de Joannis apocalypsi apud Orientales admodum dubitatur.” This he had learned from Paulus, a Persian, of the school of Nisibis: and he consequently seems inclined not to place it among the “libri perfectæ auctoritatis.”

62. The fourth synod of Toledo (633) in its seventeenth canon, decrees that, seeing the Apocalypse is by many councils and Popes sanctioned as a work of the Apostle John, and as canonical, it should under pain of excommunication, be preached on in the church between Easter and Pentecost. The Synod speaks of “plurimi qui ejus auctoritatem non recipiunt, atque in ecclesiis Dei prædicare contemnunt.” This, Lücke thinks, points to doubters in the West also. But Isidore of Seville (+ 636) in his De officiis eccl. i. 12, vol. vi. pp. 374 ff., having given the generally received canon, speaks of many Latins who doubted of the Pauline origin of the Epistle to the Hebrews, of the genuineness of 2 Peter, of the Epistle of James, and 2 and 3 John; but not a word of any who doubted about the Apocalypse. So that it may be after all that the Synod of Toledo, as Junilius, may allude to Orientals only.

63. Henceforward in the Western church, with the sole exception of the Capitulare of Charlemagne, which, following Greek authorities and

especially the Synod of Laodicea, excluded the book from public reading, we find universal recognition of the Apocalypse until the Reformation.

64. In the Greek church during the last noticed period opinions were much in the same state as in the fourth century. On one side we find rejection of the book, at the least from public ecclesiastical use: on the other, unsuspecting reception of it as a genuine work of the Apostle John. Neither side takes any pains to justify its view critically, but simply conforms to local ecclesiastical usage. Cyril of Alexandria, de Adorat. vi. vol. i. p. 188, says, τὸ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως βιβλίον ἡμῖν συντιθεῖς ὁ σοφὸς Ἰωάννης, ὁ καὶ ταῖς τῶν πατέρων τετίμηται ψήφοις. The very expression here, it is true, betrays consciousness of the existence of doubts, which however do not affect his confidence, nor that of his contemporaries Nilus and Isidore of Pelusium³.

65. At Antioch, however, the opinion in cent. v. seems to have been different. Its greatest Father of this period, Theodore of Mopsuestia (+ 429), never cites the Apocalypse in his extant writings and fragments, even where we might have certainly expected it. In the fragments of his expositions of the N. T. we have no allusion to it, even when on 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff. (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxvi. pp. 933 ff.) he speaks of Antichrist and of the second Advent; nor again in his Commentary on the twelve prophets. Opponent as he was of the allegorical method of interpretation, he may have been withheld from receiving the Apocalypse by consciousness that no other mode would suit it: or he may have followed the older practice of the Syrian church, and the canon of the Laodicean Synod. Still, he rejected the Epistle of James, which both these recognized: and Lücke thinks he may have rejected the Apocalypse from the decision of his own judgment, helped by his disinclination to the book, and the existing doubt about its canonicity: being one of those who, like Luther in later times, “den Kanon im Kanon suchten und fanden.”

66. Theodoret (bishop of Cyrus, + 457) alludes two or three times to the book in his Dialogues on the Trinity (iii. 12) and on the Holy Ghost (i. 18, printed by Migne among the works of Athanasius, vol. iv. pp. 447, 485): but on 2 Thess. ii. and on Heb. xii. 22, he leaves it unnoticed, as also in his Commentary on Daniel. On Ps. lxxxvi. 2, vol. i. p. 1217, he seems to aim at describing the heavenly Jerusalem in contrast to the apocalyptic description. In speaking (hæret. fabb. lib. ii. 3, vol. iv. p. 329 f.) of Cerinthus, and (lib. iii. 1, 2, 6, pp. 340 f., 346 ff.) of the Nicolaitans, the Montanists, and even of the chiliast Nepos and his antagonist Dionysius of Alexandria, he says not a word of the

³ Nilus de Orat. 75, 76, p. 494 f. Isidor. Pel. Epp. i. 13, 188, pp. 4, 56; ii. 175, p. 208 (λέων κέκληται ὁ χριστός).

Apocalypse. Only in his *Dialogus Immutabilis* (vol. iv. p. 59) he once names it, and adduces ch. i. 9 with the formula *Ἰωάννης φησὶν* : but then it is in citing from Athanasius.

67. After this, in the sixth century, the Syrian churches were divided on the matter. The Nestorians rejected the Apocalypse, following Theodore of Mopsuestia and the Peschito : the Monophysites received it, following the Alexandrians, and Hippolytus, and Ephrem Syrus. See Lücke, pp. 644, 5, who thinks from certain indications that even among them it was not in ecclesiastical, but only in theological use.

68. In the Greek church in Asia Minor, we have Andreas, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, the writer of the first entire and connected Commentary on the Apocalypse. He fully and earnestly recognizes its genuineness and inspiration, and (see above, par. 32) appeals to the testimony of the ancients to bear him out : mentioning by name Papias, Irenæus, Methodius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Gregory Theologus (of Nazianzum). It is perhaps hardly fair in Lücke to infer that, because he names so few, more might not have been adduced : hardly fair again to conclude that, because he promises to use their writings in his Commentary, and has not expressly cited them, he did not so use them, or was himself one of the first who explained the book.

69. Arethas, who followed Andreas⁴ in his see, and in his work of commenting on the Apocalypse, repeats in his prologue the scholium of Andreas on the Inspiration of the book, adding the authority of Basil the Great. But we are now approaching a time when, as Lücke remarks, it is really of small import who used the book and who did not, who regarded it as the work of the Apostle, and who did not. Still, a few facts stand out from the general mass, which may be useful as indications, or at all events have a claim to our attention.

70. Such is the fact of the omission of all reference to the Apocalypse in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes in cent. vi. In his *Topogr. Christiana*, book vii. (in Migne, *Patr.* vol. lxxxviii.), he treats of the duration of the heavens according to Scripture, and Lücke thinks must of necessity have cited the book had it been in his canon. Still, he uses the Festal Epistle of Athanasius, in which it is expressly included in the Canon.

71. The second canon of the Trullian, or Quinisextan council, sanctions on the one hand the canon of the Laodicean council and that of the eighty-five apostolical canons, both which omit the Apocalypse, and on the other that of the African Synods of the end of the fourth and beginning of the fifth centuries, which include it. Various conjectures

⁴ At what interval, is uncertain. Some place him as early as 540 : others, not till the 10th century. See Lücke, p. 647, note.

have been made as to the account to be given of this (see Lücke, pp. 648, 9). The desire to leave the question open (Lücke) can hardly have been the cause. We may safely leave such evidence to correct itself.

72. The list may be closed with one or two notices from later centuries, shewing that the doubts were not altogether forgotten, though generally given up.

Nicephorus (beginning of cent. ix.), in his *Chronographia brevis*, p. 1057, Migne, reckons only twenty-six books of the N. T., and does not mention the Apocalypse either in the ἀντιλεγόμενα or in the ἀπόκρυφα.

73. A prologue to the book in the cursive codex 64 (cent. x. or beginning of xi.), after defending its canonicity and apostolic origin, apologizes thus for the ancient Fathers not mentioning it among the books to be openly read in church : περὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἦν αὐτοῖς ἡ σπουδή, καὶ πρὸς τὰ κατεπείγοντα ἴσταντο, ταύτην μὴ ἐγκρίνοντας αὐτοῖς, ἢ διὰ τὸ μερικῶς μὴ ἐκτίθεσθαι αὐτούς, ἢ διὰ τὸ ἀσαφὲς αὐτῆς καὶ δυσέφικτον καὶ ὀλίγους διαλαμβανόμενον καὶ νοούμενον, ἄλλως τε οἶμαι διὰ τὸ μηδὲ συμφέρον εἶναι τοῖς πολλοῖς τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ βάθῃ ἐρευνᾶν, μηδὲ λυσιτελέες.

74. In the proœmium given in Cramer's *Catena* to the extracts from the comments of Œcumenius (cent. xi.), p. 173, the canonicity of the book is strongly asserted, and its being μύησις τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ στηθὸς ἀνακλίσεως τῆς ὑπερθέου σοφίας τοῦ ἡγαπημένου, and not τῶν νόθων, ὡς τινὲς πλάνῃ συγκροτούμενοι πνεύματι ἐληρώθησαν. For this, the writer refers to Athanasius, Basil, Gregory, Methodius, Cyril, and Hippolytus : and then says οὐκ ἂν τοιοῦτοις καὶ τοσούτοις ἀνθρώποις τοῦτο δόκουν, εἰ μὴ τὸ μέτριον αὐτῷ ᾗδεσαν σπουδαζόμενον.

75. In the *Church History* of Nicephorus Callistus (cent. xiv.), he treats it (ii. 42) as an acknowledged fact that the Apostle John, when in exile in Patmos under Domitian, wrote his Gospel and his *ἱερὸν καὶ ἔνθεον ἀποκάλυψιν*. Still, when enumerating the books of the canon in ii. 46, partly from Eusebius, he says summarily of the Apocalypse, that *τινὲς ἐφαντάσθησαν* that it was the work of John the Presbyter.

76. It will be well to review the course and character of the evidence from antiquity. As we have before noticed, so again we may observe, that throughout, we have results here in marked contrast to those of our enquiry regarding the Epistle to the Hebrews. In that case there was a total lack of any fixed general tradition in the earliest times. Gradually, the force and convenience of an illustrious name being attached to the Epistle bore down the doubts originally resting on its authorship, and the Pauline origin became every where acquiesced in. Nothing could be more different from the history of the doubts about the authorship of the Apocalypse. Here we have a fixed and thoroughly authenticated primitive tradition. It comes from men only removed by one step from the Apostle John himself. There is absolutely *no objective*

evidence whatever in favour of any other author. The doubts first originate in considerations purely subjective.

77. These are divisible into two classes, *anti-chiliastic* and *critical*. It was convenient to depreciate the book, on controversial grounds. It was found advisable not to read it in the churches, and to forbid it to the young scholar. And, as matter of fact, thus it was that the doubts about the authorship sprung up. If it countenanced error, if it was not in the canon, if it was not fit to be read, then it would not be the work of the Evangelist and Apostle.

78. Again, to the same result contributed the critical grounds so ably urged by Dionysius of Alexandria and observed upon above, par. 50. I have there remarked, not only how absolutely shadowy and nothing-worth is Dionysius's *οἶμαι* that John the Presbyter wrote the book, but how this very word is most valuable, as denoting the entire absence of all objective tradition to that effect in the middle of the third century.

79. Thus the doubts grew up, and in certain parts of the church, prevailed : the whole process being exactly the converse of that which we traced in our Prolegomena to the Hebrews.

80. And, as far as the force of ancient testimony goes, I submit that our inference also must be a contrary one. The authorship of the book by the Apostle John, as matter of primitive tradition, rests on firm and irrefragable ground. Three other authors are suggested: one, Cerinthus, by the avowed enemies of the Apocalypse,—an assertion which has never found any favour: the second, John the Presbyter, whose existence *seems* indeed vouched for by the passage of Papias, but of whom we know nothing whatever, nor have we one particle of evidence to connect him with the authorship of the Apocalypse: and the third John Mark the Evangelist, who is equally unknown to ancient tradition as its author.

81. As far then as purely external evidence goes, I submit that our judgment can only be in one direction: viz. that the Apocalypse *was written by the Apostle John, the son of Zebedee*.

82. It will now be for us to see how far internal critical considerations substantiate or impugn the tradition of the primitive church.

83. And in so doing, it will be well for us at once to deal with certain confident assertions which Lücke and others are in the habit of making respecting the testimony of the Apocalypse itself.

84. Lücke begins this portion of his Introduction by setting aside at once the evidence of Justin Martyr and Irenæus, on the ground of supposed inconsistency with the “Selbstzeugniss” of the writer himself;—he cannot be the Apostle and Evangelist, “because he plainly distinguishes himself from the Apostles;”—referring back to a previous section for the confirmation of this assertion. On looking there, we

find "in ch. xxi. 14, in describing the heavenly Jerusalem, he speaks expressly of the twelve Apostles of Christ and their names on the twelve foundation stones of the celestial city, but apparently in such a manner as not in any way to include himself among them, but rather to exclude himself from them, and to speak of them as a higher and special class of servants and messengers of God."

85. Now let the reader observe that the "apparently" ("augenscheinlich") of the former section has become "plainly" ("deutlich") in the latter: for it is thus that even the best of the Germans are often apt to creep on, and to build up a whole fabric of argument upon an inference which at first was to themselves merely an uncertainty.

86. In this particular case, the original assertion has in fact no ground to rest upon. The apocalyptic writer is simply describing the heavenly city as it was shewn to him. On the foundations are the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. Now we may fairly ask, What reason can be given, why the beloved Apostle should not have related this? Was he who, with his brother James, sought for the highest place of honour in the future kingdom, likely to have depreciated the apostolic dignity just because he himself was one of the Twelve? and on the other hand, was he whose personal modesty was as notable as his apostolic zeal, likely, in relating such high honour done to the Twelve, to insert a notice providing against the possible mistake being made of not counting himself among them?

87. So that the first tentative introduction, and the very confident after-assertion, of this testimony of the book itself, are alike groundless. A similar instance will be found below, when we come to discuss the time and place of writing, of confident assertion respecting two supposed notices of date contained in the book itself. They turn out to be altogether dependent for their relevancy on a particular method of interpretation, not borne out by fair exegesis

88. The notices contained in the Apocalypse respecting its writer may be stated as follows -

First, his name is John, ch. i. 1, 4, 9, xxii. 8.

89. Secondly, he was known to, and of account among, the churches of proconsular Asia.

90. Thirdly, he was in exile (for so we submit must the words of ch. i. 9 be understood: see note there) in the island of Patmos on account of his Christian testimony.

We may add to these personal notices, that he takes especial pains to assert the accuracy of his testimony, both in the beginning and at the end of his book: ch. i. 2, xxii. 8.

91. Now thus far we have nothing which goes against the ecclesiastical tradition that he was the Apostle and Evangelist John. In

the latter part of his life, this Apostle was thus connected with proconsular Asia, long residing, and ultimately dying at Ephesus: see Prolegomena to Vol. I., ch. v. § i. 9 ff. It is impossible to reject this concurrent testimony of Christian antiquity: nor have even those done so, whose doubts on the Apocalypse are the strongest.

92. Again, the exile of the Apostle John in Patmos under Domitian is matter of primitive tradition, apparently distinct from the notice contained in the Apocalypse: for his return from it under Nerva, of which no notice is contained in that book, is stated as such by Eusebius: τότε (when the senate after Domitian's death decreed that the unjustly exiled should return to their homes) δὴ οὖν καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Ἰωάννην ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον φυγῆς τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐφέσου διατριβὴν ἀπειληθέναι, ὁ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν ἀρχαίων παραδίδωσι λόγος, H. E. iii. 20. And again, ib. 23, ἐπὶ τούτοις κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἔτι τῷ βίῳ περιλειπόμενος αὐτὸς ἐκείνος ὃν ἡγάπα ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπόστολος ὁμοῦ καὶ εὐαγγελιστῆς Ἰωάννης τὰς αὐτόθι διεῖπεν ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανοῦ τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς.

93. Equally definite is the tradition, that St. John lived on among the Asiatic churches till the time of Trajan: see Prolegg. Vol. I., ut supra.

94. It is worth while just to pause by the way, and consider, in what situation we are placed by these traditions. To reject them altogether would be out of all reason: and this is not done by Lücke himself. So that we must either suppose that portion of them which regards the exile to have found its way in, owing to the notice of Rev. i. 9, or to have been, independently of that notice, the result of a confusion in men's minds between two persons of the same name, John. Either of these is undoubtedly *possible*: but it is their *probability*, in the face of other evidence, which we have to estimate.

95. We may safely ask then, was either of these mistakes at all likely to have been made by Irenæus, who could write as follows: ὥστε με δύνασθαι εἰπεῖν καὶ τὸν τόπον ἐν ᾧ καθεζόμενος διελέγετο ὁ μακάριος Πολύκαρπος, καὶ τὰς προόδους αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς εἰσόδους καὶ τὸν χαρακτήρα τοῦ βίου καὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἰδέαν καὶ τὰς διαλέξεις ἃς ἐποιεῖτο πρὸς τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ τὴν μετὰ Ἰωάννου συναναστροφὴν ὡς ἀπήγγειλε, καὶ τὴν τῶν λοιπῶν τῶν ἑωρακῶτων τὸν κύριον, καὶ ὡς ἀπεμνημόνευε τοὺς λόγους αὐτῶν. I own it seems to me out of all probability that such a writer, in ascribing the Apocalypse to John the Apostle, could have confused him with another person of the same name. If we ever have trustworthy personal tradition, it is surely when it mounts up to those who saw and conversed with him respecting whom we wish to be informed.

96. It may be said indeed, that Irenæus does not mention the exile in Patmos. But this would be mere trifling: he does not, simply because he had no occasion to do so: but his own date of the seeing of

the Apocalypse, at the end of the reign of Domitian (see above, par. 7), would, in combination with other notices, be sufficient to imply it: and besides, he admits it by inference from his unhesitatingly adopting the book as written by the Apostle.

97. It seems then to me that the course of primitive tradition, even among those who did not believe the Apocalypse to have been written by the Apostle, asserts of him that he was exiled in Patmos under Domitian: and that we have no reasonable ground for supposing this view to have arisen from any confusion of persons, or to have been adopted merely from the book itself. Persons are appealed to, who knew and saw and heard the Apostle himself: and those who thus appeal were not likely to have made a mistake in a point of such vital importance.

98. We now come to a weighty and difficult part of our present enquiry: how far the matter and style of the Apocalypse bear out this result of primitive tradition. The reader will have seen, by the previous chapters of these Prolegomena, that I am very far from deprecating, or depreciating, such a course of criticism. I do not, as some of those who have upheld against all criticism the commonly received views, characterize such an enquiry as presumptuous, or its results as uncertain and vague. It is one which the soundest and best critics of all ages have followed, from Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria down to Bleek and Lücke: and, as I have elsewhere observed, is one which will be more esteemed in proportion as biblical science is spread and deepened.

99. In applying it to the book before us, certainly the upholder of the primitive tradition of its Authorship is not encouraged by first appearances. He is met at once by the startling phænomena so ably detailed by Dionysius of Alexandria at the end of his judgment (above, par. 48). The Greek construction of the Gospel and Epistle⁵, though peculiar, is smooth and unexceptionable, free from any thing like barbarism or solæcism in grammar: οὐ μόνον ἀπταιστως κατὰ τὴν Ἑλληνῶν φωνήν, says Dionysius, ἀλλὰ καὶ λογιώτατα ταῖς λέξεσι, τοῖς συλλογισμοῖς, ταῖς συντάξεσι τῆς ἐρμηνείας γέγραπται. When however we come to compare that of the Writer of the Apocalypse, we find, at first sight, all this reversed: διάλεκτον καὶ γλώσσαν οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ἐλληνίζουσιν αὐτοῦ βλέπω, ἀλλ' ἰδιώμασι μὲν βαρβαρικοῖς γρόμενον, καὶ πον καὶ σολοικίζοντα.

100. All this must be freely acknowledged, and is abundantly exemplified in the following Commentary. The question for us however is

⁵ I speak in the course of this argument of the first Epistle only, as undoubted; not that I do not believe the second and third to be genuine and characteristic also. See above, chap. vi. § i.

one which lies deeper than the surface, and beyond mere first appearances. It presents itself to us in a double form :

1) Is there any account which might be given of this great dissimilarity, consistent with identity of Authorship ?

2) Are there any indications of that identity lying beneath the surface, notwithstanding this great dissimilarity ?

101. In reply to the first question, several thoughts at once suggest themselves as claiming mention and contributing to its solution. The *subject* of the Apocalypse is so different from those of the Gospel and Epistle, that we may well expect a not inconsiderable difference of style. In those, the Writer is, under divine guidance, calmly arranging his material, in full self-consciousness, and deliberately putting forth the product, in words, of his own reflectiveness : in this, on the other hand, he is the rapt seer, borne along from vision to vision, speaking in a region and character totally different⁶. Is this circumstance any contribution to our reply ? Let us consider further.

102. St. John was not a Greek, but a Galilean. To speak a certain kind of Greek was probably natural to him, as to almost all the inhabitants of Palestine of his time. But to write the Greek of his Gospel and Epistle, can hardly but have been to him matter of effort. Or to put it in another point of view, the diction and form in which they were conveyed were the result of a deliberate exercise of a special gift of the Spirit, matured by practice, and deemed necessary for the purpose of those writings, to be put forth in them.

103. In the Apocalypse, the case may be conceived to have been different. The necessarily rhapsodical and mysterious character of that book may have led to the Apostle being left more to his vernacular and less correct Greek. Circumstances too may have contributed to this. The visions may have been set down in the solitude of exile, far from friends, and perhaps from the appliances of civilized life. The Hebraistic style may have come more naturally in a writing so fashioned on Old Testament models, and bound by so many links to the prophecies of Hebrew prophets. The style too of advanced age may have dropped the careful elaboration of the preceding years, and resumed the rougher character of early youth.

104. I do not say that these considerations are enough to account for the great diversity which is presented : nay, I fairly own, that taken alone, they are not : and that the difficulty has never yet been thoroughly solved. Still I do not conceive that we are at liberty to cut the knot by denying the Apostolic Authorship, which primitive tradition has

⁶ Since writing this I see in Davidson's Introduction, p. 587, "As Guerike has well expressed it (Einleitung, p. 559), the Gospel was conceived and written *ἐν τῷ νοῷ*, in the understanding : but the Apocalypse *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, in the Spirit."

so firmly established. Far better is it to investigate patiently, and not, by blind partisanship on either side, to stop the way against unfettered search for a better account of the phenomena than has hitherto been given.

105. It has been shewn more than once, and in our own country by Dr. Davidson in his Introduction, pp. 561 ff., that the roughnesses and solœcisms in the Apocalypse have been, for the purposes of argument, very much exaggerated: that there are hardly any which may not be paralleled in classical authors themselves, and that their more frequent occurrence here is no more than is due to the peculiar nature of the subject and occasion. This consideration should be borne in mind, and the matter investigated by the student for himself.

106. Our second question asked above was, whether there are any marks of identity of Authorship linking together the Gospel, Epistle, and Apocalypse, notwithstanding this great and evident dissimilarity?

107. The individual character of the Writer of the Gospel and Epistle stands forth evident and undoubted. We seem to know him in a moment. Even in the report of sayings of our Lord common to him and the other Evangelists, the peculiar tinge of expression, the choice and collocation of words, leave no doubt *whose* report we are reading. And so strongly does the Epistle resemble the Gospel in these particulars, that the criticism as well as the tradition of all ages has concurred in ascribing the two to the same person?

108. If now we look at the Apocalypse, we cannot for a moment feel that it is less individual, less reflecting the heart and character of its Writer. Its style, its manner of conception and arrangement of thought, its diction, are alike full of life and personal reality. So that our conditions for making this enquiry are favourable. Our two objects of comparison stand out well the one over against the other. Both are peculiar, characteristic, individual. But are the indications presented by them such that we are compelled to infer different authorship, or are they such as seem to point to one and the same person?

109. The former of these questions has been affirmed by Lücke and the opponents of the Apostolic authorship: the latter by Hengstenberg and those who uphold it. Let us see how the matter stands. And in so doing (as was the case in the similar enquiry in the Prolegomena to the Epistle to the Hebrews), I shall not enter fully into the whole list of verbal and constructional peculiarities, but, referring the reader for these to Lücke and Davidson, shall adduce, and dwell upon, some of the more remarkable and suggestive of them.

110. The first of these is one undeniably connecting the Apocalypse with the Gospel and the Epistle, viz. the appellation δ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ given to our Lord in ch. xix. 13 (see John i. 1; 1 John i. 1). This

name $\delta \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ for our Lord is found in the N. T., only in the writings of St. John. I am aware of the ingenuity with which Lücke (p. 679) has endeavoured to turn this expression to the contrary account, maintaining that it is a proof of diversity of authorship, inasmuch as the Evangelist never writes $\delta \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$: but I may leave it to any fair-judging reader to decide, whether it be not a far greater argument for identity that the remarkable designation $\delta \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ is used, than for diversity that, on the solemn occasion described in the Apocalypse, the hitherto unheard adjunct $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ is added.

111. Another reply may be given to our deduction from the use of this name: viz. that it indicates not necessarily John the Apostle, but only one familiar with his teaching, as we may suppose that other John to have been. All I can say to this is, that which I cannot help feeling to apply to the whole hypothesis of the authorship by the second John, that if it be so,—if one bearing the same name as the Apostle, having the same place among the Asiatic churches, put forth a book in which he also used the Apostle's peculiar phrases, and yet took no pains to prevent the confusion which must necessarily arise between himself and the Apostle, I do not well see how the advocates of his authorship can help pronouncing the book a forgery, or at all events the work of one who, in relating the visions, was not unwilling to be taken for his greater and Apostolic namesake.

112. Another link, binding the Apocalypse to both Gospel and Epistle, is the use of $\delta \nuικ\omega\acute{\nu}$, in the Epistles to the churches, ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26, iii. 5, 12, 21(bis): and in ch. xii. 11, xv. 2, xvii. 14, xxi. 7. Compare John xvi. 33; 1 John ii. 13, 14, iv. 4, v. 4(bis), 5. It is amusing to observe again how dexterously Lücke turns the edge of this. $\delta \nuικ\omega\acute{\nu}$ is never used *absolutely* in Gospel or in Epistle, as it is in the Apocalypse: therefore it again is a mark of diversity, not of identity. But surely this is the very thing we might expect. The $\nuικ\alpha\acute{\nu} \tau\omicron\upsilon \nu \kappa\omicron\varsigma\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\upsilon \nu, \tau\omicron\upsilon \nu \pi\omicron\upsilon\eta\rho\omicron\acute{\nu} \nu, \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma, \&c.$,—these are the details, and come under notice while the strife is proceeding, or when the object is of more import than the bare act: but when the *end* is spoken of, and the final and general victory is all that remains in view, nothing can be more natural than that he who alone spoke of $\nuικ\alpha\acute{\nu} \tau\omicron\upsilon \nu \kappa\omicron\varsigma\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\upsilon \nu, \tau\omicron\upsilon \nu \pi\omicron\upsilon\eta\rho\omicron\acute{\nu} \nu, \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$,—should also be the only one to designate the victor by $\delta \nuικ\omega\acute{\nu}$. Besides which, we have also the other use, in Rev. xii. 11, xvii. 14.

113. A third remarkable word, $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$, is once used by St. Luke (Luke xvi. 11), once by St. Paul (1 Thess. i. 9), and three times in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. viii. 2, ix. 24, x. 22): but nine times in the Gospel of St. John⁷, four times in the Epistle⁸, and ten times in

⁷ John i. 9, iv. 23, 37, vi. 32, vii. 28, viii. 16, xv. 1, xvii. 3, xix. 35.

⁸ 1 John ii. 8, v. 20(3ce).

the Apocalypse⁹. Here again, it is true, Lücke adduces this on the other side, alleging that while the Evangelist uses the word only in the sense of *genuine*—ὁ ἀληθινὸς θεός, τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν, ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἀληθινός,—the Author of the Apocalypse uses it of Christ as a synonym with πιστός, δίκαιος, ἅγιος, and as a predicate of the λόγοι, κρίσεις, ὁδοί of God. This latter is true enough; but the former assertion is singularly untrue. For in three out of the nine places in the Gospel, the subjective sense of ἀληθινός must be taken: viz. in iv. 37, viii. 16, xix. 35: and in the last of these, ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, the word is used exactly as in Rev. xxii. 6, οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι πιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοί.

114. The word ἀρνίον, which designates our Lord 29 times in the Apocalypse, only elsewhere occurs in John xxi. 15, not with reference to Him. But it is remarkable that John i. 29, 36 are the only places where he is called by the name of a lamb, the word ἀμνός being used, in reference doubtless to Isa. liii. 7 (Acts viii. 32), as in one other place where He is compared to a lamb, 1 Pet. i. 19. The Apocalyptic writer, as Lücke observes, probably chooses the diminutive, and attaches to it the epithet ἐσφαγμένον, for the purpose of contrast to the majesty and power which he has also to predicate of Christ: but is it not to be taken into account, that this personal name, *the Lamb*, whether ἀμνός or ἀρνίον, whether with or without τοῦ θεοῦ, is common only to the two books?

115. To these many minor examples might be added, and will be found treated at length in Lücke, p. 669 ff., Davidson, p. 561 ff.¹ The latter writer has succeeded in many cases in shewing the unfairness of Lücke's strong partisanship, by which he makes every similarity into a dissimilarity: but on the other hand he on his side has gone perhaps too far in attempting to answer every objection of this kind. After all, while there certainly are weighty indications of identity of authorship, there is also a residuum of phenomena of diversity quite enough for the reasonable support of the contrary hypothesis. If the book stood alone in the matter of evidence, I own I should be quite at a loss how to sub-

⁹ ch. iii. 7, 14, vi. 10, xv. 3, xvi. 7, xix. 2, 9, 11, xxi. 5, xxii. 6.

¹ I have observed the following which I have not seen elsewhere noticed, occurring only in the three books, or only in the peculiar sense:—

1. οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι, John xvi. 12

οὐ δύνη βαστάσαι κακοὺς, Rev. ii. 2.

2. κεκοπιακὸς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοπορίας, John iv. 6.

οὐ κεκοπιάκες, Rev. ii. 8.

3. δύο ἀγγέλους ἐν λευκοῖς . . . John xx. 12.

περιπατήσουσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν λευκοῖς, Rev. iii. 4.

4. The verb κείμει used of mere position, John ii. 6, xix. 29, x. 5, 6, xxi. 9; Rev. iv. 2 only.

5. ὄνομα αὐτῷ, John i. 6, iii. 1 (xviii. 10); Rev. vi. 8, ix. 11.

6. Compare Rev. iii. 18 with 1 John ii. 20, 27, as to the χρῆσμα and its effects.

stantiate identity of authorship between it and the Gospel and Epistle. But as it is our main reliance is on the concurrent testimony of primitive tradition, which hardly can be stronger than it is, and which the perfectly gratuitous hypothesis respecting a second John as the author entirely fails to shake.

116. Our question respecting the internal evidence furnished by the book itself is thus in a position entirely different from that which it occupied in the Prolegomena to the Epistle to the Hebrews. There, we had no primitive tradition so general, or of such authority as to command our assent. The question was perfectly open. The authorship by St. Paul was an opinion at first tentatively and partially held: then as time wore on, acquiring consistency and acceptance. Judging of this by the book itself, is it for us to accept or to reject it? In lack of any worthy external evidence, we were thrown back on this as our main material for a judgment.

117. But with regard to the Apocalypse, external and internal evidence have changed places. The former is now the main material for our judgment. It is of the highest and most satisfactory kind. It was unanimous in very early times. It came from those who knew and had heard St. John himself. It only begins to be impugned by those who had doctrinal objections to the book. The doubt was taken up by more reasonable men on internal and critical grounds. But no real substantive counter-claimant was ever produced: only one whose very existence depended on the report of two tombs bearing the name of John, and on a not very perspicuous passage of Papias.

118. This being so, our inquiry has necessarily taken this shape:—*Is the book itself inconsistent with this apparently irrefragable testimony?* And in replying to it we have confessed that the differences between it and the Gospel and Epistle are very remarkable, and of a character hitherto unexplained, or not fully accounted for: but that there are at the same time striking notes of similarity in expression and cast of thought: and that perhaps we are not in a position to take into account the effect of a totally different subject and totally different circumstances upon one, who though knowing and speaking Greek, was yet a Hebrew by birth.

119. Thus, all things considered, being it is true far from satisfied with any account at present given of the peculiar style and phenomena of the Apocalypse, but being far less satisfied with the procedure of the antagonists of the Apostolic authorship, we are not prepared to withhold our assent from the firm and unshaken testimony of primitive tradition, that the author was the Apostle and Evangelist St. John.

SECTION II.

PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

1. The enquiry as to the former of these is narrowed within a very small space. From the notice contained in the book itself (ch. i. 9) the writing must have taken place either in Patmos, or after the return from exile. The past tenses, *ἐμαρτύρησεν* in ch. i. 2, and *ἐγενόμην* in i. 9, do not decide for the latter alternative; they may both be used as from the point of time when the book should be read, as is common in all narratives. On the other hand, it would be more probable *ab extra*, that the writing should take place after the return, especially if we are to credit the account given by Victorinus, that St. John was condemned to the mines in Patmos. We have no means of determining the question, and must leave it in doubt. If the style and peculiarities are to be in any degree attributed to outward circumstances, then it would seem to have been written in solitude, and sent from Patmos to the Asiatic churches.

2. The only traditional notice worth recounting is that given by Victorinus: on Rev. x. 11, Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. v. p. 333: where he relates that John *saw* the Apocalypse in Patmos, and then after his release on the death of Domitian, “*postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Deo Apocalypsin.*” Arethas indeed says on Rev. vii., *ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς ἐχρησμοφδεῖτο ταῦτα ἐν Ἰωνίᾳ τῇ κατ’ Ἐφέσον*: but this is too late to be of any account in the matter.

3. It has been remarked², that the circumstance of John having prepared to write down the voices of the seven thunders, Rev. x. 4, appears to sanction the view that the writing took place at the same time with the seeing of the visions.

4. As regards Patmos itself, it is one of the group called the Sporades, to the S. of Samos (Pliny, iv. 23. Strabo, x. p. 488. Thucyd. iii. 23). It is about thirty Roman miles in circumference. A cave is still shewn in the island (now *Patmo*) where St. John is said to have seen the Apocalypse. See Winer’s *Realwörterbuch*, and the Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography.

5. With regard however to the *time* of writing, there has been no small controversy. And at this we need not be surprised, seeing that principles of interpretation are involved.

We will first deal with ancient tradition as far as it gives us any indication as to the date.

6. Irenæus, v. 30. 3, p. 330, in a passage already cited (§ i. par. 7),

² Stuart, p. 215.

tells us that the Apocalypse (for such is the only legitimate understanding of the construction) *ἑώραθη . . . σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς*.

7. Clement of Alexandria (*Quis dives salvus*, § 42, p. 949 P., cited also by Eusebius, H. E. iii. 23), says *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοῦ τυράννου τελευτήσαντος ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου τῆς νήσου μετῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Ἐφεσον, κ.τ.λ.* This passage, it is true, contains no mention who the tyrant was, nor any allusion to the writing of the Apocalypse: but it is interesting for our present enquiry as shewing, in its citation by Eusebius, how *he* understood the date furnished by it. For he introduces it by saying that St. John *τὰς κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν διέειπεν ἐκκλησίας, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν νήσον μετὰ τὴν Δομετιανου τελευτὴν ἐπανελθὼν φυγῆς*, and cites Clement as one of the witnesses of the fact.

8. Origen merely calls St. John's persecutor *ὁ Ῥωμαίων βασιλεὺς*, without specifying which. And he seems to do this wittingly: for he notices that John himself does not mention who condemned him. See the passage quoted above, § i. par. 12.

9. Eusebius, H. E. iii. 18, having cited the passage of Irenæus noticed above, says *οἱ γὰρ καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἐπ' ἀκριβὲς ἐπεσημῆναντο ἐν ἔτει πεντεκαίδεκάτῳ Δομετιανοῦ, μετὰ πλείονων ἐτέρων καὶ Φλαβίαν Δομετίλλαν ἱστορήσαντες, ἐξ ἀδελφῆς γεγωνῖαν Φλαβίου Κλήμεντος, ἐνὸς τῶν τηνικάδε ἐπὶ Ῥώμης δυνατῶν, τῆς εἰς χριστὸν μαρτυρίας ἕνεκεν εἰς νήσον Ποντίαν κατὰ τιμωρίαν δεδόσθαι*. And this same statement he repeats in his *Chronicon*, A.D. 95, vol. i. p. 551 f., Migne. In H. E. iii. 20 he gives the account of the return of St. John from Patmos in the beginning of Nerva's reign, cited above, § i. par. 92.

10. Tertullian does not appear quite to bear out Eusebius's understanding of him, H. E. iii. 20: for he only says, *Apol. c. 5*, vol. i. p. 293 f., after mentioning the persecution of Nero, "*Tentaverat et Domitianus, portio Neronis de crudelitate: sed qua et homo, facile cœptum repressit, restitutis etiam quos relegaverat*." Here he certainly makes Domitian himself recall the exiles.

11. Victorinus, in the passage above referred to ("*quando hoc vidit Johannes, erat in insula Patmos, in metallum damnatus a Domitiano Cæsare*"), and afterwards ("*Johannes, de metallo dimissus, sic postea tradidit hanc eandem quam acceperat a Deo apocalypsin*"), plainly gives the date: as also in another place, p. 338: "*Intelligi oportet tempus quo scripta apocalypsis edita est, quoniam tunc erat Cæsar Domitianus unus exstat sub quo scripta est apocalypsis, Domitianus scilicet*."

12. Jerome (*de Vir. illustr.* 9, vol. ii. p. 845) says, "*quarto decimo anno secundam post Neronem persecutionem movente Domitiano in Patmos insulam relegatus scripsit apocalypsin interfecto autem Domitiano et actis ejus ob nimiam crudelitatem a Senatu rescissis sub*

Nerva principe redit Ephesum." So also his testimony above, § i. par. 25.

13. So also Sulpicius Severus and Orosius, and later writers generally. The first who breaks in upon this concurrent tradition is Epiphanius, Hær. li., in two very curious passages: the first where he says c. 12, vol. i. p. 433 f., ὕστερον ἀναγκάζει τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τὸν Ἰωάννην παραιτούμενον εὐαγγελίσασθαι δι' εὐλάβειαν καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ γηραλέᾳ αὐτοῦ ἡλικίᾳ, μετὰ ἑτη ἐνενήκοντα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς, μετὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Πάτμου ἐπάνοδον, τὴν ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου γενομένην Καίσαρος: the other, c. 33, p. 456, αὐτοῦ δὲ προφητεύσαντος ἐν χρόνους Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος ἀνωτάτω, ὅτε εἰς τὴν Πάτμον νῆσον ὑπῆρξεν . . .

14. Now it is plain that there must be some strange blunder here, which Lücke, who makes much of Epiphanius's testimony as shewing that the tradition, which he calls the *Irenæan*, was not received by Epiphanius, entirely, and conveniently, omits to notice. The passage evidently sets the return from exile in the extreme old age of St. John. To say that a considerable interval may be supposed to elapse between the ἐπάνοδος and his ninetieth year, would be mere trifling with the context. Now if this is so, seeing that Claudius reigned from 41 to 54 A.D., putting the return from exile at the last of these dates, we should have St. John aged ninety in the year 54: in other words, thirty-three years older than our Lord, and sixty-three at least when called to be an Apostle: a result which is at variance with all ancient tradition whatever. Either Epiphanius has fallen into some great mistake, which is not very probable, or he means by Claudius some other Emperor: if Nero, then he would still be wrong as to St. John's age at or near to his return.

15. The testimony of Muratori's fragment on the Canon has been cited (by Stuart, p. 218) as testifying to an early date. But all it says is this: "Ipse beatus Apostolus Paulus sequens prædecessoris sui Johannis ordinem, nomine nominatim septem ecclesiis scribat ordine tali." And the word *prædecessoris*, as has been pointed out by Credner, merely seems to mean that St. John was an Apostle before St. Paul, not that he wrote his seven epistles before St. Paul wrote his.

16. The preface to the Syriac version of the Apocalypse published by De Dieu, supposed to have been made in the 6th century, says that the visions were seen by St. John in the island of Patmos, "in quam a Nerone Cæsare relegatus fuerat."

17. Theophylact, in his preface to the Gospel of St. John, vol. i. p. 504, says that it was written in the island of Patmos, thirty-two years after the Ascension: and in so saying, places the exile under Nero. But he clearly is wrong, as Lücke remarks, or his meaning not clearly understood, when he attributes the writing of the Gospel to this time: and

moreover he is inconsistent with himself: for in commenting on Matt. xx. 23, vol. i. p. 107, he remarks that as Herod put to death the Apostle James the greater, so Trajan condemned John as a martyr to the word of truth.

18. Jerome, *adv. Jovin.* i. 26, vol. ii. p. 280, determines nothing, only citing Tertullian, "*Refert autem Tertullianus quod a Nerone (for "a Nerone," Migne reads "Romæ") missus in ferventis olei dolium purior et vegetior exiverit quam intraverit.*" But Tertullian only says, if at least *De præscript. Hæret.* c. 36, vol. ii. p. 49, be the place referred to, "*Felix ecclesia (Romana) ubi Petrus passioni dominicæ adæquatur, ubi Paulus Johannis (scil. baptistæ) exitu coronatur, ubi Apostolus Joannes posteaquam in oleum igneum demersus nihil passus est, in insulam relegatur.*" It surely is stretching a point here to say that he implies all three events to have taken place under Nero.

19. The author of the "*Synopsis de vita et morte prophetarum, apostolorum et discipulorum Domini*" (ostensibly Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre, so cited in Theophylact, vol. i. p. 500: but probably it belongs to the 6th century), makes John to be exiled to Patmos by Trajan. Andreas and Arethas give no decided testimony on the point. Arethas, in commenting on Rev. vi. 12, says, that some applied this prophecy to the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian: but this is distinctly repudiated by Andreas: allowing however (on vii. 2) that such things did happen to the Jewish Christians who escaped the evils inflicted on Jerusalem by the Romans, yet they more probably refer to the times of Antichrist. Arethas again, on Rev. i. 9, cites without any protest Eusebius, as asserting St. John's exile in Patmos to have taken place under Domitian.

20. Much more evidence on this subject from other later writers whose testimonies are of less consequence,—and more minute discussion of the earlier testimonies, will be found in Elliott, *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, i. pp. 31—46, and Appendix, No. i. pp. 503—517. In the last mentioned, he has gone well and carefully through the arguments on external evidence adduced by Lücke and Stuart for the writing under Galba and Nero respectively, and, as it seems to me, disposed of them all.

21. Our result, as far as this part of the question is considered, may be thus stated. We have a constant and unswerving primitive tradition that St. John's exile took place, and the Apocalypse was written, towards the end of Domitian's reign. With this tradition, as has been often observed, the circumstances seem to agree very well. We have no evidence that the first, or Neronian, persecution, extended beyond Rome, or found vent in condemnations to exile. Whereas in regard to the second we know that both these were the case. Indeed the liberation at Domitian's death of those whom he had exiled is substantiated by Dio Cassius, who, in relating the beginning of Nerva's reign, lib. lxxviii. 1,

says, *μίσει δὲ τοῦ Δομετιανοῦ αἱ εἰκόνες αὐτοῦ . . . συνεχωνεύθησαν . . . καὶ ὁ Νερούας τοὺς τε κρινορένους ἐπ' ἀσεβείᾳ ἀφήκε, καὶ τοὺς φεύγοντας κατήγαγε . . . τοῖς δὲ δὴ ἄλλοις οὔτ' ἀσεβείας, οὔτ' Ἰουδαικοῦ βίου κατατιᾶσθαι τινὰς συνεχώρησε.*

22. Assuming then the fact of St. John's exile at Patmos during a persecution for the Gospel's sake, it is far more likely that it should have been under Domitian than under Nero or under Galba. But one main reliance of the advocates of the earlier date is internal evidence supposed to be furnished by the book itself. And this, first, from the rough and Hebraistic style. I have already discussed this point, and have fully admitted its difficulty, however we view it. I need only add now, that I do not conceive we at all diminish that difficulty by supposing it to be written before the Gospel and Epistle. The Greek of the Gospel and Epistle is not the Greek of the Apocalypse in a maturer state: but if the two belong to one and the same writer, we must seek for the cause of their diversity not in chronological but rather in psychological considerations.

23. Again, it is said that the book furnishes indications of having been written before the destruction of Jerusalem, by the fact of its mentioning the city and the temple, ch. xi. 1 ff., and the twelve tribes as yet existing, ch. vii. 4—8. This argument has been very much insisted on by several of the modern German critics. But we may demur to it at once, as containing an assumption which we are not prepared to grant: viz. that the prophetic passage is to be thus interpreted, or has any thing to do with the literal Jerusalem. Let the canon of interpretation be first substantiated, by which we are to be bound in our understanding of this passage, and then we can recognize its bearing on the chronological question. Certainly Lücke has not done this, pp. 825 ff., but, as usual with him, has fallen to abusing Hengstenberg, for which he undoubtedly has a strong case, while for his own interpretation he seems to me to make out a very weak one.

24. Another such assumption is found in the confident assertion by the same critics, that the passages in ch. xiii. 1 ff., xvii. 10 point out the then reigning Cæsar, and that by the conditions of those passages, such reigning Cæsar must be that one who suits their chronological theory. It is not the place here to discuss principles of interpretation: but we may fairly demur again to the thus assuming a principle irrespective of the requirements of the book, and then judging the book itself by it. This is manifestly done by Lücke, pp. 835 ff. Besides which, the differences among themselves of those who adopt this view are such as to deprive it of all fixity as an historical indication. Are we to reckon our Cæsars forwards (and if so, are we to begin with Julius, or with Augustus?), or backwards, upon some independent assumption of the time

of writing, which the other phænomena must be made to fit? If the reader will consult the notes on ch. xvii. 10, I trust he will see that any such view of the passages is untenable.

25. Upon interpretations like these, insulated, and derived from mere first impressions of the wording of single passages, is the whole fabric built, which is to supersede the primitive tradition as to the date of the Apocalypse. On this account, Irenæus must be supposed to have made a mistake in the date which he assigns, who had such good and sufficient means of knowing: on this account, all those additional testimonies, which in any other case would have been adduced as independent and important, are to be assumed to have been mere repetitions of that of Irenæus.

26. But it is most unfortunate for these critics that, when once so sure a ground is established for them as a direct indication in the book itself of the emperor under whom it was written, they cannot agree among themselves who this emperor was. Some among them (e. g. Stuart, al.) taking the natural (and one would think the only possible) view of such an historical indication, begin according to general custom with Julius, and bring the writing under Nero. Ewald and Lücke, on account of the *οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ πάρεσται* of ch. xvii. 8, which they wish to apply to Nero, desert the usual reckoning of Roman emperors, and begin with Augustus, thus bringing the writing under Galba. Again, Eichhorn and Bleek, wishing to bring the writing under Vespasian, omit Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, relying on an expression of Suetonius that their reigns were a mere "*rebellio trium principum*." Thus by changing the usual starting-point, and leaving out of the usual list of the Cæsars any number found convenient, any view we please may be substantiated by this kind of interpretation. Those whose view of the prophecy extends wider, and who attach a larger meaning to the symbols of the beast and his image and his heads, will not be induced by such very uncertain speculations to set aside a primitive and as it appears to them thoroughly trustworthy tradition.

27. It may be observed that Lücke attempts to give an account of the origin of what he calls the Irenæan tradition, freely confessing that his proof (?) of the date is not complete without such an account. The character of the account he gives is well worth observing. When, he says, men found that the apocalyptic prophecies had failed of their accomplishment, they began to give a wider sense to them, and to put them at a later date. And having given this account, he attempts to vindicate it from the charge of overthrowing the authority of Scripture prophecy, and says that though it may not be as convenient as the way which modern orthodoxy has struck out, yet it leads more safely to the desired end, and to the permanent enjoyment of true faith.

28. With every disposition to search and prove all things, and ground faith upon things thus proved, I own I am quite unable to come to Lücke's conclusions, or to those of any of the maintainers of the Neronian or any of the earlier dates. The book itself, it seems to me, refuses the assignment of such times of writing. The evident assumption which it makes of long-standing and general persecution (ch. vi. 9) forbids us to place it in the very first persecution and that only a partial one: the undoubted transference of Jewish temple emblems to a Christian sense (ch. i. 20) of itself makes us suspect those interpreters who maintain the literal sense when the temple and city are mentioned: the analogy of the prophecies of Daniel forbids us to limit to individual kings the interpretation of the symbolic heads of the beast: the whole character and tone of the writing precludes our imagining that its original reference was ever intended to be to mere local matters of secondary import.

29. The state of those to whom it was addressed furnishes another powerful subsidiary argument in favour of the later date. This will be expanded in the next section.

30. These things then being considered,—the decisive testimony of primitive tradition, and failure of all attempts to set it aside,—the internal evidence furnished by the book itself, and equal failure of all attempts by an unwarrantable interpretation to raise up counter evidence, —I have no hesitation in believing with the ancient fathers and most competent witnesses, that the Apocalypse was written *πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομειανῶ ἀρχῆς*, i. e. about the year 95 or 96 A.D.

SECTION III.

TO WHOM ADDRESSED.

1. The superscription of the book plainly states for what readers it was primarily intended. At the same time indications abound, that the whole Christian church was in view. In the very epistles to the seven churches themselves, all the promises and sayings of the Lord, though arising out of local circumstances, are of perfectly general application. And in the course of the prophecy, the wide range of objects embraced, the universality of the cautions and encouragements, the vast periods of time comprised, leave us no inference but this, that the book was intended for the comfort and profit of every age of the Christian church. In treating therefore the question at the head of this section in its narrower

and literal sense, I am not excluding the broader and general view. It lies behind the other, as in the rest of the apostolic writings. "These things," as the older Scriptures, "are written for our ensamples, upon whom the ends of the world are come : " or, in the language of the Muratori fragment on the Canon, "et Johannes enim in Apocalypsi licet septem ecclesiis scribat, tamen omnibus dicit."

2. The book then was directly addressed to the seven churches of proconsular Asia. A few remarks must be made on the general subject of the names and state of these churches, before entering on a description of them severally.

3. First, as to the selection of the names. The number seven, so often used by the Seer to express universality, has here prevailed in occasioning that number of names to be selected out of the churches in the district. For these were not all the churches comprised in Asia proper. Whether there were Christian bodies in Colossæ and Hierapolis we cannot say. Those cities had been, since the writing of St. Paul's Epistle, destroyed by an earthquake, and in what state of restoration they were at this date, is uncertain. But from the Epistles of Ignatius we may fairly assume that there were churches in Magnesia and Tralles. The number seven then is representative, not exhaustive. These seven are taken in the following order : Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum, Thyatira, Sardis, Philadelphia, Laodicea. That is, beginning with Ephesus the first city in the province, it follows a line from South to North up to Pergamum, then takes the neighbouring city of Thyatira, and follows another line from North to South.

4. As regards the general state of these churches, we may make the following remarks :

We have from St. Paul, setting aside the Epistle to the Ephesians, not from any doubt as to its original destination, but as containing no local notices, and that to Philemon, as being of a private character,—three Epistles containing notices of the Christian churches within this district. The first in point of time is that to the Colossians (A.D. 61—63) : then follow the two to Timotheus, dating from 67 to 68. It is important to observe, that all these Epistles, even the latest of them, the second to Timotheus, have regard to a state of the churches evidently preceding by many years that set before us in this book. The germs of heresy and error there apparent (see Vol. III. prolegg. ch. vii. § i. par. 12 ff.) had expanded into definite sects (ch. ii. 6, 15) : the first ardour with which some of them had received and practised the Gospel, had cooled (ch. ii. 4, 5, iii. 2) : others had increased in zeal for God, and were surpassing their former works (ch. ii. 19). Again, the days of the martyrdom of Antipas, an eminent servant of Christ, are referred back to some time past (ch. ii. 13).

5. It is also important to notice that Laodicea is described (ch. iii. 17) as boasting in her wealth and self-sufficiency. Now we know from Tacitus (see below, par. 13), that in the sixth year of Nero, or in the tenth, according to Eusebius (and apparently with more accuracy), Laodicea was destroyed by an earthquake, and recovered herself *propriis opibus*, without any assistance from the Head of the state. How many years it might take before the city could again put on such a spirit of self-sufficing pride as that shewn in ch. iii. 17, it is not possible to fix exactly : but it is obvious that we must allow more time for this than would be consistent with the Neronic date of the Apocalypse. This is confirmed when we observe the spiritual character given of the Laodicean church,—that of lukewarmness,—and reflect, that such a character does not ordinarily accompany, nor follow close upon, great judgments and afflictions, but is the result of a period of calm and prosperity, and gradually encroaching compromise with ungodliness.

6. I may further mention, that the fact of the relation here shewn to exist between John and the churches of proconsular Asia, points to a period wholly distinct from that in which Paul, or his disciple Timothy, exercised authority in those parts. And this alone would lead us to meet with a decided negative the hypothesis of the Apocalypse being written under Nero, Galba, or even Vespasian. At the same time, see note on ch. ii. 20,—the mention of *φαγεῖν εἰδωλόθρυτα* there identifies the temptations and difficulties which beset the churches when the Apocalypse was written, with those which we know to have been prevalent in the apostolic age, and thus gives a strong confirmation of the authenticity of the book.

I now proceed to consider these churches one by one.

7. **EPHESUS**, the capital of proconsular Asia, has already been described and a sketch of its history given, in the Prolegg. to the Epistle to the Ephesians, Vol. III. prolegg. ch. ii. § ii. parr. 1—6. More detailed accounts are there referred to. The notes to the Epistle will in each case put the student in possession of the general character and particular excellencies or failings of each church, so that I need not repeat them here. In reference to the threat uttered by our Lord in ch. ii. 5, we may remark, that a few miserable huts, and ruins of great extent and massiveness, are all that now remains of the former splendid capital of Asia. The candlestick has indeed been removed from its place, and the church has become extinct. We may notice, that Ephesus naturally leads the seven, both as the metropolis of the province, and as containing that church with which the Writer himself was individually connected.

8. **SMYRNA**, a famous commercial city of Ionia, at the head of the bay named after it, and at the mouth of the small river Meles : from

which Homer, whose birthplace Smyrna, among other cities, claimed to be, is sometimes called Melesigenes. It is 320 stadia (40 miles) north of Ephesus. It was a very ancient city (Herod. i. 149) : but lay in ruins, after its destruction by the Lydians (B.C. 627 : cf. Herod. i. 16), for 400 years (till Alexander the Great, according to Pliny v. 31 ; Pausan. vii. 5. 1 ; till Antigonos, according to Strabo, l. xiv. p. 646). It was then rebuilt, 20 stadia from old Smyrna (Strabo, l. c.), and rose to be, in the time of the first Cæsars, one of the fairest and most populous cities in Asia (Strabo, *ibid.*). Modern Smyrna is a large city of more than 120,000 inhabitants, the centre of the trade of the Levant. The church in Smyrna was distinguished for its illustrious first bishop the martyr Polycarp, who is said to have been put to death in the stadium there in A.D. 166 (cf. Iren. Hær. iii. 3. 4, p. 176).

9. PERGAMUM (sometimes Pergamus), an ancient city of Mysia, on the river Caïcus, an *ἐπιφανὴς πόλις* (Strabo, l. xiii. p. 623). At first it appears to have been a mere hill-fortress of great natural strength ; but it became an important city owing to the circumstance of Lysimachus, one of Alexander's generals, having chosen it for the reception of his treasures, and entrusted them to his eunuch Philetærus, who rebelled against him (B.C. 283), and founded a kingdom, which lasted 150 years, when it was bequeathed by its last sovereign Attalus III. (B.C. 133) to the Roman people. Pergamum possessed a magnificent library, founded by its sovereign Eumenes (B.C. 197—159), which subsequently was given by Antony to Cleopatra (Plut. Anton. c. 58), and perished with that at Alexandria under Caliph Omar. It became the official capital of the Roman province of Asia (Pliny, v. 33). There was there a celebrated temple of Æsculapius, on which see note, ch. ii. 13. There is still a considerable city, containing, it is said (Stuart, p. 450), about 3000 nominal Christians. It is now called Bergamah.

10. THYATIRA, once called Pelopia and Euippia (Plin. v. 31), a town in Lydia, about a day's journey south of Pergamum. It was perhaps originally a Macedonian colony (Strabo, xiii. p. 625). Its chief trade was dyeing of purple, cf. Acts xvi. 14 and note. It is said to be at present a considerable town with many ruins, called Ak-Hisar, and to contain some 3000 Christians.

11. SARDIS, the ancient capital of the kingdom of Lydia, lay in a plain between the mountains Tmolus and Hermus, on the small river Pactolus : 33 miles from Thyatira and 28 from Philadelphia by the Antonine Itinerary. Its classical history is well known. In the reign of Tiberius it was destroyed by an earthquake, but restored by order of that emperor, Tacit. Ann. ii. 47 ; Strabo xiii. p. 627. It was the capital of a *conventus* in the time of Pliny (v. 30) ; and continued a wealthy city to the end of the Byzantine empire. More than one Christian

council was held here. In the eleventh century Sardis fell into the hands of the Turks, and in the thirteenth it was destroyed by Tamerlane. Only a village (Sart) now remains, built among the ruins of the ancient city.

12. PHILADELPHIA, in Lydia, on the N.W. side of Mount Tmolus, 28 miles S.E. from Sardis. It was built by Attalus Philadelphus, King of Pergamum. Earthquakes were exceedingly prevalent in the district, and it was more than once nearly demolished by them : cf. Tacit. Ann. ii. 47 ; Strabo xiii. 628. It defended itself against the Turks for some time, but was eventually taken by Bajazet in 1390. It is now a considerable town named Allahshar, containing ruins of its ancient wall, and of about twenty-four churches.

13. LAODICEA, Laodicea ad Lycum, was a celebrated city in the S.W. of Phrygia, near the river Lycus. It was originally called Diospolis, and afterward Rhoas (Plin. v. 29) : and the name Laodicea was owing to its being rebuilt by Antiochus Theos in honour of his wife Laodice. It was not far from Colossæ, and only six miles W. of Hierapolis. It suffered much in the Mithridatic war (Appian, Bell. Mithr. 20 ; Strabo xii. 578) : but recovered itself, and became a wealthy and important place, at the end of the republic and under the first emperors. It was completely destroyed by the great earthquake in the reign of Nero : but was rebuilt by the wealth of its own citizens, without help from the state, Tacit. Ann. xiv. 27. Its state of prosperity and carelessness in spiritual things described in the Epistle is well illustrated by these facts. St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Laodiceans, now lost. See Col. iv. 16, and Prolegg. to Vol. III. ch. xi. § iii. 2. It produced literary men of eminence, and had a great medical school. It was the capital of a conventus during the Roman empire. It was utterly ravaged by the Turks, and "nothing," says Hamilton, "can exceed the desolation and melancholy appearance of the site of Laodicea." A village exists amongst the ruins, named Eski-hissar.

14. See for further notices on the Seven Churches, Winer, *RWB.*, and Dr. Smith's *Dictionary of Geography* : from which two sources the above accounts are mainly compiled. In those works will be found detailed references to the works of various travellers who have visited them.

SECTION IV.

OBJECT AND CONTENTS.

1. The Apocalypse declares its own object (ch. i. 1) to be mainly prophetic; the exhibition to God's servants of things which must shortly come to pass. And to this by far the larger portion of the book is devoted. From ch. iv. 1 to xxii. 5, is a series of visions prophetic of things to come, or introducing in their completeness allegories which involve things to come. Intermixed however with this prophetic development, we have a course of hortatory and encouraging sayings, arising out of the state of the churches to which the book is written, and addressed through them to the church universal.

2. These sayings are mostly related in style and sense to the Epistles with which the book began, so as to preserve in a remarkable manner the unity of the whole, and to shew that it is not, as Grotius and some others have supposed, a congeries of different fragments, but one united work, written at one and the same time. The practical tendency of the Epistles to the Churches is never lost sight of throughout. So that we may fairly say that its object is not only to prophesy of the future, but also by such prophecy to rebuke, exhort, and console the Church.

3. Such being the general object, our enquiry is now narrowed to that of the prophetic portion itself: and we have to enquire, what was the aim of the Writer, or rather of Him who inspired the Writer, in delivering this prophecy.

4. And in the first place, we are met by an enquiry which it may be strange enough that we have to make in this day, but which nevertheless must be made. Is the book, it is asked, strictly speaking, a revelation at all? Is its so-called prophecy any thing more than the ardent and imaginative poesy of a rapt spirit, built up on the then present trials and hopes of himself and his contemporaries? Is not its future bounded by the age and circumstances then existing? And are not all those mistaken, who have attempted to deduce from it indications respecting our own or any subsequent age of the Church?

5. Two systems of understanding and interpreting the book have been raised on the basis of a view represented by the foregoing questions. The former of them, that of Grotius, Ewald, Eichhorn, and others, proceeds consistently enough in denying all prophecy, and explaining figuratively, with regard to then present expectations, right or wrong, all the things contained in the book. The latter, that of Lücke, De Wette, Bleek, Düsterdieck, and others, while it professes to recognize a certain kind of inspiration in the Writer, yet believes his view to have been entirely bounded by his own subjectivity and circum-

stances, denying that the book contains any thing specially revealed to John and by him declared to us; and regarding its whole contents as only instructive, in so far as they represent to us the aspirations of a fervid and inspired man, full of the Spirit of God, and his insight into forms of conflict and evil which are ever recurring in the history of the world and the Church.

6. I own it seems to me that we cannot in consistency or in honesty accept this compromise. For let us ask ourselves, how does it agree with the *phænomena*? It conveniently saves the credit of the Writer, and rescues the book from being an imposture, by conceding that he saw all which he says he saw: but at the same time maintains, that all which he saw was purely subjective, having no external objective existence: and that those things which seem to be prophecies of the distant future, are in fact no such prophecies, but have and exhaust their significance within the horizon of the writer's own experience and hopes.

7. But then, if this be so, I do not see, after all, how the credit of the Writer *is* so entirely saved. He distinctly lays claim to be speaking of long periods of time. To say nothing of the time involved in the other visions, he speaks of *a thousand years*, and of things which must happen at the end of that period. So that we must say, on the theory in question, that all his declarations of this kind are pure mistakes: and, in exegesis, our view must be entirely limited to the enquiry, not what is for us and for all the meaning of this or that prophecy, but what was the Writer's meaning when he set it down. Whether subsequent events justified his guess, or falsified it, is for us a pure matter of archæological and psychological interest, and no more.

8. If this be so, I submit that the book at once becomes that which is known as apocryphal, as distinguished from canonical: it is of no more value to us than the Shepherd of Hermas, or the Ascension of Isaiah: and is mere matter for criticism and independent judgment.

9. It will be no surprise to the readers of this work to be told, that we are not prepared thus to deal with a book which we accept as canonical, and have all reason to believe to have been written by an Apostle. While we are no believers in what has been (we cannot help thinking foolishly) called *verbal* inspiration, we are not prepared to set aside the whole substance of the testimony of the writer of a book which we accept as canonical, nor to deny that visions, which he purports to have received from God to shew to the Church things which must shortly come to pass, were so received by him, and for such a purpose.

10. Maintaining this ground, and taking into account the tone of the book itself, and the periods embraced in its prophecies, we cannot consent to believe the vision of the Writer to have been bounded by the

horizon of his own experience and personal hopes. We receive the book as being what it professes to be, a *revelation from God* designed to *shew to his servants things which must shortly come to pass*³. And so far from this word *ἐν τάχει* offending us, we find in it, as compared with the contents of the book, a measure by which, not our judgment of those contents, but our estimate of worldly events and their duration, should be corrected. The *ἐν τάχει* confessedly contains, among other periods, a period of a thousand years. On what principle are we to affirm that it does not embrace a period vastly greater than this in its whole contents?

11. We hold therefore that the book, judged by its own testimony, and with regard to the place which it holds among the canonical books of Scripture, is written with the object of conveying to the Church revelations from God respecting certain portions of her course even up to the time of the end. Whether such revelations disclose to her a continuous prophetic history, or are to be taken as presenting varying views and relations of her conflict with evil, and God's judgment on her enemies, will be hereafter discussed. But the general object is independent of these differences in interpretation.

12. The contents of the book have been variously arranged. It seems better to follow the plain indication of the book itself, than to distribute it so as to suit any theory of interpretation. We find in so doing, that we have,

- I. A general introduction to the whole book, ch. i. 1—3:
- II. The portion containing the Epistles to the seven churches, i. 4—iii. 22, itself consisting of
 - a. The address and preface, i. 4—8.
 - β. The introductory vision, i. 9—20
 - γ. The seven Epistles, ii. 1—iii. 22.
- III. The prophetic portion, iv. 1—xxii. 5; and herein
 - a. The heavenly scene of vision, iv. 1—11.
 - β. 1. The sealed book, and the Lamb who should open its seven seals, v. 1—14.
 2. The seven seals opened, vi. 1—viii. 5, wherein are inserted two episodes, between the sixth and seventh seals.

³ Düsterdieck has stigmatized this view (Einl. p. 44) as that of *magical* inspiration, as distinguished from his own, which he designates as that of *ethical* inspiration. It is difficult to assign any meaning to these epithets at all corresponding to the nature of the case. Why that inspiration should be called *magical*, which makes the prophet the organ of communicating the divine counsels in symbolical language to the Church, it is difficult to say: and surely not less difficult to explain, how that inspiration can be called *ethical*, which makes him pretend to have received visions *from God*, which he has only imagined in his own mind.

- a. the sealing of the elect, vii. 1—8.
- b. the multitude of the redeemed, vii. 9—17.
- γ. The seven trumpets of vengeance, introduced indeed before the conclusion of the former portion, viii. 2, but properly extending from viii. 6—xi. 19.
- But here again we have two episodes, between the sixth and seventh trumpets,
 - a. the little book, x. 1—11.
 - b. the two witnesses, xi. 1—14.
- δ. The woman and her three enemies, xii. 1—xiii. 18. And herein
 - a. the dragon, xii. 1—17.
 - b. the beast xii. 18—xiii. 10.
 - c. the second beast, or false prophet, xiii. 11—18.
- ε. The introduction to the final triumph and the final vengeance, xiv. 1—20. And herein
 - a. the Lamb and his elect, xiv. 1—5.
 - b. the three angels announcing the heads of the coming prophecy :
 - 1. the warning of judgments, xiv. 6, 7.
 - 2. the fall of Babylon, xiv. 8.
 - 3. the punishment of the unfaithful, xiv. 9—12.
 - 4. a voice proclaiming the blessedness of the holy dead, xiv. 13.
 - c. the harvest (xiv. 14—16) and the vintage (xiv. 17—20) of the earth.
- ζ. The pouring out of the seven last vials of wrath, xv. 1—xvi. 21.
- η. The judgment of Babylon, xvii. 1—xviii. 24.
- θ. The final triumph, xix. 1—xxii. 5. And herein
 - a. the church's song of praise, xix. 1—10.
 - b. the issuing forth of the Lord and His hosts to victory, xix. 11—16.
 - c. the destruction of the beasts and false prophet and kings of the earth, xix. 17—21.
 - d. the binding of the dragon, and the millennial reign, xx. 1—6.
 - e. the unbinding, and final overthrow, of Satan, xx. 7—10.
 - f. the general judgment, xx. 11—15.
 - g. the new heavens and earth, and glories of the heavenly Jerusalem, xxi. 1—xxii. 5.
- IV. The conclusion, xxii. 6—21. See on all this the table at p. 260, in which the contents are arranged with a view to prophetic interpretation.

SECTION V.

SYSTEMS OF INTERPRETATION.

1. It would be as much beyond the limits as it is beside the purpose of these prolegomena, to give a detailed history of apocalyptic interpretation. And it would be, after all, spending much labour over that which has been well and sufficiently done already. For English readers, the large portion of Mr. Elliott's fourth volume of his *Horæ Apocalypticæ* which is devoted to the subject contains an ample account of apocalyptic expositors from the first times to the present: and for those who can read German, Lücke's *Einleitung* will furnish more critical though shorter notices of many among them⁴. To these works, and to others like them⁵, I must refer my readers for any thing like a detailed history of interpretations: contenting myself with giving a brief classification of the different great divisions of opinion, and with stating the grounds and character of the interpretations adopted in the following Commentary.

2. The schools of apocalyptic interpretation naturally divide themselves into three principal branches:

- a.* The Præterists, or those who hold that the whole or by far the greater part of the prophecy has been fulfilled;
- β.* The Historical Interpreters, or those who hold that the prophecy embraces the whole history of the Church and its foes from the time of its writing to the end of the world:
- γ.* The Futurists, or those who maintain that the prophecy relates entirely to events which are to take place at or near to the coming of the Lord.

I shall make a few remarks on each of these schools.

3. *a.* The Præterist view found no favour, and was hardly so much as thought of, in the times of primitive Christianity. Those who lived near the date of the book itself had no idea that its groups of prophetic imagery were intended merely to describe things then passing, and to be in a few years completed⁶. The view is said to have been first promulgated in any thing like completeness by the Jesuit Alcasar, in his *Vestigatio arcani sensus in Apocalypsi*, published in 1614. He regarded

⁴ It is to be regretted that Lücke should have performed this portion of his work so much in the spirit of a partisan, and not have contented himself with giving a résumé ab extra in the spirit of fairness, as Mr. Elliott has done. But his notices and remarks are very able and valuable.

⁵ e.g. Dr. Todd on the Apocalypse, pp. 269 ff.: Mr. Charles Maitland's *Apostolic School of Prophetic Interpretation*, &c. Mr. Elliott has continued his notices down nearly to the present time in the appendix to his *Warburtonian Lectures*, pp. 510—566.

⁶ Cf. Methodius, B. P. M. iii. 693: "Johannes non de præteritis, sed de iis quæ vel tunc fierent, vel quæ olim eventura essent, loquitur."

the prophecy as descriptive of the victory of the Church first over the synagogue, in chapters v.—xi., and then over heathen Rome, in chapters xii.—xix.: on which follows the triumph, and rest, and glorious close, chapters xx.—xxii. Very nearly the same plan was adopted by Grotius in his *Annotations*, published in 1644: and by our own Hammond in his *Commentary*, published in 1653: whom Le Clerc, his Latin interpreter, followed. The next name among this school of interpreters is that of Bossuet, the great antagonist of Protestantism. His *Commentary* was published in 1690. In the main, he agrees with the schemes of Alcasar and Grotius⁷.

4. The præterist school of interpretation has however of late been revived in Germany, and is that to which some of the most eminent expositors of that nation belong⁸: limiting the view of the Seer to matters within his own horizon, and believing the whole denunciations of the book to regard nothing further than the destruction of Pagan and persecuting Rome.

5. This view has also found exponents in our own language. It is that of the very ample and laborious *Commentary* of Moses Stuart in America, and of Dr. Davidson and Mr. Desprez in England.

6. *β.* The continuous historical interpretation belongs almost of necessity to these later days. In early times, the historic material since the apostolic period was not copious enough to tempt men to fit it on to the symbols of the prophetic visions. The first approach to it seems to have been made by Berengaud, not far from the beginning of the twelfth century: who however carried the historic range of the Apocalypse back to the creation of the world⁹. The historic view is found in the fragmentary exposition of the Seals by Anselm of Havelburg (1145): in the important exposition by the Abbot Joachim (cir. 1200)¹.

7. From Joachim's time we may date the rise of the continuous historic school of interpretation. From this time men's minds, even within the Romish church, became accustomed to the ideas, that the apocalyptic Babylon was in some sense or other not only Pagan but Papal Rome: and that Antichrist was to sit, whether as an usurper or not, on the throne of the Papacy.

8. I pass over less remarkable names, which will be found composing an interesting series in Mr. Elliott's history², noticing as I pass, that

⁷ See Elliott, vol. iv. p. 480, and a very good description in Lücke, p. 540.

⁸ e. g. Ewald, Lücke, De Wette, Düsterdieck.

⁹ See Elliott, vol. iv. pp. 362 ff.

¹ Elliott, vol. iv. pp. 376—410: where see also a tabular view of Joachim's apocalyptic scheme.

² Vol. iv. pp. 416 ff.

such was the view held by the precursors and upholders of the Reformation: by Wicliffe and his followers in England, by Luther in Germany, Bullinger in Switzerland, Bishop Bale in Ireland; by Fox the martyrologist, by Brightmann, Pareus, and early Protestant expositors generally.

9. As we advance in order of time, the same view holds its ground in the main among the Protestant churches. It is, with more or less individual varieties and divergences, that of Mede (1630), Jurieu (1685), Cressener (1690), Vitranga (1705), Daubuz (1720), Sir Isaac Newton (first published in 1733, after his death; but belonging to an earlier date), Whiston (1706), and the Commentators further on in that century, Bengel and Bishop Newton,

10. Mr. Elliott very naturally makes the great French Revolution a break, and the beginning of a new epoch, in the history of apocalyptic interpretation. From it, the continuous historical view seemed to derive confirmation and consistency, and acquired boldness to enter into new details, and fix its dates with greater precision.

11. Some of the more marked upholders of the view since that great Revolution have been divided among themselves as to the question, whether the expected second advent of our Lord is to be regarded as preceding or succeeding the thousand years' reign, or millennium. The majority both in number, and in learning and research, adopt the premillennial advent: following, as it seems to me, the plain and undeniable sense of the sacred text of the book itself.

12. It is not the purpose of the present Prolegomena to open controversial dispute with systems or with individuals³. The following Commentary will shew how far our views agree with, how far they differ from the school of which I am treating. With this caution, I cannot refrain from expressing my admiration of the research and piety which have characterized some of the principal modern Protestant expositors of this school. I must pay this tribute more especially to Mr. Elliott, from whose system and conclusions I am compelled so frequently and so widely to diverge.

³ The statement made above in the text will account for my not having noticed in detail, with a view to refutation, Mr. Elliott's work, "Apocalypsis Alfordiana," published since the first appearance of this volume. A careful perusal of that work has not altered my view on any of the points of interpretation whereon we differ. Its arguments are not formidable, consisting for the most part of confident re-assertion of the system which they uphold. In preparing the present edition of this volume I began by inserting in the notes elaborate answers to them: but I found that thus my pages became burdened with matter merely controversial, and moreover that I could not continue this course consistently with the unfeigned respect which I felt and wished to shew towards Mr. Elliott: the spirit of his book, which I forbear here from characterizing, rendering this wholly impossible.

13. *γ*. Our attention now passes to the Futurist school, consisting of those who throw forward the whole book, or by far the greater part of it, into the times of the great second Advent, denying altogether its historical significance.

14. Of these writers, some, who have been called the extreme futurists⁴, deny even the past existence of the seven Asiatic churches, and hold that we are to look for them yet to arise in the last days: but the majority accept them as historical facts, and begin the events of the last days with the prophetic imagery in chap. iv. Some indeed expound the earlier seals of events already past, and then in the later ones pass at once onward to the times of antichrist.

15. The founder of this system in modern times (the Apostolic Fathers can hardly with fairness be cited for it, seeing that for them all was future) appears to have been the Jesuit Ribera, about A.D. 1580⁵. It has of late had some able advocates in this country. To it belong the respected names of Dr. Maitland, Dr. Todd, Mr. Burgh, Isaac Williams, and others.

16. I need hardly say that I cannot regard this scheme of interpretation with approval. To argue against it here, would be only to anticipate the Commentary. It seems to me indisputable that the book does speak of things past, present, and future: that some of its prophecies are already fulfilled, some are now fulfilling, and others await their fulfilment in the yet unknown future: but to class all together and postpone them to the last age of the world, seems to me very like shrinking from the labours which the Holy Spirit meant us, and invites us, to undertake.

17. In the exposition of the Apocalypse attempted in this volume, I have endeavoured simply to follow the guidance of the sacred text, according to its own requirements and the analogies of Scripture. I am not conscious of having any where forced the meaning to suit my own prepossession: but I have in each case examined, whither the text itself and the rest of Scripture seemed to send me for guidance. If a definite meaning seemed to be pointed at in such guidance, I have upheld that meaning, to whatever school of interpretation I might seem thereby for the time to belong. If no such definite meaning seemed to be indicated, I have confessed my inability to assign one, however plausible and attractive the guesses of expositors may have been.

18. The result of such a method of interpretation may be apparent want of system; but I submit that it is the only way which will conduct us safely as far as we go, and which will prevent us from wresting the

⁴ e.g. the author of "The Jewish Missionary," and "The Sealed Book."

⁵ Elliott, vol. iv. pp. 465 ff.

text to make it suit a preconceived scheme. This latter fault seemed to me so glaring and so frequent in our expositors of the historical school, and inspired me with such disgust, that I determined my own pages should not contain a single instance of it, if I could help it. And I venture to hope that the determination has been carried out.

19. The course which I have taken, that of following the text itself under the guidance of Scripture analogy, naturally led to the recognition of certain landmarks, or fixed points, giving rise to canons of interpretation, which I maintain are not to be departed from. Such are for instance the following :

20. The close connexion between our Lord's prophetic discourse on the Mount of Olives, and the line of apocalyptic prophecy, cannot fail to have struck every student of Scripture. If it be suggested that such connexion may be merely apparent, and we subject it to the test of more accurate examination, our first impression will I think become continually stronger, that the two, being revelations from the same Lord concerning things to come, and those things being as it seems to me bound by the fourfold *ἔρχου*, which introduces the seals, to the same reference to Christ's coming, must, corresponding as they do in order and significance, answer to one another in detail : and thus the discourse in Matt. xxiv. becomes, as Mr. Isaac Williams has truly named it, "*the anchor of apocalyptic interpretation*:" and, I may add, the touchstone of apocalyptic systems. If its guidance be not followed in the interpretation of the seals, if any other than our Lord is he that goes forth conquering and to conquer, then, though the subsequent interpretation may have occasional points of contact with truth, and may thus be in parts profitable to us, the *system* is an erroneous one, and, as far as it is concerned, the true key to the book is lost.

21. Another such landmark is found I believe in the interpretation of the *sixth seal*: if it be not indeed already laid down in what has just been said. We all know what that imagery means in the rest of Scripture. Any system which requires it to belong to another period than the close approach of the great day of the Lord, stands thereby self-condemned. I may illustrate this by reference to Mr. Elliott's continuous historical system, which requires that it should mean the downfall of Paganism under Constantine. A more notable instance of inadequate interpretation cannot be imagined.

22. Closely connected with this last is another fixed point in interpretation. As the seven seals, so the seven trumpets and the seven vials run on to the time close upon the end. At the termination of each series, the note is unmistakably given, that such is the case. Of the seals we have already spoken. As to the trumpets, it may suffice to refer to ch. x. 7, xi. 18: as to the vials, to their very designation *τὰς ἐσχάτας*,

and to the *γέγονεν* of ch. xvi. 17. Any system which does not recognize this common ending of the three, seems to me to stand thereby convicted of error.

23. Another such absolute requirement of the sacred text is found in the vision of ch. xii. 1 ff. In ver. 5, we read that the woman *ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ποιμαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ, καὶ ἡρπάσθη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ*. All Scripture analogy and that of this book itself (cf. ch. xix. 15) requires that these words should be understood of our incarnate Lord, and of no other. Any system seems to me convicted of error, which is compelled to interpret the words otherwise.

24. Another canon of interpretation has seemed to me to be deducible from the great care and accuracy with which the Seer distinguishes between the divine Persons and the ministering angels. Much confusion is found in the apocalyptic commentaries from this point not being attended to. "Is such or such an angel Christ Himself, or not?" is a question continually meeting us in their pages. Such a question need never to have been asked. *ἄγγελος*, throughout the book, is an *angel*: never our Lord, never one of the sons of men. This holds equally, I believe, of the angels of the seven churches and of the various angels introduced in the prophetic vision.

25. Various other rules and requirements of the same kind will be found mentioned in the Commentary itself. It may be well to speak of some other matters which seem worthy of notice here.

26. The apocalyptic *numbers* furnish an important enquiry to every Commentator, as to their respective significance. And, in general terms, such a question can be readily answered. The various numbers seem to keep constant to their great lines of symbolic meaning, and may, without any caprice, be assigned to them. Thus *seven* is the number of perfection: seven spirits are before the throne (ch. i. 4; iv. 5): seven churches represent the church universal: the Lamb has seven horns and seven eyes (v. 6): in the several series of God's judgments, each of them complete in itself, each of them exhaustive in its own line of divine action, seven is the number of the seals, of the trumpets, of the thunders, of the vials.

27. *Four*, again, is the number of terrestrial extension. Four living-beings are the celestial symbols of creation (iv. 6 ff.): four angels stand on the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of heaven (ch. vii. 1): four seals, four trumpets, four vials, in each case complete the judgments as far as physical visitations are concerned: four angels are loosed from the Euphrates to slay the destined portion out of all mankind (ix. 13 ff.), in obedience to a voice from the four corners of the altar: Satan deceives the nations in the four corners of the earth (xx. 8): the new Jerusalem lieth four-square, having all sides equal.

28. *Twelve* is the number especially appropriated to the Church, and to those appearances which are symbolically connected with her. Twice twelve is the number of the heavenly elders: twelve times twelve thousand, the number of the sealed elect: the woman in ch. xii. 1 has a crown of twelve stars: the heavenly city has twelve gates, at the gates twelve angels, and on them the names of the twelve tribes of Israel; also twelve foundations, and on them the names of the twelve Apostles: and its circumference (probably: see note, ch. xxi. 16) is twelve thousand stadii. Finally, in the midst of her the tree of life brings forth twelve manner of fruits.

29. The occurrence of aliquot portions of these numbers is also worthy of our attention. The half of seven, three and a half, is a ruling number in the apocalyptic periods of time. Three years and a half had been the duration of the draught prayed for by Elijah (see James v. 17, note: also Luke iv. 25); "a time, and times, and the dividing of time" was the prescribed prophetic duration of the oppression of the saints in Dan. vii. 25. Accordingly, we find in the Apocalypse (ch. xi. 2) that the two witnesses, one of whose powers is, to shut up heaven that there shall be no rain (xi. 6), shall prophesy 1260 days = $3 \times 360 + 180$ = three years and a half. And if this particular reminds us of Elijah, the other, the turning the water into blood and smiting the earth with plagues, directs our attention to Moses, whose testimony endured throughout the forty and two stations of the children of Israel's pilgrimage, as that of these witnesses is to endure forty and two months = $3 \times 12 + 6$ months = three years and a half. (Again, for three *days* and a half shall the bodies of these witnesses lie unburied in the street of the great city, after which they shall rise again.) The same period in days (1260) is the term during which the woman shall be fed in the wilderness (xii. 6). The same in months (42) is allotted (xiii. 5) to the power of the first wild-beast which ascended from the sea.

30. I have not pretended to offer any solution of these periods of time, so remarkably pervaded by the half of the mystic seven. I am quite unable to say, who the two witnesses are: quite unable, in common with all apocalyptic interpreters, to point out definitely any period in the history of the church corresponding to the 1260 days of ch. xii. 6, or any in the history of this world's civil power which shall satisfy the forty-two months of ch. xiii. 5. As far as I have seen, every such attempt hitherto made has been characterized by signal failure. One after another, the years fixed on for the consummation by different authors have passed away, beginning with the 1836 of Bengel: one after another, the expositors who have lived to be thus refuted have shifted their ground into the safer future.

31. It is not my intention to enter the lists on either side of the vexed

“year-day” question. I have never seen it proved, or even made probable, that we are to take a day for a year in apocalyptic prophecy: on the other hand I have never seen it proved, or made probable, that such mystic periods are to be taken literally, a day for a day. It is a weighty argument against the year-day system, that a period of “a thousand years” (xx. 6, 7) does occur in the prophecy: it is hardly a less strong one against literal acceptance of days, that the principles of interpretation given us by the Seer himself (xvii. 17) seem to require for the reign of the beast a far longer period than this calculation would allow. So that in the apparent failure of both systems, I am driven to believe that these periods are to be assigned by some clue, of which the Spirit has not yet put the Church in possession.

32. Still less can I offer any satisfactory solution of the prophetic number of the beast (xiii. 18). Even while I print my note in favour of the *Λατρεύς* of Irenæus, I feel almost disposed to withdraw it. It is beyond question the best solution that has been given: but that it is not *the* solution, I have a persuasion amounting to certainty. It must be considered merely as worthy to emerge from the thousand and one failures strewn up and down in our books, and to be kept in sight till the challenge *ἄδε ἡ σοφία ἐστίν* is satisfactorily redeemed.

33. On one point I have ventured to speak strongly, because my conviction on it is strong, founded on the rules of fair and consistent interpretation. I mean, the necessity of accepting literally the first resurrection, and the millennial reign. It seems to me that if in a sentence where two resurrections are spoken of with no mark of distinction between them (it is otherwise in John v. 28, which is commonly alleged for the view which I am combating),—in a sentence where, one resurrection having been related, “the rest of the dead” are afterwards mentioned,—we are at liberty to understand the former one figuratively and spiritually, and the latter literally and materially, then there is an end of all definite meaning in plain words, and the Apocalypse, or any other book, may mean any thing we please. It is a curious fact that those who maintain this, studious as they generally are to uphold the primitive interpretation, are obliged, not only to wrest the plain sense of words, but to desert the unanimous consensus of the primitive Fathers, some of whom lived early enough to have retained apostolic tradition on this point. Not till chiliastic views had run into unspiritual excesses, was this interpretation departed from⁶.

34. It now remains that I say somewhat respecting my own view of the character and arrangement of the prophecy, which may furnish the

⁶ The student will find a good account of the history of opinions on this subject in Herzog's Encyclopædie, art. *Chiliasmus*.

reader with a general idea of the nature of the interpretation given in the notes.

35. And first for the principles on which that interpretation is based. α) The book is a revelation given by the Father to Christ, and imparted by Him through His angel to St. John, to declare to His servants things which must shortly come to pass: in other words, the future conflicts and triumphs of His church; these being the things which concerned "His servants."

36. β) Of all these, the greatest event is His own coming in glory. In consequence, it is put forward in the introduction of the book with all solemnity, and its certainty sealed by an asseveration from the Almighty and everlasting God.

37. γ) Accordingly we find every part of the prophecy full of this subject. The Epistles to the Churches continually recur to it: the visions of seals, trumpets, vials, all end in introducing it: and it forms the solemn conclusion, as it did the opening of the book.

38. δ) But it was not the first time that this great subject had been spoken of in prophecy. The Old Testament prophets had all announced it: and the language of this book is full of the prophetic imagery which we also find in them. The first great key to the understanding of the Apocalypse, is, the analogy of Old Testament prophecy.

39. ε) The next is our Lord's own prophetic discourse, before insisted on in this reference. He himself had previously delivered a great prophecy, giving in clear outline the main points of the history of the church. In this prophecy, the progress of the Gospel, its hindrances and corruptions, the judgments on the unbelieving, the trials of the faithful, the safety of God's elect amidst all, and the final redemption in glory of His faithful people, were all indicated. There, they were enwrapped in language which was in great part primarily applicable to the great typical judgment on the chosen people—the destruction of Jerusalem. When this book was written, that event had taken place: completing the first and partial fulfilment of our Lord's predictions. Now, it remained for prophecy to declare to the church God's course of dealing with the nations of the earth, by which the same predictions are to be again fulfilled, on a larger scale, and with greater fulness of meaning.

40. It is somewhat astonishing, that many of those who recognize to the full the eschatological character of the prophetic discourse of our Lord, should have failed to observe in the Apocalypse the very same features of arrangement, and an analogy challenging continual observation.

41. ζ) In accordance with the analogy just pointed out, I conceive that the opening section of the book (after the vision in the introduc-

tion), containing the Epistles to the Churches, is an expansion of our Lord's brief notes of comfort, reproof, and admonition addressed to His own in the prophecy on the Mount of Olives and elsewhere in His prophetic discourses.

42. "It reveals to us our Lord as present with His people evermore in the fulness of His divine Majesty as the Incarnate and glorified Son of God: present with them by His Spirit to sympathize, to sustain, to comfort, to reprove, to admonish, as their need requires: his eye evermore on every heart, his love ever ready to supply all their need. The Epistles are no other than the expression of that special message of rebuke or encouragement which day by day in all ages the Lord sees to be needed, in one or other of its parts, by every Church, and every Christian, on earth. Every body of Christians, we are reminded, like every individual, has at each moment, its own definite religious character and condition: like Ephesus, sound, but with declining love and faith: like Smyrna, faithful in tribulation and rich in good works: like Pergamum, steadfast under open trial, but too tolerant of compromises with the world's ways: like Thyatira, diligent in well-doing, and with many signs of spiritual progress, yet allowing false teaching and corrupt practice to go unchecked: like Sardis, retaining the form of sound doctrine, but in practice sunk into a deep slumber threatening spiritual death: like Philadelphia, faithful to the Lord's word and name, loving Him though in weakness, and therefore kept in safety: or finally like Laodicea, 'lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot:' self-satisfied, because sunk too deep in spiritual sloth and indifference to be conscious of her poverty, and ready therefore to lose all without struggle or regret*."

43. This first section has set before us the Lord present with His church on earth; the next introduces us at once to His presence in heaven, and to the celestial scenery of the whole coming prophecy. It is to be noted that this revelation of God is as the God of His Church. The Father, seated on the Throne: the Lamb in the midst of the throne, bearing the marks of His atoning sacrifice: the sevenfold Spirit with His lamps of fire: this is Jehovah the covenant God of His redeemed. And next we have Creation, symbolized by the four living-beings—the Church, patriarchial and apostolic, represented by the twenty-four elders: and the innumerable company of angels, minister-

⁷ I borrow the words of a MS. Lecture on the Apocalypse by an old and valued friend.

⁸ It has been supposed by some (the first of whom apparently was the Abbot Joachim) that these Epistles are in themselves prophetic of various states of the church from the time of the Apocalypse to the final close of the dispensation. One of the principal among these is Vitringa, in whose Commentary, pp. 27 ff., will be found a full account, and elaborate defence of the view. I need not say that I myself cannot subscribe to it.

ing in their glory and might, now by one of them, now by another, throughout the course of the prophecy.

44. In the next section, the Lamb, alone found worthy, opens one after another the seals of the closed book or roll, so that, when they are all opened, it may be unrolled and read. One point I have urged in the following notes : viz., that the roll is never during the prophecy actually opened, nor is any part of it read. The openings of its successive seals are but the successive preparations for its contents to be disclosed : and as each is opened, a new class of preparations is seen in prophetic vision. When the seventh is loosed, and all is ready for the unfolding and reading, there is a symbolic silence, and a new series of visions begins.

45. As regards the seals themselves, the first four are marked off from the other three in a manner which none can fail to observe. They represent, I believe, Christ's victory over the world in His appointed way. We have Himself going forth to conquer, and in His train, the sword which He came to send on earth, the wars, famines, and pestilences, which He foretold should be forerunners of His coming. At each of these appearances, one of the living-beings who symbolize Creation echoes with his *ἔρχου* the sighs of the world for the manifestation of the sons of God. I conceive it to be a mistake, necessarily involved in the consecutive historical interpretation, but sometimes found where that is not, to interpret these four seals, as succeeding one another in time. All are co-ordinate, all are correlative.

46. Next to the sighs of Creation for the Lord's coming, we have those of His martyred saints, crying from under His altar. Then, at the opening of the sixth seal, we have reproduced the well-known imagery of our Lord's discourse and of the O. T. prophets, describing the very eve and threshold, so to speak, of the day of the Lord : the portents which should usher in His coming : but not that coming itself. For the revelation of this, the time is not yet. First, His elect must be gathered out of the four winds—the complete number sealed, before the judgments invoked by the martyred souls descend on the earth, the sea, the trees. First, the Seer must be vouchsafed a vision of the great multitude whom none can number, in everlasting glory. The day of the Lord's coming is gone by, and the vision reaches forward beyond it into the blissful eternity. Why ? Because then, and not till then, shall the seventh seal, which looses the roll of God's eternal purposes, be opened, and the book read to the adoring Church in glory. Then we have the last seal opened, and the half-hour's silence—the “initium,” as Victorinus sublimely says, “*quietis æternæ*.”

47. Thus far the vision of the seals necessarily reached onward for its completion. But there is much more to be revealed. God's judgments

on the earth and its inhabitants are the subject of the next series of visions. The prayers of the martyred saints had invoked them : with the symbolizing therefore of the answer to these prayers the next section opens. Then follow the trumpet-blowing angels, hurting the earth, the trees, the sea, the rivers, the lights of heaven. And here again, as before, the first four trumpets complete these œcumenical judgments, and with the fifth the three woes on mankind begin. The previous plagues have affected only the accessories of life : the following affect life itself.

48. In these latter we have the strictest correspondence with the foregoing vision of the seals. Two of them are veritably plagues, the one of the locust, the other of the horsemen. After this sixth trumpet are inserted two episodical passages, the one a vision, the other a prophecy (see below) : then, when the seventh is about to sound, the consummation of God's judgments passes unrecorded, as it did under the seals ; and at the seventh trumpet, we have the song of thanksgiving and triumph in heaven. Such remarkable and intimate correspondence carries its own explanation : the two visions of the trumpets and seals run on to one and the same glorious termination : the former, in tracing the course of the world as regards the Church, the latter, in tracing God's judgments of vengeance on the ungodly dwellers on earth : for it is for this that the heavenly song at its conclusion gives thanks.

49. If now we turn to the two episodes between the sixth and seventh trumpets, we find them distinctly introductory to that section which is next to follow. A little book is given to the Seer, sweet to his mouth, but bitter in digestion, with an announcement that he is yet again to prophesy to many nations—that a fresh series of prophetic visions, glorious indeed but woeful, was now to be delivered by him.

50. These begin by the measurement of the temple of God—seeing that it is the Church herself, in her innermost hold, which is now to become the subject of the prophecy. The course of the two witnesses, recalling to us by their spirit and power Moses and Elias, is predicted : and during the prediction, one principal figure of the subsequent visions is by anticipation introduced : the wild-beast that cometh up out of the abyss. That this is so, is at once fatal in my estimation to the continuous historical interpretation.

51. The student will find that there is no explanation of the two witnesses in the ensuing Commentary. I have studied the various solutions, and I own that I cannot find any which I can endorse as being that which I can feel to be satisfactory. I have none of my own. I recognize the characters : but I cannot appropriate them. I do not feel it to be any reproach to my system, or any disproof of its substance, that there are this and other gaps in it which I cannot bridge over.

Nay, on the contrary, if it be a sound interpretation, there must be these : and to find events and persons which may fit the whole, ere yet the course of time is run, would seem to me rather writing a parody, than earnestly seeking a solution.

52. And now the seventh angel sounds ; and as before at the opening of the seventh seal, the heavenly scene is before us, and the representatives of the church universal fall down and give thanks that God's kingdom is come, and the time of the dead to be judged. But though this series of visions likewise has been thus brought down to the end of the final consummation, there is more yet to be revealed ; and in anticipation of the character of the subsequent visions, the temple of God in heaven is opened, and the pause between one and another series is announced, as before between the seals and the trumpets, and as after at the end of the vials, by thunders and lightnings and voices.

53. And now opens the great prophetic course of visions regarding the church. Her identification in the eyes of the Seer is first rendered unmistakable, by the scene opening with the appearance of the woman and the serpent, the enmity between him and her seed, the birth of the Man-child who should rule over the nations,—His ascension to heaven and to the throne of God. Here, at least, all ought to have been plain : and here again I see pronounced the condemnation of the continuous historical system.

54. The flight of the woman into the wilderness, the casting down of Satan from heaven, no longer to accuse the brethren there, his continued enmity on earth, his persecution of the remnant of the woman's seed, these belong to the introductory features of the great vision which is to follow, and serve to describe the state in which the Church of God is found during the now pending stage of her conflict.

55. What follows, carries out the description of the war made by the dragon on the seed of the woman. A wild-beast is seen rising out of the deep, uniting in itself the formerly described heads and horns of the dragon, and also the well-known prophetic symbols of the great empires of the world : representing, in fact, the secular powers antagonistic to the Church of Christ. To this wild-beast the dragon gives his might and his throne : and notwithstanding that one of its heads, the Pagan Roman Empire, is crushed to death, its deadly wound is healed, and all who are not written in the Lamb's book of life worship it.

56. The further carrying out of the power and influence of the beast is now set before us by the vision of another wild-beast, born of the earth, gentle as a lamb in appearance, but dragon-like and cruel in character. This second beast is the ally and servant of the former : makes men to worship its image and receive its mark, as the condition of civil rights and even of life itself. Here, in common with very many of the best

interpreters, I cannot fail to recognize the sacerdotal persecuting power, leagued with and the instrument of the secular : professing to be a lamb, but in reality being a dragon : persecuting the saints of God : the inseparable companion and upholder of despotic and tyrannical power. This in all its forms, Pagan, Papal, and in so far as the Reformed Churches have retrograded towards Papal sacerdotalism, Protestant also, I believe to be that which is symbolized under the second wild-beast.

57. Next, the apocalyptic vision brings before us the Lamb on Mount Sion with the first-fruits of His people, and the heavenly song in which they join,—as prefatory to the announcement, by three angels, of the prophecies which are to follow, so full of import to the people and church of God. These are, first, the proclamation of the everlasting Gospel as previous to the final judgments of God : next, the fall of Babylon, as an encouragement for the patience of the saints : third, the final defeat and torment of the Lord's enemies. After these is heard a voice proclaiming the blessedness of the holy dead. Then follow, in strict accord with these, four announcements, 1) the harvest and the vintage of the earth, and the seven last plagues, symbolized by the out-pouring of the vials : 2) the ample details of the fall and punishment of Babylon : 3) the triumph of the Church in the last defeat of her Lord's enemies : 4) the millennial reign, and finally, the eternity of bliss. But on each of these somewhat more must be said.

58. I have found reason to interpret the *harvest*, of the ingathering of the Lord's people : the *vintage*, of the crushing of His enemies : both these being, according to the usage of this book, compendious, and inclusive of the fuller details of both, which are to follow.

59. The vintage is taken up and expanded in detail by the series of the vials : seven in number, as were the seals and the trumpets before. These final judgments, specially belonging to the Church, are introduced by a song of triumph from the saints of both dispensations, and are poured out by angels coming forth from the opened sanctuary of the tabernacle of witness in heaven.

60. The course of these judgments is in some particulars the same as that of the trumpets. The earth, the sea, the rivers, the lights of heaven—these are the objects of the first four : but ever with reference to those who worship the beast and have his mark on them. At the fifth, as in each case before, there is a change from general to special : the throne and kingdom of the beast, the river Euphrates, these are now the objects : and the seventh passes off, as in each former case, to the consummation of all things.

61. Meantime, as so often before, anticipating hints have been given of new details belonging to the other angelic announcements. At the sixth vial, we have the sounds of the gathering of an approaching battle

of God's enemies against Him, and the very battle-field pointed out. After the seventh and its closing formula, Babylon comes into remembrance before God, to give her the cup of His vengeance. Thus then we pass to the second of the angelic announcements—the fall of Babylon. Here the Seer is carried in spirit into the wilderness, and shewn the great vision of the woman seated on the beast. I have entered in the Commentary into all the details of this important portion of the prophecy: and it is unnecessary to repeat them here. It may suffice to say, that the great persecuting city, the type of the union of ecclesiastical corruption with civil tyranny, is finally overthrown by the hands of those very kingdoms who had given their power to the beast, and this overthrow is celebrated by the triumphant songs of the Church and of Creation and of innumerable multitudes in heaven.

62. But here again, according to the practice of which I cannot too often remind the student, a voice from heaven announces the character of the new and final vision which is to follow: Blessed are they which are called to the marriage supper of the Lamb. And now, in the prophetic details of the third of the previous angelic announcements, and of the proclamation of the blessedness of the holy dead, the great events of the time of the end crowd, in their dread majesty, upon us. First, the procession of the glorified Redeemer with the armies of heaven following Him, coming forth to tread the winepress of the wrath of Almighty God. Then the great battle of the Lord against His foes, the beast and the false prophet, leagued with the kings of the earth against Him. Then, the binding of the dragon, the old serpent, for a season. Then, the first resurrection, the judgment of the church, the millennial reign: as to which I have again and again raised my earnest protest against evading the plain sense of words, and spiritualizing in the midst of plain declarations of fact. That the Lord will come in person to this our earth: that His risen elect will reign here with Him and judge: that during that blessed reign the power of evil will be bound, and the glorious prophecies of peace and truth on earth find their accomplishment:—this is my firm persuasion, and not mine alone, but that of multitudes of Christ's waiting people, as it was that of His primitive apostolic Church, before controversy blinded the eyes of the Fathers to the light of prophecy.

63. But the end is not yet. One struggle more and that the last. At the end of the millennial period, Satan is unloosed, and the nations of the earth are deceived by him—they come up against and encircle the camp of the saints and the beloved city: and fire comes down out of heaven and consumes them: and the devil who deceived them is cast into the lake of fire. Then is described the general judgment of the dead, the destruction of death and Hades, and the condemnation of all whose names are not found written in the book of life.

64. Finally, in accord with the previous proclamation of the blessedness of the holy dead, the description of the heavenly Jerusalem forms the glorious close of the whole.

65. It remains that I say a few words in explanation of the annexed Table, which contains an arrangement of the Apocalyptic matter in accordance with the view upheld above.

66. In the upper part of the table, extending all across it, are specified the general subject of the book, printed in black, and the Epistles to the seven churches. Then follow, printed in red, the heavenly scenery and personages common to the whole following prophecy, till all the various visions merge, at the bottom of each column, in the new heavens and new earth, the description of which is again printed in red across the table beneath the columns.

67. The columns themselves contains the various visions, followed by the episodes which occur in them, in order: each in turn passing away into the great day of the Lord, and the events of the time of the end. Any one who has followed the Commentary, or even the epitome given in these Prolegomena, will have no difficulty in making use of the conspectus given in the table.

68. The words printed in thick type are intended to direct the reader's attention to their recurrence as furnishing landmarks, or tests of interpretation: e. g. the numbers, seven, four, twelve: the white horse and its Rider: the ruling the nations with a rod of iron, as unmistakably identifying the Man-child of ch. xii. with the Victor of ch. xix.: &c. &c.

69. I have now only to commend to my gracious God and Father this feeble attempt to explain the most mysterious and glorions portion of His revealed Scripture: and with it, this my labour of now eighteen years, herewith completed. I do it with humble thankfulness, but with a sense of utter weakness before the power of His Word, and inability to sound the depths even of its simplest sentence. May He spare the hand which has been put forward to touch His Ark: may He, for Christ's sake, forgive all rashness, all perverseness, all uncharitableness, which may be found in this book, and sanctify it to the use of His Church: its truth, if any, for teaching: its manifold defect, for warning. My prayer is and shall be, that in the stir and labour of men over His Word, to which these volumes have been one humble contribution, others may arise and teach, whose labours shall be so far better than mine, that this book, and its writer, may ere long be utterly forgotten.

AMHN EPXOY KYPIE IHΣOY.

CHAPTER IX.

APPARATUS CRITICUS.

SECTION I.

LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
A	A	A	Alexandrinus.	V.	<i>See Vol. I.</i>	A
B	B	—	Vatican, 1209.	IV.	<i>See Vol. I.</i>	B
—	—	¹ B	Basilianus, Vatican, 2066.	VIII.	Card. Quirini (for Wetstein), Tischendorf and Tregelles. Published by Tischendorf, and by Mai at the end of his edition of the Codex Vaticanus.	—
C	C	C	Ephræmi.	V.	<i>See Vol. I.</i>	C
D	—	—	Claromontanus ² .	VI.	<i>See Vol. II.</i>	—
H	—	—	Paris, Coisl. 202 A.	VI.	<i>See Vol. II.</i> Contains of this Vol. only Heb. ii. 11—16, iii. 13—18, iv. 12—15.	—
—	Hr	..	<i>See Heb. 179 below.</i>			—
K	K	—	Moscow Synod, 98.	IX.	<i>See Vol. II.</i>	—
L	L	—	Angelicus or Passionei.	IX.	<i>See Vol. II.</i>	—
M	—	—	Uffenbachianus.	X.	<i>See Vol. II.</i> (Def. Heb. iv. 3—xii. 20.)	—
P	P	P	St. Petersburg. Porphyrii ³ .	VIII.	<i>See Vol. II.</i> (Def. Heb. xii. 9, 10; 1 Joh. iii. 19—v. 1; Jude 4—15; Rev. xvi. 12—xvii. 1, xix. 21—xx. 9, xxii—6—end.)	—
N	N	—	Sinaiticus.	IV.	<i>See Vol. I.</i>	N
			Frag. Mosquense.	VI?	Matthæi. Contains Heb. x. 1—7, 32—38.	—
⁴ a	a	—	Lambeth, 1182.	XII.	Scrivener.	—
⁵ b	b	—	Lambeth, 1183.	1358	Scrivener.	—
⁵ c	c	—	Formerly Lambeth, 1184.	XV.	Sanderson in Scrivener.	—

¹ In this edition we have distinguished this MS. from the preceding, by the use of a different type for the letter denoting it. The difference is further marked by quoting the cursive supplement to the great MS. uniformly as “Br,” and no longer, with Tregelles, as “91.”

² It seems no longer necessary to quote the Codex Sangermanensis (“E”) side by side with this manuscript, as it has been clearly proved that the one is a transcript of the other.

³ A few readings communicated by Dr. Tregelles were inserted in the third edition of the Apocalypse. [The whole of the Apocalypse has now (1871) been collated with Tischdñf.’s ed. of the MS. in Mon. Sacra Inedit., vol. vi., and the readings in the Epp. inserted from Tregelles’ New Test.]

⁴ Appendix to Mr. Scrivener’s edn. of the “Codex Augiensis,” Cambridge, 1859. It has not been thought worth while to encumber the page with every various reading found in these manuscripts; but whenever any variation of the uncials is mentioned, the testimony of these accurately-collated documents is added.

⁵ A manuscript once in the possession of Professor Carlyle; returned to the Patriarch of Jerusalem in 1817.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
⁶ d	d	—	Lambeth, 1185.	XV.	Scrivener	—
e	—	a	Lambeth, 1186.	XI.	Scrivener.	—
f	f	—	Theodori.	1295	Scrivener. Belonged to Pickering the publisher.	—
g	g	—	Wordsworth.	XIII.	Scrivener.	g
7 h	h	b	Butler 2. Brit. Mus., Addl. 11837.	1357	Scrivener. (= Heb. 104, Cath. 91, Gosp. 201 below.)	i
—	j	—	Burney 48. Brit. Mus.	XIV.	Scrivener. Contains Catholic Epistles only. They are found at fol. 221 of the 2nd Vol. of a MS. of Chrysostom's homilies, but not in the same hand with them.	m
k	k	—	Trin. Coll. Camb. B. x. 16.	1316	Scrivener.	—
l	l	—	Chr. Coll. Camb. F. i. 13.	XII.	Scrivener. Mill (<i>Cant.</i> 2). (= Heb. 29, Cath. 24 below.)	—
—	—	c	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5678.	XV.	Scrivener. (= Apoc. 31 below.)	—
..	..	d	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5778.	XII.	Apoc., Scrivener. Epp., Mill (<i>Sin.</i>). (= Heb. 34, Cath. 28, Apoc. 8 below.)	—
..	..	e	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5613.	1407	Scrivener (in Apoc.) 1 Pet., 1 John v. collated by Griesb. (= Heb. 63, Cath. 60, Apoc. 29 below.)	—
m	m	f	The Leicester MS.	XIV.	Scrivener. (= Heb. 37, Cath. 31, Apoc. 14.) See 69, Vol. I.	69
n	n	—	Emm. Coll. Camb. i. 4. 35.	XII.	Scrivener. Mill (<i>Cant.</i> 3). (= Heb. 30, Cath. 53.)	—
o	o	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Mm. 6, 9.	XII or XIII.	Scrivener. Mill's <i>Hal.</i> (= Heb. 61 and 221, Cath. 61 and 111, Gosp. 40.)	v
—	—	g	PARHAM No. 17.	XII.	Scrivener.	—
—	—	h	Parham No. 2.	XIV.	Scrivener.	—
—	—	j	Brit. Mus., Addl. MS. No. 17469.	XIV.	Scrivener.	—
—	—	k	Liber Canonicus, No. 34.	1516	Scrivener.	—
..	..	l	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5537.	1087	Apoc., Scrivener. Epp., Mill (<i>Cov.</i> 2). (= Heb. 31., Cath. 25, Apoc. 7 below.) (Def. 1 Joh. v. 15—2 Joh. 6.)	—
..	..	m	Middlehill, Worcester. No. 1461 (formerly Meer-man 118),	XI. or XII.	Apoc., Scrivener. (= Heb. 242, Cath. 178, Apoc. 87. Epp., inspected by Scholz?) (Def. Heb. ix. 3—x. 29; Ja. i. 1—5; iii. 6—iv. 16; 2 Pet. iii. 10—1 Joh. i. 1; iii. 13—iv. 2; Jude 16—end.)	—
—	—	n	Bodleian, Baroc. 4.	XV.	Scrivener.	—
1	1	—	Reuchlini. Basle, K. iii. 3 (late B. vi. 27).	X.	Wetstein, "bis atque accurate," Tregelles and Roth. in Gosp. (See below, Apoc. 15 note.)	—

⁶ "Might almost be considered a series of fragments in several different hands." The Catholic Epistles are written by one scribe, the Epistle to the Hebrews by another.

⁷ Formerly Cod. Prædicatorum S. Marci, 701. See Scrivener, Collation of MSS. of Gosp. p. xlv. Introd. to N. T. Criticism, p. 163.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
2	2	—	Basle (late B. ix. ult.).	XV.	Mill (<i>B</i> 2). The basis of Erasmus' 1st edn.	—
—	—	1	Reuchlini.	?	See note ⁸ .	—
3	3	—	Vienna, F.'s 15, K.'s 5.	XII.	Alter. Known as Corsendoncensis.	3
4	4	—	Basle (late B. x. 20).	XV.	Wetstein throughout Epp. Mill (<i>B</i> 3), in 1, 2, 3 Joh.	—
5	5	—	Paris, 106.	XII.	Stephens' δ'. Scholz.	5
6	6	—	Paris, 112.	XI.	Stephens' ε'.	6
7	—	—	Basle (late B. vi. 17).	X.	Readings given in Wetstein. Text surrounded by various Scholia from Thdrt., Gennad., Ec., Sevrn., &c. On parchment. (Ends Heb. xii. 8.)	—
(8)	..	—	—	Stephens' ζ' (= Cath. 50. <i>Identified by some with Heb.</i> 132, <i>Cath.</i> 113 below).	—
9	7	—	Paris, 102.	X.	Stephens' ι'. No lacunæ.	—
(10)	(8)	—	<i>Not identified.</i>	—	Stephens' ια'.	—
11	9	—	Camb. Univ. Lib. MS. Kk. 6. 4.	XI.	Stephens' ιγ'. Belonged to Vat. blus. (Def. Heb. vii. 26—xi. 10; xi. 23—end.)	—
12	10	2	Paris, 237.	X.	Stephens' ιε'. Wetstein "de integro." Many additional readings in Scholz.	—
(13)	..	—	Jacobi Fabri Daven-	—	<i>See Vol. III.</i>	—
(14)	..	—	triensis.	XVI.	<i>See Vol. III.</i> (= Cath. 47.)	90
(15)	..	—	Amandi.	—	<i>See Vol. III.</i>	—
..	11	—	Paris, 103.	X.	(= Heb. 140.) Reiche (in Heb.), Wetstein (in Cath.) Marg. Schol. (Def. Heb. xi. 35—end. Heb. xi. 35—xii. 1, supplied in xiv. or xv. cent.)	—
—	—	(3)	<i>Not identified.</i>	—	Stephens' ις'.	—
16	12	⁹ 4	Paris, 219.	XI.	Wetstein. Inspected by Reiche. Apocalypse re-examined, in certain places, by A. W. Grafton. Text mixed up with commentary, but easily distinguishable. Belonged to J. Lascaris.	—

⁸ The only MS. of the Apocalypse (containing i. 1—xxii. 16, *γενος του δαδ*) used by Erasmus for his first edition. It was found in the library at Mayhingen by Prof. Delitzsch of Erlangen, who published an account of its readings as compared with the texts of Erasmus and Tischendorf. This account has been incorporated in the digest, the only exception to its faithful reproduction being that palpable and undeniable clerical errors in the MS. have not been noticed. Such, e.g., are, *λευικός* for *λευκός*, xix. 11: *ἀκρόθησαν* for *ἐκρόθισαν*, xx. 4: *καὶ κοσμημένην* (accents *sic*), xxi. 2: *εἰς αὐτοὺς αἰῶνας*, xxii. 5. The text in the MS. is mixed up with the commentary of Andreas, who lived in the latter half of Cent. V. Its age is not definitely stated; but it bears marks of being copied from an earlier uncial MS. See Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde*, pt. i. pp. 7—16 and pt. ii. pp. 1—21.

⁹ The mss. (of the Apocalypse) themselves were consulted by me in nearly every place where in the last edition they were either cited *e silentio* or queried. Roughly speaking, each manuscript was examined in about 200 readings, one or two of them in

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
		(5)	Various readings given by Laurentius Valla.			
17	3	—	Paris, 14. (Colb. 2844.)	XI.	Tregelles. <i>See</i> 33, <i>Vol. I.</i>	33
18	14	..	Paris, Coisl. 199.	XI.	Wetstein. (= Apoc. 17 below.) A very few additional readings in Scholz. Apoc. re-examined.	35
—	15	—	Paris, Coisl. 25.	XI.	Wetstein. Scholia.	—
19	16	—	Paris, Coisl. 26.	XI.	Wetstein. Variorum Comm.	—
20	—	—	Paris, Coisl. 27.	X.	Wetstein. Variorum Comm. Mutilated.	—
21	17	..	Paris, Coisl. 205.	XI.	Wetstein. (= Apoc. 19 below.) Apoc. re-examined. (Heb. xiii. 15—end of Ep. Apoc. i. 1—ii. 5, supplied in a recent hand.)	—
22	18	..	Paris Coisl. 202 A.	XIII.	Wetstein. Variorum Comm. (= Apoc. 18 below.) Apoc. re-examined. Andreas' Comm.	—
23	19	—	Paris, Coisl. 200.	XIII.	Wetstein. Stephens θ. "Continet totum N.T. præter Apoc. (nam in Catalogo hujus Bibliothecæ Apoc. pro. Ep. Paul. ponitur)." Wetstein.	38
24	..	—	Bodleian, Misc. 136.	XII.	Occasionally cited by Wetstein. Ebnerianus. (= Cath. 48 below.)	105
25	20	—	Brit. Mus., King's Lib. 1. B. 1.	XIV.	Wetstein (Westmonasteriensis 935). Mutilated.	—
(26)	21	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Dd. 11. 90.	XIII.	Wetstein. Identified with Mill's <i>Lee</i> . Belonged to "Jo. Luke." (The whole of Heb. is lost.)	—
27	—	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Ff. 1. 30.	XI.	Catena chiefly from Photius.	—
..	22	—	Brit. Mus., Addl. MS. 5115-7.	XII.	Inspected by Wetstein. "Lectt. ex 1 Tim. communicavit. Rev. Paulus" (Griesbach). Belonged to Meade, and then to Askew. (= Heb. 75 below.) Gospels written in 1326.	109
28	23	6	Bodleian, Baroc. 3.	XI.	Mill (<i>Baroc.</i>). Caspar Wetstein. (Def. 1 Pet. iii. 7—23.) Scholia, that on Apoc. edited by Cramer. (= Cath. 53.)	—
(29)	(24)	—	<i>The same MS. as "1" above.</i>			
(30)	..	—	<i>The same MS. as "n" above.</i>			
31	25	(7)	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "1" above.</i>			
32	26	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5557.	XII.	Mill (<i>Cov.</i> 3).	—
33	27	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5620.	XV.	Mill (<i>Cov.</i> 4). No lacunæ (Griesb. Symb. Crit.). In Cath., either a transcript of 29, or derived from the same original.	—
34	28	(8)	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "d" above.</i>			

very many more. ("4" and "9" were examined in about 182 places. "10" was collated up to ch. ii. 21, and consulted in the rest whenever there was reason to think that Mill had passed over any of the variations, the authorities for which were to be stated in the digest of this volume. "17" was examined in about 364 places; "18," in about 283; and "19," in about 220.) A. W. G. (note in 2nd edn.)

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
35	29	—	Geneva, 20.	XII.	Mill (<i>Genev.</i>).	—
36	30	99	Bodleian, Misc. 74.	XIII.	Mill (<i>Hunt.</i> 1). Apocalypse partially re-examined. Formerly known as Huntingdon 131.	—
—	—	910	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Dd. 6. 69.	XIV.	Mill (<i>M.</i>). Apoc. re-examined. Marginal comm.	60
..	..	(11)	Petavii? <i>Situation unknown.</i>	?	Mill (<i>Pet.</i> 2). (= Heb. 45, Cath. 39.) (Def. Ja. i. 1—v. 17; 3 John 9—end of Jude.)	—
..	..	12	Vatican, Alex. 179.	—	Mill (<i>Pet.</i> 3). Zacagni. Birch. Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 46, Cath. 40.)	—
..	..	13	Frankfort on Oder. Seidel.	XI.	Middeldorpf in Rosenmüller's Comm. Theol. Vol. 2. (= Heb. 48, Cath. 42.) (Def. 2 Pet. i. 1, 2; 1 Joh. v. 11—21.)	—
(37)	(31)	(14)	<i>The same MS. as Heb. Cath. "m," Apoc. "f" above.</i>			
38	32	—	Bodleian, Laud. 31 (late 715).	XIII.	Mill (<i>Laud.</i> 2). (Def. 2 Pet. iii. 2—18.)	51
39	33	—	Linc. Coll. Oxford, 82.	XI.	Mill (<i>Lin.</i> 2). (Entered among Latin MSS. in Coxæ's Catalogue.) (Def. 2 Pet. i. 1—15.)	—
40	34	..	Dublin, Montfort. MS.	XVI.	Barrett (App. to edn. of Z. of Gosp.) and Dobbin. (= Apoc. 92.) The Apocalypse was certainly transcribed from Cod. Leicestrensis. In this edn. therefore citations are almost wholly confined to the concluding portion, where "f" is defective.	61
—	—	15	Basle fragment, A. N. iii. 12.	—	Rev. iii. 3—iv. 8 written in cursive letters in the volume referred to as "E" in the Gospels ¹ .	—
41	35	—	Magd. Coll. Oxf., 9.	XI.	Mill (<i>Magd.</i> 1)	57
—	36	—	New Coll. Oxf., 58.	XIII.	Mill (<i>N.</i> 1). Edited by Cramer. Catena.	—
43	37	—	New Coll. Oxf., 59.	XIII.	Mill (<i>N.</i> 2). Marginal gloss.	—
44	38	—	Leyden, 77 Voss.	XIII.	Sarrau. Wetstein. Addl. readings in Dermout (Mill's <i>Pet.</i> 1). No lacunæ (Dermout). Belonged to Petau and to Vossius.	—
(45)	(39)	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 11, above.</i>			
46	40	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 12, above.</i>			
47	—	—	Bodleian, Roe 16.	XII.	Mill (<i>Roe</i> 2). Marginal Scholia. [Tregelles.]	—
..	41	..	Vatican, 2080.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 194, Apoc. 20.) Part of the last chapter of Apoc. transcribed by Blanchini.	175
48	42	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 13, above.</i>			
49	43	—	Vienna, L.'s 28, N.'s 300.	XII.	Alter. Mill's <i>Vien.</i>	76

¹ So Tischdf.; but Delitzsch states that it is in the cursive ms. "1" of the Gospels.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
(50)	..	—	<i>Situation unknown.</i>	—	A MS. brought from Rhodes, occasionally referred to by Stunica, one of the Complutensian editors. (= Cath. 52.)	—
(51)	(44)	—	<i>See Vol. III. and Apoc. 5 above.</i>	82
52	45	16	Hamburg	XV.	Bengel's Uffenbachianus, in his Apparatus Criticus. In Apoc. closely allied with our "1" = 7 above.	—
(53)	—	—	<i>Part of the MS. "M" above.</i>	—	—	—
55	46	—	Munich, 375.	XI.	Bengel (Augsburg 6). Ec. comm.	—
(56)	..	17	<i>The same MS. as</i>	—	<i>See Vol. III. note,</i>	—
..	..	18	Heb. 18, Cath. 14, above.	—	—	—
..	..	18	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. 22, Cath. 18, above.	—	—	—
..	..	19	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. 21, Cath. 17, above.	—	—	—
..	..	20	<i>The same MS. as</i> Cath. 41, above.	—	—	—
—	—	21	Vallicella Lib. Rome, D. 20.	XIV.	Uncited. Andreas' comm.	—
..	..	22	Vallicella Lib. Rome, B. 86.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 204, Cath. 166.)	—
57	..	(23)	—	<i>See note 3.</i>	—
..	..	23	Vienna, L's 1, N's	XIII.	Edited by Alter. (= Cath. 65, Apoc. 33.)	218
58	—	—	Vatican, 165.	XII.	Edited by Zacagni. Called Cryptoferratensis.	—
..	(47)	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. 14, above.	—	—	—
..	48	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. 24, above.	—	—	—
—	49	—	<i>Not known now.</i>	—	Wetstein (Andreas Fæschii). Contains Cath. Epp. with Scholia of Sev., Ammon., Max.	92
..	(50)	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. [8], above.	—	—	—
..	51	..	Paris, 56.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 133, Apoc. 52 below.) [Def. Apoc. xxii. 17—21.]	—
..	(52)	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. [50], above.	—	—	—
..	(53)	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. Cath. "n" above.	—	—	—

² Scholz's citations of these numbers are taken from Wetstein, and not from these mss. as would be inferred from his list. Wetstein's 21, 22 are two (supposititious?) French mss. which appear in Bentley's specimen of the last chapter of Revelation in his proposals for a new edition of the Greek Testament.

³ Scholz inserts here a MS. (Paris, Coisl. 200), which Wetstein says does not contain the Apocalypse. The Medicæan readings once designated by this number ought not to be reckoned as if they represented the variations of some one MS.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
..	54	—	Paris, Bibl. de l'Ar-senal, 4.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Known as San-Maglorianus. (= Heb. 130 below.)	43
—	(55)	—	<i>Not known now.</i>	—	A second copy of Ep. Jude, in the MS. numbered Heb. 14, Cath. 47, above.	—
59	—	—	Paris, Coisl. 204.	XI.	Inspected. Catena.	—
(60)	..	24	Vatican, 2062.	XI.	<i>See Vol. III. note.</i> Inspected by Scholz. Readings from the latter chapters of Apoc. given by Blanchini. (= Heb. 193, Cath. 160.) Apoc. follows Acts. (Def. Heb. ii. 1—end.)	—
..	..	25	Vatican, Palat. 171.	XIV.	Zacagni. Readings given in Amelotte's French version of the Apocalypse. Additional readings and corrections of ch. i. 1—iii. 9, given in Birch. (= Heb. 88, Cath. 77.)	149
—	—	26	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake [12. (1, Scholz)].	XI.	Caspar Wetstein (= lect. 57).	—
..	..	27	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake 34 [2, Scholz].	XI.	Caspar Wetstein. (= Heb. 244, Cath. 190.) 1 Joh. collated by Scholz. (Ja. and 1 Pet., no trace contained in the MS.)	No.
—	—	(28)	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "n" above.</i>			
..	56	—	Bodleian, Clarke 4.	XII.?	Date not given in the printed Cat. of Clarke's MSS. On parchment. Inspected by Scholz. (Omits Jude?) (= Heb. 227.)	—
..	57	.	Copenhagen, 1.	1278	Hensler. Cited by Bengel and Birch. (= Heb. 72.)	234
..	58	—	Bodleian, Clarke 9.	XIII.?	Date not given in Cat. On parchment. Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 224.)	—
..	59	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5588.	XIII. 1	Pet. collated by Griesb. (= Heb. 62.)	—
..	60	29	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "e" above.</i>			
(61)	(61)	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. Cath. "o" above.</i>			
62	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 59 above.</i>			
63	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "e" Cath. 60 above.</i>			
65	62	—	Paris, 60.	XIV.	Inspected, and 1 Joh. v. collated by Griesbach.	—
(66)	67	..	Vienna, L.'s 34, N.'s 302.	XII.	<i>See Vol. III. note.</i> Alter and Birch. (= Cath. 66, Apoc. 34.) Collated by Alter with Apoc. 33. The readings inserted by a corrector are very valuable. Scholi a.	—
68	63	—	Vienna, L.'s 35, N.'s 313.	XIII.	Alter and Birch.	—
69	64	—	Vienna, L.'s 36, N.'s 303.	XIII.	Alter and Birch.	—

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
..	..	30	Wolfenbüttel, xvi. 7.	XIV.	Knittel in Matthæi's Appendix. (= Heb. 74, Cath. 69.)	—
—	—	31)	<i>The same MS. as</i> Apoc. "c" above.			
—	—	32	Dresden, Loescheri.	XV.	Matthæi (t in Appendix).	—
..	65	33	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. 57 above.			
..	66	34	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. 67 above.			
—	—	35	Vienna, 248.	XIV.	Alter. Collated with Apoc. 33. Andr. comm. Some readings in Delitzsch.	—
—	—	36	Vienna, Koll. 26.	XIV.	Alter. Collated with Apoc. 33. Andr. comm.	—
70	67	—	Vienna, L.'s 37, N.'s 221.	1831	Alter and Birch.	—
71	—	—	Vienna, F.'s 19, K.'s 10.	XII.	Alter and Birch.	—
72	..	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Cath. 57 above.			
73	68	—	Upsala, Sparwenfeld 42.	XI.	Aurivillius. Catena.	—
74	69	..	<i>The same MS. as</i> Apoc. 30, above.			
75	..	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Cath. 22, above.			
77	70	..	Vatican, 360.	XI.	Inspected by Birch and Scholz. (= Apoc. 66.)	131
78	71	—	Vatican, 363.	XI.	Inspected by Birch and Scholz.	133
79	72	37	Vatican, 366.	XIII.	Inspected by Birch and Scholz.	—
80	73	—	Vatican, 367.	XI.	Birch, "per omnia contuli."	—
—	—	38	Vatican, 579.	XIII.	Birch. Re-collated for this volume by B. H. Alford.	—
83	—	—	Vatican, 765.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Comm. on marg.	—
84	—	—	Vatican, 766.	XII.	Inspected by Birch. Comm. on marg.	—
(85)	—	39	Vatican, 1136.	XII.	Birch (throughout Apoc.). (Does not contain Heb. Begins Apoc. iii. 8; but illegible to iv. 7.) Apoc. before Epp.	—
86	75	40	Vatican, 1160.	XIII.	Birch. "Apoc. accurate examinavi cætera cursim perlustrans."	141
87	76	—	Vatican, 1210.	XI.	"Ep. Jac., 1 et 2 Pet., 1 Joh. necnon 4 priora Cap. Ep. ad Ebræos exacte contuli." Birch.	142
88	77	..	<i>The same MS. as</i> Apoc. 25, above.			
(89)	78	—	Vatican, Alex. 29.	XII.	Birch, "accurate exam." (Does not contain Heb.)	—
—	—	41	Vatican, Alex. 68.	XIV.	Birch (throughout Apoc.). Andr. comm.	—
90	79	—	Vatican, Urb. 3.	XI.	Inspected by Birch.	—
91	80	42	Vatican, Pio. 50.	XII.	Birch, "per omnia diligenter his coll."	—
—	—	43	Barberini Lib. Rome, 23.	XIV.	Contains among other things a fragment of a catena upon the Apocalypse (ch. xiv. 17—xviii. 20). Collated by Birch.	—

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
—	81	—	Barberini Lib. Rome, 377.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Commentary.	—
92	82	44	Propaganda Lib. Rome, 250.	1274	Engelbreth in Birch. (Once <i>Borg.</i> 4.)	180
93	83	?	Naples i. B. 12.	XI.	Birch. Ja. i., ii. "per omnia contuli."	—
94	84	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 1.	X.	Inspected by Birch. Mutilated at end. Marginal commentary.	—
95	(85)	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 5.	XIII.	Inspected by Birch. Does not contain Cath. Epp. Thl.'s comm.	—
96	86	..	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 20.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Margl. comm. (= Apoc. 75.)	—
97	87	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 29.	X.	Inspected by Birch.	—
98	88	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 31.	XI.	Inspected by Birch.	—
99	89	45	Laur. Lib. Florence, iv. 32.	XI.	Inspected by Birch; and Apoc. i.—iii. collated.	—
—	90	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, viii. 14.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Contains Ep. of Ja. with marginal scholia.	197
100	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 4.	XII.	Inspected by Birch. Comm.	—
101	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 6.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Comm.	—
102	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 7.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Var. comm.	—
103	—	—	Laur. Lib. Florence, x. 19.	XI.	Inspected by Birch. Catena.	—
(104)	(91)	..	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. Cath. "h." Apoc. "b" above.			201
105	92	—	Bologna, Can. Reg., 640.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz.	204
106	93	..	St. Mark's Venice, 5	XV.	Rinck. (= Apoc. 88; Apoc. copied from 46 below.)	205
107	94	—	St. Mark's Venice, 6	XV.	Rinck.	206
108	95	46	St. Mark's Venice, 10.	XV.	Rinck.	209
109	96	—	St. Mark's Venice, 11.	XIII.	Rinck.	—
110	—	—	St. Mark's Venice, 33.	XI.	Rinck. Comm.	—
111	—	—	St. Mark's Venice, 34.	XI.	Rinck. Comm.	—
112	—	—	St. Mark's Venice, 35.	XI.	Rinck. Comm. (Def. Heb. x. 25 —end.)	—
..	97	—	Wolfenbüttel, Gud. Gr. 104 A.	XII.	Cath., Langer in Griesbach (98). (= Heb. 241.) (Heb. inspected by Scholz.)	—
4113	98	—	(Moscow?)	XI.	Matthæi (a). Belonged to Matthæi himself.	—
114	99	—	Moscow, Synod. 5.	1445	Matthæi (c)	—
115	100	—	Moscow, Synod. 334.	XI.	Matthæi (d) Thl.'s comm.	—
116	101	—	Moscow, Synod. 333.	XIII.	Matthæi (f) Scholia.	—
(117)	(102)	—	<i>The same MS. as</i> Heb. Cath. "K" above.			
118	103	—	Moscow, Synod. 193.	XII.	Matthæi (h). A volume of scholia with texts on margin.	—
120	104	47	Dresden, Cod. Matth.	XI.	Matthæi (k).	241

* Rinck uses this number for St. Mark's Venice, 36.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
121	105	48	Moscow, Synod. 380.	XII.	Matthæi (l).	242
122	106	—	Moscow, Synod. 328.	XI.	Matthæi (m).	—
123	—	—	Moscow, Synod. 99.	XI.	Matthæi (n).	—
—	—	49	Moscow, Synod. 67.	XV.	Matthæi (o). Andr. comm.	—
—	—	50	Moscow, Synod. 206.	XII.	Matthæi (p).	—
?	(107)	—	Dresden, 252.	XV.	Matthæi (19). See App. to Joh. (Gosp.) p. 378. A Euchologium containing amongst other N. T. lections Heb. ii. 2—10; 11—18; vii. 26—viii. 2; xiii. 17—21; Ja. v. 10—20 (10—16 a 2nd time); 2 Pet. i. 10—19; 1 Joh. iv. 12—19. This MS. ought to be entered amongst the lectionaries (ev. 57).	—
125	—	—	Munich, 504.	1387	Inspected by Scholz.	—
126	—	—	Munich, 455.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. Prob. copied from same MS. as preceding.	—
128	Munich, 211.	XI.	Scholz says, "Coll. integer fere cod.," but it is only cited occasionally. (=Cath. 179, Apoc. 82.) Some readings in Apoc. given by Delitzsch.	—
129	—	—	Munich, 35.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Thl.'s comm. (so Hardt.)	—
130	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 54, above.</i>			
..	⁵ 108	—	Escorial χ. iv. 17.	XI.	No published collation of the Epistles. (= Heb. 228.)	226
..	⁵ 109	—	Escorial χ. iv. 12.	XIV.	No published collation of the Epistles. (= Heb. 229.)	227
..	(110)	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Nn. 5. 27.	—	A folio copy of the Greek Bible printed "Basileæ per Joan. Hervagium 1545." A few notes are written on the margin. (= Heb. 222).	241
..	(⁶ 111)	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. Cath. "o" above.</i>			
..	(⁶ 112)	—	<i>The MS. numbered Heb. 11. Cath. 9, above.</i>			
131	..	—	Paris, Coisl. 196.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. (=Cath. 132.)	330
132	113	51	Paris, 47.	1364	Reiche).	18
133	..	52	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 51, above.</i>			

⁵ These appear to be the MSS. spoken of by Rev. Edw. Clarke in his "Letters concerning the Spanish Nation," 4to, London, 1763, p. 133. "I took down two of the oldest MSS. of the Epistles which I could find in the Escorial. . . Both concur word for word in this reading, "Οτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυροῦντες τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ τὸ αἷμα: καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κ.τ.λ." (This passage was kindly pointed out to me by Dr. Tregelles. A. W. G.)

⁶ See Vol. III., note.

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information	Gosp.
134	114	—	Paris, 57.	XIII.	Reiche.	—
(135)	115	—	Paris, 58.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. [Does not contain Heb.]	—
136	116	53	Paris, 59.	XVI	Inspected by Scholz.	—
137	117	(54)	Paris, 61.	XIII.	Reiche (Epp.); who states that it does not contain the Apocalypse.	263
138	118	55	Paris, 101.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
139	119	56	Paris, 102 A.	X.	Inspected by Scholz. Reiche.	—
140	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 11, above.</i>			
141	120	—	Paris, 103 A.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. (Def. 1 Joh. ii. 11—iii. 3; iii. 24—v. 14; 2 Joh. ; 3 Joh. 11—end of Jude.)	—
142	121	—	Paris, 104.	XIII.	"Coll. max. cod. pars," Scholz.	—
143	122	—	Paris, 105.	XIV.	"Coll. max. cod. pars," Scholz. (Contains of Cath. Epp. only the follg. fragments: 1 Pet. ii. 20—iii. 2; iii. 17—end of 2 Pet.; 1 Joh. i. 1—iii. 5; iii. 21—v. 97; 2 Joh. 8—3 Joh. 10; Jude 7—end.)	—
144	123	—	Paris, 106 A.	XIV.	"Coll. max. cod. pars," Scholz. Scholia. (Def. 1 Pet. i. 9—ii. 7.)	—
148	—	—	Paris, 111.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
149	124	57	Paris, 124.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
150	125	—	Paris, 125.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
151	—	—	Paris, 126.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
—	—	58	Paris, 19.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
—	—	59	Paris, 99 A.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
152	—	60	Paris, 136 A.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Contains (only ?) Heb. Apoc.	—
153	126	—	Paris, 216.	X.	Inspected by Scholz and Reiche. Scholia.	—
154	127	—	Paris, 217.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz and Reiche. Thdrt.'s comm.	—
155	128	—	Paris, 218.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Catena.	—
156	129	—	Paris, 220.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm., text often omitted.	—
—	130	—	Paris, 221.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Catena. (Def. 2 Pet. i. 14—end; 1 Joh. iv. 11—Jude 8.)	—
157	—	—	Paris, 222.	XI.	"Coll. magna codicis pars," Scholz.	—
158	131	—	Paris, 223.	1045	Inspected by Scholz and Reiche Catena.	—
..	132	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 131, above.</i>			
—	—	61	Paris, 491.	XIII.	A defective copy of the Apoc. among various works of Bas. Thdrt. Max.	—
—	—	62	Paris, 239, 240.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
—	—	63	Paris, 241.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
159	—	64	Paris, 224.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Areth. comm.	—
160	—	—	Paris, 225.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Fragments with Thl.'s comm.	—
163	—	—	Paris, 238.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Contains Heb. i.—viii. with cat.	—

⁷ So Scholz: but on 1 John v. 7, he speaks of "122" as "*hoc loco mutilus*."

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information	Gosp.
164	—	—	Paris, 849.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Thdrtr.'s comm., w. text on marg.	—
165	—	—	Turin, C. i. 39 (284).	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
166	133	—	Turin, C. i. 40 (285).	XIII.	Heb., "Coll. loc. sel." Cath., accurate," Scholz.	—
167	134	—	Turin, C. ii. 17 (19).	XI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
168	—	—	Turin, C. ii. 38 (325).	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
169	..	—	Turin, C. ii. 31 (1).	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Mutilated in Heb. (= Cath. 136.)	—
170	135	..	Turin, C. ii. 5 (302).	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Apoc. 83.)	339
..	136	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 169, above.</i>			
—	—	65	Moscow, Univ. Lib., 25.	XII.	A fragment containing Apoc. xvi. 20—end, inspected by Scholz.	—
171	—	—	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 6.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (Def. Heb. iv. 7—end.)	—
172	—	—	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 15.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm. after Chr.	—
..	137	—	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 97.	XI.	Cath., "Coll. cod. fere integer," Ep. Paul. "loc. plur." (= Heb. 176).	—
173	138	—	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 102.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
174	139	—	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 104.	1434	Inspected by Scholz.	—
175	—	—	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 125.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Continuous comm.	—
176	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 137, above.</i>			
..	140	..	S. Mark's Venice, 546.	XI.	(Part Cent. xiii.) Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 215, Apoc. 74.) Epp. Catena, Apoc. comm.	—
..	141	—	Laur. Lib., Florence, vi. 27.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 239).	—
177	—	—	Modena, 14 (MS. II. A. 14).	XV.	"Coll. cod. integer," Scholz.	—
178	142	—	Modena, 243 MS. III. B. 17).	XII.	"Coll. cod. integer," Scholz under Paul. "Coll. loca selecta," Scholz under Acts.	—
(179)	..	—	Modena, 196 MS. II. g. 3).	XII.	The cursive portion of H of the Acts (cited in the Catholic Epp. as Hr.). Scholz. Comm.	—
—	143	—	Laur. Lib., Florence, vi. 5.	XI.	Contains Chr. on Mt. Lu. and Cath. Epp. with catena.	?
180	144	—	Laur. Lib., Florence, vi. 13.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	363
181	145	—	Laur. Lib., Florence, vi. 36.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	365
182	146	?	Laur. Lib., Florence, (2708?)	1332	Inspected by Scholz.	367
183	147	..	Laur. Lib., Florence, iv. 30.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Apoc. 76.)	—
184	148	—	Laur. Lib., Florence, (2574?)	984	Inspected by Scholz.	393
—	149	—	Laur. Lib., Florence, (176?)	XIII.	Contains Cath. Epp. with Latin version.	—
..	150	..	Riccardi Lib., Florence, 84.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 230, Apoc. 84.)	308
185	..	—	Vallicella Lib., Rome, E. 22.		Inspected by Scholz. (= Cath. 167.)	393

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
186	..	—	Vallicella Lib., Rome, F. 17.	1330	Inspected by Scholz. (= Cath. 170.)	—
..	..	66	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 77, Cath. 70, above.</i>			
—	—	67	Vatican, 1743.	1320	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
—	—	68	Vatican, 1904.	XI.	"Integre fere coll." Scholz. Contains only ch. vii. 17—viii. 2; xxi.—end. Arith. comm.	—
..	..	69	Vatican, Ottob. 258.	XIII.	Latter part xiv. Cent., Latin version. Scholz says "Coll. integer fere cod.;" but it is only cited in a few places. Mutilated at end. (= Heb. 198. Cath. 161.)	—
..	151	70	Vatican, Ottob. 66.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz (= Heb. 199.)	—
..	(152)	—	Camb. Univ. Lib., MS. Nn. 3. 20, 21.		A copy of the printed Greek Test., 8vo. London, 1728, interleaved, and bound up in two volumes. Contains MS. notes by John Taylor. (= Heb. 223.)	442
..	153	—	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5796.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Heb. 240.)	—
(187)	154	—	Vatican, 1270.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm. (Does not contain Heb.)	—
188	155	—	Vatican, 1430.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Commentary by a different hand.	—
189	—	—	Vatican, 1649.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Thdrt.'s comm. Heb. bef. Past. Epp.	—
190	156	—	Vatican, 1650.	1073	Inspected by Scholz. Comm. on Heb.	—
(191)	157	—	Vatican, 1714.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. Contains Ja. iii. 1—4, iv. 11—end; Jude; 3 Joh.	—
192	158	—	Vatican, 1761.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Heb. ix. 14—end and Past. Epp. edited by Mai as supplementary to B.	—
—	159	—	Vatican, 1968.	XI.	"Cursim coll. cod. integer," Scholz. Contains . . . Ja. 1 Pet. with Scholia.	—
193	160	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 24, above.</i>			
194	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 41, Apoc. 20, above.</i>			
195	—	—	Vatican, Ottob. 31.	X.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
196	—	—	Vatican, Ottob. 61.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
197	Vatican, Ottob. 176.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. (= Apoc. 78.)	—
198	161	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 69, above.</i>			
199	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 151, Apoc. 70, above.</i>			
200	162	—	Vatican, Ottob. 298.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Latin version	—
201	163	—	Vatican, Ottob. 325.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
203	164	71	Vatican, Ottob. 381.	1252	Inspected by Scholz.	390
—	165	—	Vatican, Ottob. 417.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. Contains Cath. Epp. among various works of St. Ephrem and others.	—
204	166	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 22, above.</i>			

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
..	167	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 185, above.</i>			
205	168	---	Vallicella Lib., Rome, F. 13.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
206	169	—	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. v. 29.	1344	Inspected by Scholz.	—
207	—	—	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. v. 32.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
208	—	—	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. viii. 55.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. Thdrt.'s comm.	—
—	—	72	Ghigi Lib., Rome, R. iv. 8.	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz. Andr. comm.	—
—	—	73	Corsini Lib Rome, 838.	XVI.	Andr. comm.	—
..	170	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 186, above.</i>			
209	171	—	Two MSS. in the Library of the Collegio Romano	XVI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
210 (211)	172 (173)	—	Naples (no number).	XVI. XI.	Inspected by Scholz. <i>Apparently the same as Heb. 93, Cath. 83, above.</i>	—
212	174	—	Naples, I. C. 26.	XV.	Scholz (magna pars).	—
213	—	—	Barberini Lib. Rome, 29.	1338	Inspected by Scholz. Scholia.	—
215	..	74	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 140, above.</i>			
..	..	75	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 96, Cath. 86, above.</i>			
..	..	76	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 183, Cath. 147, above.</i>			
—	—	77	Laur. Lib., Florence, vii. 9.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. Areth. comm.	—
..	—	78	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 197, above.</i>			
—	—	79	Munich, 248, Codex Syrleti.	XVI.	F. Sylburg 1596 in ed. of Andr. comm. Some readings in Delitzsch. (Copied from the same MS. as Andr.a?)	—
—	—	80	Munich, 544.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. (The same MS. as Andr.p?)	—
—	—	81	Munich, 23.	XVI.	Theod. Peltanus 1547. Andr. comm.	—
216	175	—	Mon. of S. Bas. Mes-sana, 2.	XII.	(Inspected by Munter?)	—
217	—	—	Palermo.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (Def. Heb. ii. 9—end.)	—
218	176	—	Syracuse.	XII.	Inspected by Munter.	421
219	177	—	Leyden, Meerman, 116.	XII.	Dermout. (Def. 1 John iv. 20—end; 2, 3 John; Jude.)	122
..	178	..	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "m" above.</i>			
..	179	82	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 128, above.</i>			
..	180	—	Strasburg, Molsheim-ensis.	XII.	Various readings communicated to Scholz. (= Heb. 238.)	431
220	181	—	Berlin, Diez. 10.	XV.	Pappelbaum. (Def. Heb. i. 1—9.)	400

Heb.	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
6(221)	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Heb. Cath. "o" above.</i>			
(222)	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. (110) above.</i>			
(223)	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. (152) above.</i>			
224	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 58, above.</i>			
6(225)	..	—	<i>The MS. numbered Heb. 11, Cath. 9, above.</i>			
6(226)	—	—	<i>The MS. numbered Heb. 27, above.</i>			
227	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 56, above.</i>			
228	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 108, above.</i>			
229	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 109, above.</i>			
	..	83	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 170, Cath. 135, above.</i>			
230	..	84	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 150, above.</i>			
..		} 182a	Two MSS. in a Monastery on the Island of Patmos.	XII.	} Inspected by Scholz (= Heb. 243.)	—
231	183		Gr. Mon. Jerusalem, 8.	XIII. XIV.		—
232	184	85	Gr. Mon. Jerusalem, 9.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. Comm.	—
233	185	—	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 1.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
234	186	—	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 2.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	457
235	187	86	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 10.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	462
236	188	—	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 15.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz.	—
..	..	(87)	<i>The MS. designated Apoc. "m" above.</i>			
..	..	88	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 106, Cath. 93, above.</i>			
237	189	89	Mon. S. Saba, nr. Jerusalem, 20.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.	466
238	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 180, above.</i>			
239	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 141, above.</i>			
240	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 153, above.</i>			
241	..	—	<i>The same MS. as Cath. 97, above.</i>			
242	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. "m" above.</i>			
243	}	..	<i>The same MSS. as Cath. 182, above.</i>			
243A						

Heb	Cath.	Apoc.	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information.	Gosp.
244	190	. .	<i>The same MS. as Apoc. 27, above.</i>			
245	191	—	Ch.Ch.Oxf., Wake 38 [3, Scholz].	XII.	(Inspected by Scholz?) Catena.	—
246	192	—	Ch.Ch.Oxf., Wake 37. [4, Scholz].	XI.	(Inspected by Scholz?)	—
8-pe	8-pe	—	St. Petersburg, xi. 1. 2. 230.	XII.	Muralto.	8-pe
—	—	90	Synod Lib., Moscow, Cod. Matth.	X.	Matthæi (a). (Scholz's (50 ²).)	—
—	—	(91)	The cursive portion of Vatican 1209.	XVI.	Mico for Bentley. (Printed in App. to Woide's edn. of Cod. Alex.) Some readings, and a transcript of Rev. xxii. 17-21, by Brun in Delitzsch. <i>Cited as Br.</i>	
. .	. .	92	<i>The same MS. as Heb. 40, Cath. 34, above.</i>			

The following is a List of Lectionaries.

	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information
lect-1	Leyden, 243. Scaligeri.	XI.	Wetstein and Dermout. Contains . . . Heb. ix. 11—24; 1 Pet. i. 1—ii. 3; ii. 17—25; iii. 8—18; iv.; 1 Joh. i. 1—9; Jude 1—6. (= ev-6)
lect-2	Brit. Mus., Cotton. Vesp. B. 18.	XI.	"Contains the portions of Acts and Epp. appointed to be read throughout the whole year. Casley collated it in 1735, and Wetstein inserted his extracts." (Michaelis.) Mutilated at beg. and end.
lect-3	Bodleian, Baroc. 202?	995	(Quoted by Mill. Heb. x. 22, 23 qu.?)
lect-4	Brit. Mus., Harl. 5731.	XIV.	Griesbach. Contains the following fragments:—Heb. i. 1—12; ii. 2—10; id. 11—18; vii. 26—viii. 2; ix. 1—7; xi. 9, 10; id. 32—40; xiii. 17—21. (= Gosp. 117)
lect-5	Bodleian, Cromwell. 11. (Olim 226.) A liturgy book, containing 5thly (pp. 149—290), εὐαγγελιστοῦ τῶν μεγάλων ἑορτῶν.	1225	Griesbach, who says "Variantes lectiones collegi e . . . Heb. i. 1—12; iv. 14—v. 6; xi. 24—26; xi. 32—xii. 2."
lect-6	Göttingen (C. de Missy).	XV.	Matthæi (v.).—See his appendix to Thess. Contains a large number of the usual lections, but not that which includes 1 Joh. v. 6—8.
lect-7	Copenhagen, 3.	XV.	Hensler in Birch. Not quoted at all in Epp. Cath. (= ev-44)
lect-8	Propaganda Lib., Rome, 287.	XI.	Birch. Contains Ja. v. 10—20. (= ev-37)
lect-9	Paris, 32.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-84)
lect-10	Paris, 33.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-85)
lect-11	Paris, 104	XII.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-12	Paris, 375.	1022	Scholz. An important MS. (= ev-60)
lect-13	Moscow, Synod. 4.	X.	Matthæi (b) ⁸ .
lect-14	Moscow, Synod. 291.	XII.	Matthæi (e) ⁸ .
lect-15	Moscow, Typogr. 31.	1116	Matthæi (tz). Contains besides O. T. lections, only 3 pericopæ of 1 Joh. but not iv. 20 (or v. 5) to v. 21.
lect-16	Moscow, Synod. 266.	XV.	Matthæi (ξ) } Do not contain { (= ev-52)
lect-17	Moscow, Synod. 267.	XV.	Matthæi (χ) } the 1 Joh. v. { (= ev-53)
lect-18	Moscow, Synod. 268.	1470	Matthæi (ψ) } pericopa. { (= ev-54)
lect-19	Moscow, Typogr. 47.	XVII.	Matthæi (ω). Contains Ja. v. 10—16; v. 7—18; 1 Joh. iv. 12—19; Ja. v. 10—20; 2 Pet. i. 10—19. (= ev-55)
lect-20	Moscow, Typogr. 9.	XVI.	Matthæi (16). Contains Heb. i. i—12. (= ev-56)
lect-21	Paris, 294.	XI.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-83)
lect-22	Paris, 304.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-23	Paris, 306.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz.

⁸ These contain the lection from 1 John v., but not the received gloss.

	Designation.	Date.	Name of Collator and other information
lect-21	Paris, 308.	XIII	Mostly O. T. lections; only three in 1 Joh.
lect-25	Paris, 319.	XI.	1 Pet. ii. iii. collated by Scholz.
lect-26	Paris, 320.	XII.	Inspected by Scho'z. Mutilated.
lect-27	Paris, 321.	XIII.	1 Joh. collated by Scholz. Defective.
lect-28	Bodleian, Selden 2.	XV.	Griesbach. (= ev-26)
lect-29	Paris, 370.	XII.	Some lections from Gosp. and Epp., esp. Heb. (= ev-94)
lect-30	Paris, 373.	XIII.	
lect-31	Paris, 276.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz. (= ev-82)
lect-32	Paris, 376.	XIII.	Entered in list of MSS. of Gospels as 324. Inspected by Scholz.
lect-33	Paris, 382.	XIII.	"Cursim coll. magna codicis pars," Scholz.
lect-34	Paris, 383.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-35	Paris, 324.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-92)
lect-36	Paris, 326.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-93)
lect-37	Riccardi Lib., Florence, 84.	XV.	See 368. Vol. I.
lect-38	Vatican, 1528.	XV.	
lect-39	Vatican, Ottob. 416.	XIV.	(ev-1333)
lect-40	Barberini, Lib., Rome, 18.	XIV.	Some parts of Cent. X.
lect-41	Barberini, Lib., Rome (no number).	XI.	The first 114 leaves are lost.
lect-42	Vallicella Lib., Rome, C. 46	XVI.	
lect-43	Riccardi Lib., Florence, 2742	?	(Inspected by Scholz?)
lect-44	Glasgow (Missy BB).		{ Manuscript collations by Missy were
lect-45	Glasgow (Missy CC).	1199	{ once in Michaelis' possession,
lect-46	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 63.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-47	Ambros. Lib., Milan, 72.	XII.	Inspected by Scholz. (ex-104)
lect-48	Laur. Lib., Florence, 2742.	XIII.	Inspected by Scholz. (ev-112)
lect-49	Mon. St. Saba, nr. Jerus., 16.	XIV.	(Inspected by Scholz?)
lect-50	St. Saba, 18.	XV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-51	St. Saba, 26.	XIV.	Inspected by Scholz.
lect-52	St. Saba (no number).		Inspected by Scholz.
lect-53	St. Saba (no number).	XIV.	Inspected by Schoiz. (ev-160.)
lect-54	St. Saba (no number).	XIII.	
lect-55	Trèves Cathedral Lib., Codex S. Simeonis.	X.	Edited by Steininger. Contains 1 Pet i. 3—9, 13—19, ii. 11—24; 1 Joh. iii 21—iv. 6, iv. 11—16, id. 20—v. 5. (=ev-179)
lect-57	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake [12 (1, Scholz)].	XI.	(= 26 Apoc.)
lect-58	Ch. Ch. Oxf., Wake [35 ?].	1172	

SECTION II.

ANCIENT VERSIONS REFERRED TO IN THIS VOLUME.

vss. the versions in general.

vulg. the Latin VULGATE.

The following manuscripts are cited when they differ from the Clementine edition :—

am. amiatinus, written about A.D. 541. Tischendorf has edited it, and considers it the oldest and most valuable extant.

demid. demidovianus. Published by Matthæi. Written in the XIIth century.

fuld. fuldensis. Readings given by Lachmann. Written in the VIth century.

harl. harleianus, No. 1772. Collation given by Griesbach Symb. Crit.

lips-4. }
lips-5. } three manuscripts of the Apocalypse belonging to the Univer-
lips-6. } sity of Leipzig. Readings given by Matthæi.

lux. luxoviensis. A lectionary cited by Mabillon and Sabatier.

tol. toletanus. A collation was published by Blanchini in his “Vindiciæ Can. Script.”

The OLD LATIN Version in use before Jerome’s revision is known from the following documents :—

In the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, from the copy written side by side with the Greek of MS. D. Cited as D-lat when either the Latin words are quoted or the Greek and Latin are at variance.

In the *Third Epistle of John*, from the Latin of Codex Bezae (D. of the Acts) of which a fragment is extant containing “qui malefacit,” ver. 11 to end. Cited as D-lat.

In the *Epistle of James*, and beginning of 1 *Peter*, from two manuscripts :—

corb. Corbeiensis. Published by Martianay in 1695 from the MS. cited in the Gospels as lat-ff¹.

vind. Vindobonensis. A few palimpsest fragments of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, copied by Tischendorf. Contains Ja. i. 1—5, iii. 13—18, iv. 1, 2, v. 19, 20, and 1 Pet. i. 1—12.

In the *Apocalypse*, the citations from Primasius are the chief representatives of the old text.

spec. denotes the Latin readings contained in Mai's "Speculum."
latt. denotes the consent of the Latin versions.

Syr. The Peschito (or simple) SYRIAC version. Supposed to have been made as early as the *second century*⁹.

syr. The later or Philoxenian version. Cent. V. Revised by Thomas of Harkel, A.D. 616.

syr-dd. (*in the Apocalypse*) a version of the Apocalypse published by De Dieu in 1627 from a MS. in the Leyden Library. Tregelles says, "It is possibly not really an ancient work; though its age is wholly uncertain, and its internal character and the nature of its text, as well as the want of all external credentials, place it indefinitely low as to critical value."

syrr. denotes the consent of the Syriac versions.

copt. the COPTIC or Memphitic Egyptian version.

sah. the Thebaic or Sahidic Egyptian version.

basm. the Bashmuric Egyptian version¹.

coptt. denotes that the Egyptian versions agree in supporting a given reading.

copt-wilk. Wilkins' edition of the Coptic version.

copt-schw. that of Schwartz.

copt-dz. Codex Diez, written about the *tenth century*.

sah-ming. Mingarel's; sah-mnt, Munter's edition of the Thebaic.
sah-woide, the MS. of the Thebaic published in the appendix to Woide's edition of the Codex Alexandrinus.

goth. the GOTHIC version: made from the Greek by Ulphilas about the middle of the *fourth century*.

æth. the ÆTHIOPIC version: assigned to the *fourth century*.

æth-rom. the edition given in the Roman polyglott.

æth-pl. Pell Platt's edition.

arm. the ARMENIAN version: made in the *fifth century*.

arm-usc. arm-zoh. the editions of Uscan and Zohrab respectively.

⁹ The Peschito does not contain 2 Pet., 2, 3 John, or Jude; they have been added in modern editions from a later Syriac version found by Pococke in a ms. in the Bodleian. This is cited as "syr-pk."

¹ This version follows sah so closely as to have no independent critical value except where sah is not extant. (See Treg. in Horne, vol. iv. p. 299.)

SECTION III.

FATHERS AND ANCIENT WRITERS CITED IN THE DIGEST TO THIS VOLUME.

(N.B.—The abbreviation is designated by the thick type. In the remainder of the word or sentence *Latin* writers are described in Italics.)

Ambrose, *Bp. of Milan*, A.D. 374—397

Amphilochius, *Bp. of Iconium*, 374

Andreas, *Bp. of Cæsarea in Capadocia*, Cent^y. VI., cited as **Andr-a** from *Cod. Augustanus*, twelfth century; **Andr-b**, from *Cod. Bavaricus*, sixteenth century (*Delitzsch*); **Andr-p**, from *Cod. Palatinus*, fifteenth century; and **Andr-coisl**, *Cod. Coislinianus*, No. 223, tenth century (see *Tischdf.*)

Andreas of Crete, 635

Ansbert, *Ambrose*, d. 767

Antiochus of Ptolemais, 614

Antonius Monachus, b. 251, d. 356

Arethas, *Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia*, Cent^y. X.²

Athanasius, *Bp. of Alexandria*, 326—373

Augustine, *Bp. of Hippo*, 395—430

Basil, *Bp. of Cæsarea*, 370—379

Bede, *the Venerable*, 731

Cassianus, Cent^y. V.

Cæsarius of Constantinople, 368

Cæsarius, *Episc. Arelatensis*, 502—544

Cassiodorus, b. 479, d. 575

Chromatius, *Bp. of Aquileia*, 402

Chronicon Paschale, Cent^y. VII.

Chrysostom, *Bp. of Constantinople*, 397—407; **Chr-mss** as cited by

Tischdf. from *Matthæi*; **-montf**, from *Montfaucon*; **Chr-wlf**, *Wolfenbüttel ms.* of *Chr.* written in the sixth century.

Clement of Alexandria, fl. 194

Clement, *Bp. of Rome*, 91—101

Cosmas Indicopleustes, 535

Cyprian, *Bp. of Carthage*, 248—258

Cyril, *Bp. of Alexandria*, 412—444

Cyril, *Bp. of Jerusalem*, 348—386

Damascenus, *Johannes*, 730

“*Dialogi de Trinitate*,” variously ascribed to *Ath Thdrt Max*

Didymus of Alexandria, 370

Dionysius, *Bp. of Alexandria*, 247—265

Ephrem the Syrian, b. 299, d. 378

Epiphanius, *Bp. of Salamis in Cyprus*, 368—403

Epistle of the Church of Lyons

Eusebius, *Bp. of Cæsarea*, 315—320

Euthalius, *Bp. of Sulci*, 458

Euthymius Zigabenus, 1116

Fastidius, *Bp. in Britain*, 430

Faustinus, 383

Firmicus, *Julius.F. Maternus*, 345

Fulgentius, *Bp. in Africa*, 508—533

Gelasius of Cyzicum, fl. 476

Gildas, fl. 581

Glycas of Sicily, 1120

² Respecting the difficulties at present besetting the question of *Arethas'* text, see *Delitzsch, Handschriftliche Funde*, ii. p. 26 ff.

Haymo, *Bp. of Halberstadt*, 841—853

Hesychius of Jerusalem, Cent^y. IV. or VI.

Hilary, *Bp. of Poitiers*, 354—368

Hippolytus, disciple of Irenæus, *Bp. of Portus*, 220

Idacius, *the name under which Vig. published his work "de Trinitate."*

Irenæus, *Bp. of Lyons*, 178. Generally cited (as **Iren-int** or **Iren-lat**) from a Latin translation old enough to have been used by Tertullian.

Isidore of Pelusium, 412

Jerome, fl. 378—420

Leo, *Bp. of Rome*, 440—461

Lucifer, *Bp. of Cagliari*, 354—367

Macarius of Egypt, 301—391

Martin, *Bp. of Rome*, 649—655

Maximus Taurinensis, 430—466

Maximus Confessor, fl. 630—662

Meletius, *Bp. of Antioch*, 381

Methodius, fl. 290—312

Nazianzenus, Gregory, fl. 370—389

Nilus of Constantinople, end of Cent^y. IV.

Novatian, 251

Nyssa, Gregory, *Bp. of*, 371

Oecumenius, *Bp. of Tricca* in Thrace, Cent^y. XI. ?

Optatus, fl. 364—375

Origen, b. 185, d. 254

Orosius, 416

Orsiesius the Egyptian, 345

Pacianus, *Bp. of Barcelona*, 370

Pelagii Ep. ad Demetr. 417 ?

Peter, *Bp. of Alexandria*, 300—311

Philastrius, *Bp. of Brescia*, fl. 380

Philo Carpasius, Cent^y. V.

Phœbadius, *Bp. of Agen*, cir 350—390

Photius, *Bp. of Constantinople*, 858—891

Polycarp, *Bp. of Smyrna*, d. 169

Primasius, Cent^y. VI.

Proclus, *Bp. of Constantinople*, 434

Procopius of Gaza, 520

"*De Promissionibus dimid. temp.*"

"*Quæstiones ex vet. et nov. Testt.*"

Printed among the works of Aug.

Rufinus of Aquileia, 397

Salvianus, 440

Sedulius, 430

Severus of Antioch, Cent^y. VI.

"*De Singularitate Clericorum.*"

Among Cypr's works.

Socrates of Constantinople, 440

Synopsis ascribed to Athanasius.

Tertullian, 200

Theodore, *Bp. of Mopsuestia*, 399—428

Theodore of the Studium, 795—826

Theodoret, *Bp. of Cyrus*, 420—458

Theophylact, *Abp. of Bulgaria*, 1071

Tichonius, 390

Timothy, *Bp. of Alexandria*, 380

Titus, *Bp. of Bostra*, cir. 360—371

Victor of Antioch, 401

Victor Vitensis, *an African Bp.*, Cent^y. V.

Victorinus, 380

Victor, *Bp. of Tunis*, 565

Vigilius of Thapsus, 484

"*De Vocatione gentium.*"

Zeno, *Bp. of Verona*, 362—380

To this list it may be useful to add the following ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE DIGEST :

aft, after.

al, alii.

appy, apparently.

bef, before.

beg, beginning.

comm, commentary—when appended to the name of a Father, denotes that the reading referred to is found in the body of his commentary, and not in the text (txt) printed at the head of the commentary.

This last is often very much tampered with.

corr, corrector. corrd, corrected.

ctra, contra.

def, defective.

ed or edn, edition.

elsw, elsewhere.

elz, elzevir edition of the Greek Test.

e sil, e silentio collatorum.

exc, except.

expr, expressly.

follg or flg, the following words.

gr, Greek. gr-lat-ff, Greek and Latin Fathers.

ins, insert—"ins *kai* AB" means that the MSS. A and B insert *kai*.

int, interpreter or interpretation—appended to the name of a Father, means that the citation is made from a translation, not from the original.

marg, margin.

om, omit—"om *kai* AB" means that the MSS. A and B omit the *kai* given in the text or inserted by other MSS.

Ps, Pseudo—used in citing the spurious works ascribed to Ath. and other Fathers.

pref, prefix.

rec, the *textus receptus*, or received text of the Greek Testament.

This is used when Steph and elz agree.

rel, reliqui—means that all the other manuscripts named on the margin have the reading to which it is appended³.

simly, similarly.

Steph, Stephens' Greek Testament.

transp, transpose.

³ rel-scr, occasionally used in the Apocalypse, means 'the rest of the mss. collated by Scrivener.'

txt, text—when followed by a list of MSS., versions, &c., means that the reading adopted in this edition is supported by those MSS., versions, &c. (See also under comm above.)

ver, verse.

vss, versions.

vv, verses.

The figures 2, 3, &c., inserted *above* the line to the right hand, imply a second, third, &c., hand in a MS. Thus B¹ means the original scribe of B; C², the first corrector of C; C³, the second; D^r, a recent scribe in D, by whom corrections were made or parts not originally in the MS. supplied.

The same figures *below* the line, imply *recurrence* of the reading 2, 3, &c. times in the author mentioned; e. g. Aug₁, Orig₂, Bas₃:⁴ similarly are used the words sæpe, aliq or alic (aliquoties or alicubi), ubique.

Words printed in the digest in the larger type used for the text itself are to be taken as of equal authority with the reading printed in the text: the place in the text where such readings occur being indicated by an asterisk.

SECTION IV.

LIST AND SPECIFICATION OF EDITIONS OF OTHER BOOKS QUOTED, REFERRED TO, OR MADE USE OF IN THIS VOLUME.

(N.B.—Works mentioned in the lists given in the Prolegomena to the previous volumes are not here again noticed.)

ALTER, F. C., *Novum Testamentum ad Codicem Vindobonensem græce expressum, varietatem lectionis addidit*, Vienna 1787.

AMBROSE ANSBERT (+ 767) in *S. Johannis Apocalypsin*. Printed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum maxima*, vol. xiii. pp. 403 ff.

AUBERLEN, *Der Prophet Daniel und die Offenbarung Johannis in ihren gegenseitigen Verhältniss betrachtet*, u.s.w., Basel 1854.

BARKER, Rev. W. G., *Friendly Strictures on certain portions of the Rev. E. B. Elliott's Horæ Apocalypticæ*, London 1847.

BEDE, *Opp.* ed. Colon. 1688.

BENGEL, *Erklärung der Offenbarung Joh.* u.s.w., Stuttgart 1740 (cited second-hand).

Idem, *Apparatus Criticus*, Tubingen 1673.

4-2-mss. appended to the name of a Father means that the reading cited is contained in two mss. of that Father.

Chr-5-mss₃ means that in 5 mss. of Chrysostom the reading cited occurs 3 times.

- BIRCH, Andreas, *Variæ Lectiones ad Textum Apocalypseos*, 8vo. Copenhagen 1800.
- BIRKS, T. R., *Outlines of Unfulfilled Prophecy*, London 1854.
- BLEEK, Der Brief an die Hebräer erläutert u.s.w., 3 vols., Berlin 1828—1840.
- BOSSUET, L'Apocalypse, avec une Explication. Œuvres, ed. Versailles 1815, tom. 3.
- BRIGHTMANN, *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, Lond. 1616.
- CATENA in *Epistolas Catholicas*. Accesserunt Œcumenii et Arethæ Commentarii in Apocalypsin ad fidem Codd. MSS. Edidit J. A. Cramer, S. T. P., *Aulæ Novi Hospitii Principalis*, Oxon. 1840.
- DAUBUZ, *Perpetual Commentary on the Apocalypse*, fol. Lond. 1720.
- DELITZSCH, Prof. F., *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*, Leipzig 1857.
- Idem, *Handschriftliche Funde*, erstes Heft: die erasmischen Entstellungen des Textes der Apokalypse, nachgewiesen aus dem verloren geglaubten Codex Reuchlins, Leipzig 1861.
- Idem, *Handschriftliche Funde*, zweites Heft: neue Studien über den Codex Reuchlins u. neue Textgeschichtliche Aufschlüsse über die Apokalypse aus den Bibliotheken in München, Wien, Rom, u.s.w.: mit Beiträgen von S. P. Tregelles, Leipzig 1862.
- DE WETTE, *Exegetisches Handbuch* u.s.w. (see previous volumes.)
- DIETLEIN, *Der zweite Brief Petri* u.s.w.
- DÜSTERDIECK, Dr. Friedr., *Die drei johanneischen Briefe: mit einem vollständigen theologischen Commentare*, 2 voll., Göttingen 1852-1854.
- Idem, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannis* (being the sixteenth portion of Meyer's *Commentary on the New Test.*), Göttingen 1859.
- EBBARD, Dr. J. H. A., *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (being the second part of the fifth vol. of Olshausen's *Biblischer Commentar*), Königsberg 1850.
- Idem, *Die Briefe Johannis* (being the fourth part of the sixth vol. of the same), Königsberg 1859.
- Idem, *Die Offenbarung Johannis* (being the seventh vol. of the same), Königsberg 1853.
- ELLIOTT, Rev. E. B., *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, 4 voll. Fourth edit. Lond. 1851.
- Idem, *The Destinies and Perils of the Church as predicted in Scripture*, being the Warburtonian Lectures from 1849 to 1853. One of the Appendices is on the present state of the controversy on apocalyptic interpretation. London 1859.
- ERDMANN, *Primæ Joannis Epistolæ argumentum, nexus et consilium*, Berolini 1855.

- ESTIUS, Guil., *Annotationes in præcipua ac difficiliora S.S. loca.* fol., Paris 1683.
- EVANGELIUM (Das) DES REICHS (anonymous), Leipzig 1859.
- EWALD, *Commentarius in Apocalypsin Johannis exegeticus et criticus*, Lipsiæ 1828.
- FAIRBAIRN, Pat., D.D., *Prophecy viewed in respect to its distinctive nature, its special function, and proper interpretation*, Edinburgh 1856.
- FORD, Henry, *Appendix ad Editionem N. T. Græci e Cod. MS. Alexandrino descripti*, a C. G. Woide, folio, Oxford 1799.
- GLOSSA ORDINARIA (i.e., Walafrid Strabo, in 850), from the *Biblia Maxima* (St. Augustine's College Library, Canterbury).
- GRÄBER, Herm. Joh., *Versuch einer historischen Erklärung der Offenbarung des Johannes, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Auslegungen von Bengel, Hengstenberg u. Ebrard*, Heidelberg 1857.
- GREGORY OF NYSSA, cited by the Abbé Migne's pages in his edition of the *Fathers*.
- GROTIUS (cited from the *Critici Sacri*).
- HAMMOND (see former voll.).
- HENGSTENBERG, Prof., *Die Offenbarung des h. Johannes*, u.s.w., 2 voll. Berlin 1849—1850.
- HUNTINGFORD, Rev. E., *The voice of the last Prophet, a practical interpretation of the Apocalypse*, London 1858.
- HUTHER, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über die drei Briefe des Johannes* (being the fourteenth portion of Meyer's Commentary), Göttingen 1855.
- Idem, *Krit.-exeget. Handb. über den 1 Brief des Petrus, den Brief des Judas, u. den 2 Brief des Petrus* (being the twelfth portion of the same), Göttingen 1852.
- Idem, *Krit.-exeget. Handb. über den Brief des Jakobus* (being the fifteenth portion of the same), Göttingen 1858.
- JOACHIM, Abbas, *Expositio magni Prophetæ Abbatis Joachimi* (1186) in *Apocalypsin*, Venet. 1527.
- KUINOEL, *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Hebræos*, Lipsiæ 1831.
- LEIGHTON, Archbp., *A practical Commentary on the first Epistle general of St. Peter*, in his works, 2 voll., London 1828.
- LÜCKE, Dr. Friedr., *Versuch einer vollständigen Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannis und in die gesammte apokalyptische Literatur*, Bonn 1832 ; 2nd edition, 1852.
- Idem, *Commentar über die Schriften des Evangelist Johannes* (vol. iii. containing the Epistles), Bonn 1856.
- LÜNEMANN, Dr. Gottlieb, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Hebräerbrief* (being the thirteenth portion of Meyer's Commentary), Göttingen 1855.

- MAITLAND, Charles, *The Apostles' School of Prophetic Interpretation: with its History down to the present time*, London 1849.
- MATTHÆI, C. F., *Apocalypsis Græce et Latine ex codicibus nunquam antea examinatis*, Rigae 1785.
- MEDE, *Clavis Apocalyptica*, and commentary following; in his works, Cambridge 1677.
- MICHAELIS, J. D., *Introduction to the New Testament*, translated from the 4th edn. of the German, and considerably augmented with notes explanatory and supplemental by Herbert Marsh, B.D., Fellow of St. John's Coll. Cambridge, Cambridge 1793.
- NEWTON, B. W., *Thoughts on the Apocalypse*, London and Plymouth 1844.
- OOSTERZEE, Dr. J. J., *Christus unter den Leuchtern*, u.s.w., Leipzig 1854.
- OWEN, Dr. John, *An Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, with preliminary Exercitations, 4 voll., London 1840.
- RAMPF, Dr., *Der Brief Judä* u.s.w., historisch, kritisch, exegetisch betrachtet (Roman Catholic), Sulzbach 1854.
- REICHE, J. G., *Codicum MSS. N. T. Græcorum aliquot insigniorum in Bibl. Regia Parisiensi asservatorum Nova Descriptio et cum textu vulgo recepto Collatio*, præmissis quibusdam de neglecti codicum MSS. N. T. studii causis observationibus, Göttingen 1847.
- REVELATION (The) of Jesus Christ, explained agreeably to the analogy of Holy Scripture: and the interpretation of its symbols. By a Clergyman, London 1850.
- RIEHM, *Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, Ludwigsburg 1858.
- SANDER, *Commentar zu den Briefen Johannis*, Elberfeld 1851.
- SCOTT, W. H., *The Interpretation of the Apocalypse and the chief prophetical Scriptures connected with it*, London 1853.
- STEIGER, W., *Der erste Brief Petri mit Berücksichtigung des ganzen biblischen Lehrbegriffs ausgelegt*, Berlin 1832.
- STEIN, Prof., *Commentar über die Offenbarung des Apostel Johannes* (Roman Catholic), Schaffhausen 1854.
- STIER, Dr. Rudolf, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* u.s.w., Halle 1842.
- Idem, *Der Brief Jakobi* u.s.w., Barmen 1845.
- Idem, *Der Brief Judä, des Bruders des Herrn*, Berlin 1850.
- Idem, *Die Reden des Herrn Jesu vom Himmel her* (forming a supplement to the *Reden Jesu*), Barmen 1859.
- Idem, *Die Reden der Engel in heiliger Schrift*, Barmen 1861.
- STUART, Prof. Moses, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Henderson's Edition, London 1856.
- Idem, *A Commentary on the Apocalypse*, London 1850.
- THOLUCK, Dr. A., *Kommentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*. 3rd edition, Hamburg 1850.

- TODD, Dr. J. H., Six Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist in the Apocalypse of St. John, preached before the University of Dublin, at the Donnellan Lecture, Dublin 1846.
- TREGELLES, Dr. S. P., The Book of Revelation in Greek, edited from ancient authorities, with a new English version and various readings, London 1844.
- TRENCH, Archbp., Commentary on the Epistles to the Seven Churches in Asia, London 1861.
- VICTORINUS of Pettau (cir. 300), Comm. in Apocalypsin: in Migne's Patrologia Latina, vol. v.
- VITRINGA Campegius, 'Ανάκρισις Apocalypseos Johannis Apostoli, &c., Leucopetræ 1721.
- WEISS, Dr. Bernhard, Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff, Berlin 1855.
- WILLIAMS, Isaac, The Apocalypse, with notes and reflections, London 1852.
- WOODHOUSE, Dean, The Apocalypse, or Revelation of St. John, translated, with notes, critical and explanatory, London 1805.
- WORDSWORTH, Bishop, Lectures on the Apocalypse, Critical, Expository, and Practical, delivered before the University of Cambridge, being the Hulsean Lectures for the year 1848, London 1849.
- Idem, the New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the original Greek (the last portion, containing the general Epistles and the Book of Revelation), London 1860.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

ABDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

I. ¹ ^a Πολυμερῶς καὶ ^b πολυτρόπως ^c πάλαι ὁ θεὸς ^d λα- a here only τ. (-ρῆς, Wisd. vii. 22.)
b here only τ. οὗτος ὁ πόλεμος τοῖς πάθεσι ποικίλος, κ. ταῖς τύχαις πολυτροπώτατος, Plut. C. Mar. p. 424 C. c Matt. xi. 21. Mark xv. 44. Luke x. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 19. 2 Pet. i. 9. Jude 4 only. Isa. xxxvi. 26 only. d of divine revelations, ch. ii 2, 3. iii. 5. v. 5. xi. 18. Luke i. 46, 70. xxiv. 26. Acts iii. 21, 24. vii. 6, 38, 44. viii. 26. x. 7. xxi. 9. see also ch. vii. 14. ix. 19. xii. 24, 25. xiii. 7. never in St. Paul.

TITLE. Steph η προς εβραιους επιστολη παυλου, simply a h k o : elz η προς εβρ. επιστ., with g l : εγραφη απο ιταλιας δια τιμοθεου η προς εβρ. επιστ. εκτεθεισα ως εν πινακι M : του αγιου κ. πανευφημου αποστ. παυλ. επιστ. πρ. εβρ. L : [παυλ. επ. πρ. εβρ. P :] προς εβραιους ABN C (in subscr) [D (at head of pages) K-marg m n 17 [47] fuld coptt.

CHAP. I. 1—II. 18.] AFTER MANY-
FOLD REVELATIONS IN FORMER TIMES,
GOD HAS NOW REVEALED HIMSELF TO
US IN HIS SON (i. 1—4), WHO IS
GREATER THAN THE ANGELS, THE DIS-
PENSERS OF THE LAW (i. 4—14; infer-
ence, ii. 1—4), THOUGH FOR A TIME HE
WAS MADE LOWER THAN THE ANGELS,
AND SUBJECTED TO SUFFERINGS, IN OR-
DER TO BE, AS OUR HIGH PRIEST, OUR
RECONCILER TO GOD (ii. 5—18). And
herein (i. 1—4), *introduction and state-
ment of position.*

We may notice, 1. The opening of this Epistle without any address, or mention of the Author. Various reasons have been assigned for this, and inferences drawn from it (see Prolegg.). Some have said that the matter to be treated was so weighty, that the Writer merged altogether his own personality, and trusted to the weight of his subject to gain him a hearing. But, as Ebrard remarks, this would not account for entire omission of the name of the man and his standing. He therefore imagines that another shorter letter of a more private nature must have accompanied this. But we may reply, that this idea derives no countenance from the phenomena of the Epistle itself, containing as it does at the end private notices which might well have been dispensed with, if such a commendatory Epistle had accompanied it. We must therefore deal with this circumstance without any such hypo-

thesis to help us. On the supposition of the Pauline authorship, some account may be given of it,—viz. that the name of the Apostle was concealed, from the nature of the relations between himself, and those to whom he was writing (see this hypothesis examined in the Prolegomena). And on the idea of Pauline *superintendence*, it would obviously admit of the same solution. 2. The carefully balanced and rhetorical style in which the Epistle begins, characteristic indeed of its whole diction (see Prolegg.), but especially marking this first period (vv. 1—4). The clauses are joined by close grammatical and rhetorical dependence: there is no anacoluthon, no carelessness of construction, but all is most carefully and skilfully disposed.

1.] In many portions (for the usage of πολυμερῶς and of its cognate adj. πολυμερής, we have two passages of Maximus Tyrius, in which πολύτροπος is also conjoined with it: Dissert. xvii. 7, τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχῇ δύο ὀργάνων ὄντων πρὸς σύνεσιν, τοῦ μὲν ἀπλοῦ, δι καλοῦμεν νοῦν, τοῦ δὲ ποικίλου καὶ πολυμεροῦς καὶ πολυτρόπου, ἃς αἰσθήσεις καλοῦμεν: and ib. vii. 2, οὐθὲν δεῖ τῆς πολυμεροῦς ταύτης κ. πολυτρόπου μούσης τε καὶ ἁρμορίας: also ib. xxxix. 2, τὸ πολυμερές καὶ πολύφωνον τοῦ τῶν σωμάτων πολέμου, ἃς καλοῦμεν νόσους: Plut. de Virt. Mil. p. 757 D, ποικίλον τι δράμα κ. πολυμερές: id. de Invid. et Odio, p. 537 D, τοῦ Θεοσίτου ὁ ποιητῆς τὴν μὲν τοῦ

e = Luke i. 72. λήσας e τοῖς e πατράσιν f ἐν τοῖς e προφήταις g ἐπ' h ἐσχά-
 xi 48. John
 vi. 31. Acts
 iii. 13 al. fr. absol., John vi. 58. vii. 22. Acts vii. 10. xiii. 32 xxvi 6. Rom. ix 5, xi 28. xv 8. 2 Pet iii 4 only.
 f3 Kings xxii. 38. g gen. i. 2. Mark ii 26. Luke ii. 2 iv. 27. Acts xi 28. 1 Tim. vi 12. h constr. a b c d e
 (see note), 1 Pet. i. 20. Num. xxiv. 14. Deut. iv. 30. Dan. viii. 19, 23 x. 14. f g h k l m n o
 17. 47

σώματος κακίαν πολυμερῶς καὶ περι-
 οδευμένως ἐξεμόρφωσε, τὴν δὲ τοῦ ἡθους
 μοχθηρίαν συντομώτατα κ. δι' ἐνὸς ἔφρα-
 σεν. Aristotle (in Stephanus, but without
 a reference) has πολυμερέστατος πόντος,
 also De Part. Anim. iv. 7. 1, τῶν ὀστρακο-
 δέρμων οὐκ ἔστι τὸ σῶμα πολυμερές,
 and Plato, Tim. Locr. p. 98 D, ὕδατος στοι-
 χεῖον πολυμερέστατον. Hesychius inter-
 prets the adj. εἰς πολλὰ μεριόμενον; and
 the adverb, πολυσχεδῶς. Hence we may
 gather the meaning to be 'in many por-
 tions,' or 'parts,' manifestly as regards
 the *distribution*. "Non enim omnia, nec
 eadem, omnibus prophetis revelata sunt,
 sed quasi partibus mysteriorum distri-
 butis: alia aliis inspirata. Exempli causa;
 Jesaie, partus virginis et passio Christi;
 Danieli, tempus adventus ejus: Jonæ,
 ejusdem sepultura: Malachiæ, adventus
 præcursoris. Ac rursum aliis plura, aliis
 pauciora." Estius. πολυμερῶς says Thdr̄t.,
 τὰς πανταδαπᾶς οἰκονομίας σημαίνει. So
 that "at sundry times" is not an accurate
 rendering; nor can it be said as by the
 schol. in ms. 113, cited by Bleek (τὸ
 πολυμερῶς τὸ διάφορον τῶν καιρῶν αἰνίτ-
 τεται, καθ' οὓς ἕκαστός τις τῶν προφητῶν
 μερικὴν τινα ἐνεχειρίζετο οἰκονομίαν), Cal-
 vin, Bleek, Lünemann, al., to *express* the
 meaning: *time* is a historical condition of
 the sequence of parts,—*persons to whom*,
 an anthropological condition,—but it does
 not follow that "at sundry times," or "to
 sundry persons," gives the force of 'in
 divers parts:' because it might be the
 same thing which was revealed again and
 again. This revelation in portions, by
 fragments, in and by various persons, was
 necessarily an imperfect revelation, to
 which the one final manifestation in and
 by One Person is properly and logically
 opposed, without any ἐφάπαξ or ἀπλῶς as
 Tholuck seems to desiderate in the apodo-
 sis) and in divers manners (ἄλλως γὰρ
 ὤφθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ, κ. ἄλλως τῷ Μωσῇ,
 κ. ἑτέρως Ἠλίας, κ. ἄλλως τῷ Μιχαίᾳ.
 καὶ Ἡσαίας δὲ κ. Δανιὴλ κ. Ἰεζεκιὴλ
 διάφορα ἐθεάσαντο σχήματα. Thdr̄t.
 Bleek remarks that in Num. xii. 6—8, the
 diversity of manner of revelation is recog-
 nized: dreams and visions being set be-
 neath that open speaking, mouth to mouth,
 which the Lord used towards His servant
 Moses. Wetst. cites a remarkable parallel
 from Eustathius, where, speaking of Odys-
 seus, he says, πολυτρόπως ἀνεγνωρίσθη
 πᾶσιν οἷς ἄλθεν εἰς γνῶσιν, μηδενὸς

αναγνωρισμοῦ συμπεσόντος ἐτέρῳ ἀνα-
 γνωρισμῷ τὸ σύνολον· ἄλλως γὰρ τῷ
 Τηλεμάχῳ, ἐτέρως τῇ Εὐρυκλείᾳ, ἐτέρως
 τοῖς δούλοις, ἄλλον δὲ τρόπον τῷ Λαέρτῃ,
 καὶ ὅλως ἀνομοίως ἅπασιν. See also ref.
 It will be seen, that I cannot agree with
 Chrys. and many others in regarding the
 two adverbs as a mere rhetorical redund-
 ance—*τοῦτέστι διαφόρως*. Both set forth
 the imperfection of the O. T. revelations.
 They were various in nature and in form:
 fragments of the whole truth, presented in
 manifold forms, in shifting hues of sepa-
 rated colour: Christ is the full revelation
 of God, Himself the pure light, uniting in
 His one Person the whole spectrum: see
 below on ἀπαύγασμα. Kypke, Bleek,
 and others, have pointed out the mistake
 of Lambert Bos (Observ. Misc. p. 109), who
 imagined, from the passage of Max. Tyr.
 Diss. vii. 2, cited above, that these words
 were originally applied to music) in *time*
past (generally interpreted of the O. T.
 period, ending with Malachi. But, as
 Ebrard well observes, there is no need for
 cutting off the period there. In the interim
 between Malachi and the Writer's time,
 though the O. T. canon was closed, we
 cannot say that God's manifold revelations
 of Himself had absolutely ceased. Nay,
 strictly speaking, the Baptist himself be-
 longed to the former, though he pointed on
 to the latter period. No doubt Bleek is
 right in denying that he was here in the
 Writer's view, and in maintaining that the
 period of former revelations is here re-
 garded as distinct from the final Christian
 one: but for all that, we must not put an
 artificial terminus where he puts none)
 God having spoken (see the usage of
 λαλεῖν in this sense in reff. and Bleek, p.
 12) to the fathers (see usage in reff. It
 is evident from this term being common
 to the Writer and his readers, where no
 reference is made to Jews in the context
 (as in Rom. ix. 5 al.), that he was writing
 as a Jew and to Jews. οἱ πατέρες,
 "qui in carne et in fide nos genuere."
 Ps.-Anselm) in (not = διὰ, though it in-
 cludes it. The readers of Vol. III. of
 this work need hardly be reminded that
 such a rendering of ἐν has never been
 acquiesced in by me. Nor can I concede
 to any number of Commentators that, as
 Primasius here,—*Præpositio pro alia
 præpositione sæpe accipitur, sicut in mul-
 tis locis epistolæ invenitur his præposi-
 tionibus indifferenter uti.*" Nor again

του τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ, ² ὃν ¹ ἔθηκεν ^{i = Rom. iv. 17, from Gen. xvil.}

5. 1 Tim ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 6. Jer. i. 5.

CHAP. I. 1. rec εσχάτων, with c l [47] hal¹ D-lat syrr [æth] Orig, Orthod, Ps-Ath₁ [Marcell, Tit-bostr₁] Cyr-jer: txt ABDKLM[P]N rel vulg copt [arm] Orig₁ Eus₂ Ath₁ Did₂ Chr[-mss₂ Thidrt₂ Damasc] Cyr₄ Phot₁.

must we bring in the convenient solution of Hellenism, when we find the same usage in Greek classical writers, and the same inadequacy of explanation of it. In such expressio is as λαλεῖν ἐν, viewed irrespectively of the idea of Beza, "Deum quasi prophetis ipsis insidere," the ἐν designates the *element in which* the λαλεῖν takes place, and holds therefore its own proper force. That we may be sometimes compelled by English idiom to render it 'by,' is possible, though I do not at present recall any instance: certainly such an one does not occur here, where the contrast is much weakened by making it instrumental, instead of conditional. It may be well to state, that this merging of the proper force of prepositions is not confined to those who deal with Greek as a dead language. Chrys. here says, ἐν υἱῷ, διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ φησι ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ τὸ ἐν, διὰ ἐστὶ: similarly Ec., Thl., Primasius (above), and in modern times Luther, Calvin, Groc., al., Reiche, Thol., Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. On the other hand, Thos. Aquinas (in Bl.: "Quod prophetæ non ipsi loquuti sunt ex se, sed Deus loquutus est in eis"), Beza (see above), Gerhard, Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, Owen, Wolf, Bengel ("Ergo Deus ipse erat in prophetis: tum maxime in Filio. Rex mortalitatis loquitur per legatum: non tamen in legato"), Uhland, Bleek, De W., Lunemann, al. Erasm.-Schmid, al. take ἐν προφήταις to mean, "in the prophetic writings:" but for this there seems no ground, and thus the antithesis would be marred.

The sense contended for above agrees with the expressions of Philo, e.g. De Præm. et Pcen. § 9, vol. ii. p. 417, ἑρμηνεύς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ προφήτης, ἐνδοθεν ὑπηχούντος τὰ λεκτά τοῦ θεοῦ. See also De Monarch. i. 9, pp. 221 f.: De Spec. Leg. § 8, p. 343: Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 53, vol. i. p. 511: all these are cited in Bl.) the prophets (to be taken here apparently in the wider sense,—as including not only those whose inspired writings form the O. T. canon, but all who were vehicles of the divine self-manifestation to the fathers. Thus Enoch in Jude 14 is said προφητεύσαι. Moses is of course included, and indeed would on any view be the *chief* of those here spoken of, seeing that by him the greater part of God's revelation of Himself to the fathers was made),—at the end of these days (see var. read. In order to understand this expression, it

will be well to call to mind certain Jewish modes of speaking of time. The Rabbis divided the whole of time into πρὶν ἐλθῆναι αὐτόν, and ἔπειδ' ἐλθῆναι αὐτόν, αἶων οὗτος, and ἔπειδ' ἐλθῆναι αὐτόν, αἶων ἐρχόμενος, or μέλλων. There has been much learned dispute as to the exact limits of these two:—whether the days of the Messiah, πρὶν ἐλθῆναι αὐτόν, were counted in the former or in the latter. Bleek, aft. Witsius, Rhenferd, and Schöttg., has given Rabbinical passages favouring both views. A safe inference from the whole seems to be, that the days of the Messiah were regarded as a period of transition from the former to the latter,—His appearance, as the ushering in of the termination of αἱ ἡμέραι αὐτά, the beginning of the end,—and His second coming in glory as the συντέλεια τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων or τοῦ αἰῶνος (ταύτου). And with this, N. T. usage agrees,—see ref. 1 Pet., also James v. 3: Jude 18: 2 Pet. iii. 3. Thus ἐπ' ἔσχάτου τῶν ἡμ. τούτων would mean, 'at the end of this age,' in the technical sense of these words as signifying the whole world-period, the 'terminus ad quem' of which is the general Resurrection. And thus is the manifestation of Christ in the flesh ever spoken of, and especially in this Epistle: cf. ch. ix. 26; and notes on ch. ii. 5; vi. 5. See, on the whole, Bleek's note; and Stuart's, who however has mistaken the meaning, in rendering "during the last dispensation," and making τούτων to import that the period had already begun. It is not of a beginning, but of an *expiring* period, the Writer is speaking.

The ancient expositors principally use these words as ground of consolation—ἐν τούτῳ αὐτοὺς διανύσσει λέγων ὅτι ἡ συντέλεια ἐγγύς. ὁ γὰρ ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι καταμαλακισθεὶς, ἐπειδὴν ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀγῶνος τὸ τέλος, ἀναπνεῖ μικρὸν. Thl. aft. Chr.) spake (not "hath spoken:," the ἔσχάτου is looked back on as a definite point, at which the divine revelation took place. The attention of the readers is thus directed not so much to the present state in which they are, as to the act of God towards them. Thus, as almost always, the distinction between the aor. and perfect is important) unto us (i. e. all who have heard that voice, or to whom it is to be announced. There is no distinction between those who received God's revelation immediately from the Son, and those who received it mediately through others. To

Matt. xxi.

38 ll. Rom.

iv. 13 Tit.

ii. 7. Sir vi. 17. xi. 7. James ii. 5. Mic. i. 15.

17. Ch. xxxvi. 17.

k = John i. 3. Col. i. 16.

l = ch. xi. 3. 1 Tim i.

ABDK

LMPN

a b c d e

f g h k l

m n o

17. 47

2. rec *τους αιωνας* bef *εποιησεν* (*corr'n for mistaken emphasis: see note*), with D²KL[P] rel syr [arm Orig₁ Did₂ Bas₁] Cyr-jer₁ Chr Cyr₁ Thdr₂ [Damasc]: txt ABD¹⁻³MN m 17 latt Syr copt [æth Orig₁] Eus₂ Ath₁ Tit-bostr₁ Cyr₂ [Ambr₁].

this latter number belonged the Writer * himself, cf. ch. ii. 3) in (see above) his Son (υἱῷ without the art. is to be noted, and has been variously explained. The omission would not at any time surprise us after a preposition; but here after *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις*, we should expect, as an antithesis, *ἐν τῷ υἱῷ*. Hence we must seek a reason beyond that usual idiomatic omission. Emphatic position will often dispense with the art.: and this may be alleged here. But even thus we do not get at the final cause. If the position of *υἱῷ*, whenever anarthrous, is emphatic *to this extent*, it must be for some reason still latent. Some have suggested official denomination, making *υἱός* into a quasi-proper name. But this again is only an introduction to the final reason. *Why* is such an anarthrous name here used, as designating our Lord? And thus we come to the word itself, as we must do in all such cases, for our account of the idiom. And that account here seems to be found in the peculiar and exclusive character of that relation to God, which *υἱός* expresses. We may say, that Jesus is '*the Son of God*:' by this is definitely enough expressed the fact, and the distinction from other sons of God implied: but we may also say that He is '*Son of God*:' and we thus give the predicate all fulness of meaning and prominence, and even more emphatically and definitely express the exclusive character of His Sonship. And by this anarthrous appellation does the Writer frequently speak of Him: e. g. ch. vii. 28, *ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπου καθίστησιν κ.τ.λ.* . . . *ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ὁρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον, υἱὸν εἰς τὴν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον*: see also iii. 6; v. 8; vii. 8. Nor is the usage confined to him: cf. John x. 36; xix. 7, and in the case of *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου*, v. 27. So far is this or any other usage of the art. from being "arbitrary," as Stuart here maintains. I will quote his sentence for a caution to tiros: "After all the rules which have been laid down respecting the insertion or omission of the article in Greek, and all the theories which have been advanced, he who investigates for himself, and is guided only by *facts*, will find not a little that is arbitrary in the actual use of it. The cases are certainly very numerous, where Greek writers insert or reject it at

pleasure." The direct contrary of this assertion is the fact, and cannot be too much impressed on every Greek Testament student. The rules respecting the art. are rigid, and are constantly observed; and there is no case of its omission or insertion in which there was not a distinct reason in the mind of the Writer,—usually, but not always, discernible by the patient and accurate scholar among ourselves. In this particular case our language, though it allows the predicate in the nominative, '*Son of God*,' to be used anarthrously, does not allow it to be so used with a preposition, nor in the objective case: so that we are here obliged to take refuge in the nearly equivalent, though not so accurate '*in His Son*.' To render it '*in a Son*' would be directly to contravene the logical account of the anarthroushood of the predicate. We might periphrase, '*in Him who was Son of God*.' We now pass off into a description of the dignity, and person, and work, of this Son of God: which description ends in asserting and proving Him to be higher than angels, the loftiest of created beings),

2.] *whom He constituted* (aor., not perfect, referring, as also *ἐποίησεν*, to the *ἐν ἀρχῇ*—the date of the eternal counsel of God. *τίθῃμι* with this double accusative is commonly reputed a Hebraism. But as Bleek remarks, our Epistle is singularly free from Hebraistic constructions, and there is in fact no reason whatever for deducing our present expression from such a source. Elsner gives from Xen. de Rep. Lac. p. 684, *θεὸς τοὺς γέροντας κυρίου τοῦ περὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγῶνος*: Arrian. Epiet. p. 264, *τοιοῦτόν σε θάμεν πολίτην κορωβίων*: Eur. Hec. 722: and Bleek from Xen. Cyr. iv. 6. 2, *ὥσπερ ἂν εὐδαίμονα πατέρα παῖς τιμῶν τιθείη*) *heir* (ἐθηκε κληρονόμον, τούτέστι τοῦτον κύριον πάντων ἐποίησεν. . . τῷ δὲ τοῦ κληρονόμου δνόματι κέχρηται δύο δηλῶν, καὶ τὸ τῆς υἰότητος γνήσιον, καὶ τὸ τῆς κυριότητος ἀναπόσπαστον. Chrys.: and so Thl. "Convenienter statim sub Filii nomen memoratur hæreditas." Bengel. That κληρ. is not equivalent to κύριον simply, is plain: the same expression could not, as Bleek well remarks, have been used of the Father. It is in virtue of the Sonship of our Lord that the Father constituted Him heir of all things, before

3 ὃς ὢν ^m ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης καὶ ⁿ χαρακτήρ τῆς ^o ὑπο- ^m ^{Wisd. vii.} ^{n here only. Lev. xiii.}

26 only. ἀπαύγ. τῆς μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ, Clem. 1 ad Cor. 36.

28. 2 Macc. iv. 10 only.

o 2 Cor. ix. 4. xi. 17 ch. iii. 14. xi. 1 only. Deut. i. 12.

the worlds began. "In Him also," says Delitzsch, "culminates the fulfilment of the promise given to the seed of Abraham, τὸ κληρονόμον εἶναι τοῦ κόσμου." See below. See for St. Paul's use of the word and image, reff.: and Gal. iv. 7) of all things (neuter: *τούτέστι*, τοῦ κόσμου παντός, Chr. And we cannot give this a more limited sense, nor restrict it to this world; especially as the subsequent portion of the chapter distinctly includes the angels in it. It is much disputed whether this heirship of Christ is to be conceived as belonging to Him essentially in his divine nature, or as accruing to Him from his work of redemption in the human nature. The Fathers, and the majority of the moderns, decide for the latter alternative. So Chrys., and even more emphatically Thdrt.: ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὁ θεὸς ἀπόστολος ἤρξατο, καὶ τὰ ταπεινότερα πρῶτον λέγων οὕτως ἄπτεται μειζύων. κληρονόμος γὰρ πάντων ὁ δεσπότης χριστὸς οὐχ ὡς θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀνθρώπος. ὡς γὰρ θεός, ποιητὴς ἐστὶ πάντων· ὁ δὲ πάντων δημιουργὸς φύσει πάντων δεσπότης. And so the Socinian and quasi-Socinian interpreters, arriving at the same view by another way, not believing the præ-existence of Christ. But it is plain that such an interpretation will not suit the requirements of the passage. For this humiliation of his, with its effects, first comes in at the end of ver. 3. All this, now added, is referable to his essential Being as Son of God; not merely in the Godhead before his Incarnation, but also in the Manhood after it, which no less formed a part of His 'constitution' by the Father, than his Godhead itself. So that the *ἔθηκεν*, as observed above, must be taken not as an appointment in prospect of the Incarnation, but as an absolute appointment, coincident with the *σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, belonging to the eternal Sonship of the Lord, though wrought out in full by his mediatorial work. Delitzsch contends for its exclusive application to the exaltation of Christ in his historical manifestation, beginning with the creation of the world: but I cannot see that he has proved his point), by whom (see ref. John: as His acting Power and personal instrument: so Thl., aft. Chrys.: ἐπειδὴ δὲ αἴτιος ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ υἱοῦ, εἰκότως καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένων διὰ ταῦτ' ἦρσι, δι' οὗ. ὁ πατὴρ γὰρ δοκεῖ ποιεῖν, ὁ τὸν ποιήσαντα υἱὸν γεννήσας. The idea of Grotius, fortified by a misrendering of Beza's, Rom. vi. 4,—that "*δι' οὗ, per quem*, videtur hic recte accipi posse pro *δι' ὧν*,

propter quem," is only worth recording, to make us thankful that the labours of the great scholars of Germany have brought in a day when it no longer needs refutation) He also made (*created*). According to the ancient arrangement of the words, adopted in the text, the word brought into emphasis by καὶ is not τοὺς αἰῶνας, but ἐποίησεν. And so Bengel, "Emphasis particulæ καί, et, cadit super verbum fecit, hoc sensu: Filium non solum definit hæredem rerum omnium, ante creationem: sed etiam fecit per eum sæcula") the ages (the meaning of τοὺς αἰῶνας has been much disputed. The main classes of interpreters are two. 1. Those who see in the word its ordinary meaning of "*an age of time*:" 2. those who do not recognize such meaning, but suppose it to have been merged in that of "*the world*," or "*the worlds*." To (1) belong the Greek Fathers: Chrys. (see however note on ch. xi. 3), Thdrt. (τοῦτο δηλωτικὸν τῆς θεότητος. οὐ μόνον γὰρ αὐτὸν δημιουργόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδίον ἐδειξεν· ὁ γὰρ αἶων οὐκ οὐσία τίς ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἀνυπόστατον χρῆμα, συμπαραμάρτυρον τῷ γεγεννητῇ ἔχουσι φύσιν. καλεῖται γὰρ 'αἶων' καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου συστάσεως μέχρι τῆς συντελείας διάστημα. This he then supports by Matt. xxviii. 20: Ps. lxxxix. 8, LXX: Eph. i. 21; ii. 7; and concludes, αἶων τοίνυν ἐστὶ τὸ τῇ κτιστῇ φύσει παρεργυμένον διάστημα. τῶν αἰώνων δὲ ποιητὴν ἔθηκε τὸν υἱόν, ἰδίον αὐτὸν εἶναι διδάσκων, καὶ παιδεύων ἡμᾶς ὡς αἰὶ ἦν παντὸς οὐτινοςοῦν υπερκείμενος χρονικοῦ διαστήματος), Thl. (ποῦ δὲ εἰσιν οἱ λέγοντες, ἦν ὅτε οὐκ ἦν; αὐτὸς τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησε, καὶ πῶς ἦν αἶων ὅτε οὐκ ἦν αὐτός;), Ec. &c., and Thom. Aquin., and Heinsius. On the other hand, (2) is the view of the majority of Commentators. It is explained and defended at length by Bleek, none of whose examples however seem to me to be void of the same ambiguity which characterizes the expression here. The Jews, it appears, came at length to designate by their phrase *הַיָּמִין הַזֵּה* (see above on ἐπ' ἐσχάτων κ.τ.λ.), not only the present age, but all things in and belonging to it—and so of the "*future age*" likewise. He produces a remarkable instance of this from Wisd. xiii. 9, εἰ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἰσχυσαν εἰδέναι, ἵνα δύνωνται στοχάσασθαι τὸν αἶωνα, τὸν τούτων (of the things in the world) δεσπότην πῶς τάχιον οὐχ εἶρον; He therefore would regard τοὺς αἰῶνας as strictly parallel with πάντα above, and would interpret, "Whom He has constituted lord,

= here only

(see note).

Num. xi. 14.

Deut. i. 9.

11. 1 Tim. vi. 13. ch. i. 8, 10.

7. xi. 5. 2 Cor. i. 15 al.

στάσεως αὐτοῦ, ἡ φέρων τε ἡ τὰ πάντα τῷ ῥήματι τῆς

ABDK

LMPN

a b c d e

f g h k l

m n o

17. 47

3. for φερων, φανερων B¹ (Tischdf expr: txt B³, but former reading restored in 13th cent).

possessor and ruler over all, over the whole world, even as by Him He has made all, the universe." And nearly so Delitzsch, Ebrard, and Lünemann: these two latter adding however somewhat, inasmuch as they take it of all this state of things constituted in time and space. Ebrard says: Die ewige Selbstoffenbarung Gottes in sich, durch das ewige Ausprechen seiner Fülle im ewigen persönlichen Wort, das Gott zu sich (Joh. i. 1) redet, und im Wesen des Ewigen Geistes, bildet den Grund und somit das Ewige (nicht zeitliche) Prius der vom Willen des Dreieinigen ausgehenden Offenbarung seiner in einer Sphäre, die nicht ewig, sondern zeitlich räumlich, nicht Gott, sondern Creatur ist. And this last view I should be disposed to adopt, going however somewhat further still: for whereas Ebrard includes in τοῖς αἰώνας God's revelation of Himself in a sphere whose conditions are Time and Space, and so would understand by it all things existing under these conditions, I would include in it also *these conditions themselves*,—which exist not independently of the Creator, but are His work—His appointed conditions of all created existence. So that the universe, as well in its great primeval conditions,—the reaches of Space, and the ages of Time, as in all material objects and all successive events, which furnish out and people Space and Time, God made by Christ. It will be plain that what has been here said will apply equally to ch. xi. 3, which is commonly quoted as decisive for the *material* sense here. Some (Schlichting, al.) have endeavoured to refer τοῖς αἰώνας, 3, to the new or spiritual world, or the ages of the Messiah, or of the Christian Church: principally in the interests of Socinianism: or, 4. as Sykes and Pyle, to the various dispensations of God's revelation of Himself: or even, 5. as Fabricius (Cod. Apocr. i. p. 710, Bl.), to the Gnostic æons, or emanations from the Divine Essence, and so to the higher spiritual order of beings, the angels. Against all these, besides other considerations, ch. xi. 3 is a decisive testimony). It will be seen by consulting the note on John i. 1, how very near the teaching of Philo approached to this creation of the universe by the Son. See, among the quotations in my Vol. I. Edn. 6, p. 679, especially those from Philo, vol. i. p. 106: and that in p. 681 from ib. p. 162.

See Isa. ix. 6 Heb. and LXX-AN.

3.] "The Son of God now becomes Himself the subject. The 'verbum finitum' belonging to the relative *ὅς* is not found till ἐκάθισεν at the end of the verse. But the intermediate participial clauses do not stand in the same relation to the main sentence. The first members, ὢν ἀπαύγασμα . . . δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, still set forth those attributes of the Son of God which are of a permanent character, and belonging to Him before the Incarnation: whereas the following member, the last participial clause, stands in nearer relation to the main sentence, expressing as it does the purification of mankind from sin, wrought by the incarnate Son of God, as one individual historical event,—as the antecedent of that exaltation of Him to the right hand of God, which the main sentence enounces." Bleek.

Who (the *ὅς* represents, it will be evident, rather the præ-existent than the incarnate Logos. But it is perhaps a mistake to let this distinction be too prominent, and would lead to the idea of a change having taken place in the eternal relation of the Son to the Father, when He subjected himself to the conditions of space and time. Even then He could say of himself, *οὐδὲς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὃ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ*. See Ebrard's note), being (cf. *ἐνάρχων*, Phil. ii. 6, also of His præ-existent and essential being. This comparison seems decisive against Hofmann, who (Schriftbeweis, i. 140 ff.) takes ὢν and φέρων according to his theory that all the attributes of the Son of God spoken of in the N. T. are adduced in connexion with and as manifested by His work of Redemption. See against this view Delitzsch, h. l. p. 7. But it must also be remembered that ὢν and φέρων are *present* participles. They must not be rendered *utpote qui*, or *cum esset* and *ferret*, but kept to their essential and timeless sense,—'being,' and 'bearing') the brightness (*effulgentia*, not "*repercussus*, qualis est in nube quæ dicitur παρῆλιος," as Grot., Calv. ("splendor ex illius lumine refulgens,—refulgentia"), al. This latter would be legitimate, but does not seem to have been the ordinary usage. Bl. cites from Philo de Conspicent. § 11, vol. ii. p. 356, τὸ δὲ ἐμφυσιζόμενον (Gen. ii. 7) δῆλον ὡς αἰθέριον ἦν πνεῦμα καὶ εἰ δὲ τι αἰθερίου πνεύματος κρείττον, ἀπὸ τῆς

δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, st καθαρισμόν τῶν ^s ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ^{s = 2 Pet. i. 9. Job vii. 21. (see note.)}

t as above (s). Luke ii. 22. v. 14 || Mk. John ii. 6. iii. 25 only. Lev. xiv. 32.

rec aft αυτου ins δι' εαυτου (probably a gloss: see note), with D³KLM rel syrr Ath₁ Chr₁ [Thdrt Damasc-txt] Aug₁; δι' αυτου D¹ Thdrt (τὸ Δι' αὐτοῦ δασέας ἀναγινώσκειν προσήκει ἀντὶ τοῦ Δι' εαυτοῦ); per quem copt, et per quem aeth: om ABD³[P]N 17 [47] vulg arm Ps-Ath₁ Cyr-jer₁ Cyr₁ [Dial₁ Euthal-ms] Damasc₁-comm₁ Sedul Cassiod₁.
rec ποιησάμενος bef τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (appy to bring the accus nearer the verb, esp as ημων also intervened), with KL rel syr Chr Thdrt [Damasc₁-txt₁]: txt ABDM[P]N m 17 [47] latt [arm] Ath₁ Ps-Ath₁ Cyr-jer₁ Cyr Did₁ Damasc-comm [Aug].
rec aft ἁμαρτιῶν ins ημων (prob doctrinal corr to shew that they were not his own. So Bleek), with D³KL m [17. 47] syr [arm] Ath₁ Ps-Ath Chr Thdrt [Damasc₁-h₁]: ὅμων N³: om ABD¹M[P]N¹ rel latt Syr copt aeth Ath₁ Cyr-jer₁ Did₁ Cyr[-p₃] Damasc₁ Aug Sedul Cassiod₁.

μακαρίας καὶ τρισμακαρίας φύσεως ἀπαύ-
γασμα,—where the sense clearly is, that the
breath breathed into man was as it
were a ray of the divine nature itself. See
also id. de Opif. Mund. § 51, vol. i. p. 35;
de Plant. Noë, § 12, p. 154. Cf. Wisd. vii.
26, where wisdom is called an ἀπαύγασμα
φωτὸς αἰδίου. And this (which, as De-
litzsch remarks, is represented by the φῶς
ἐκ φωτός of the Church) seems to have
been universally the sense among the an-
cients: no trace whatever being found of
the meaning 'reflexion.' Nor would the
idea be apposite here: the Son of God is,
in this his essential majesty, the expression,
and the sole expression, of the divine
Light,—not, as in his Incarnation, its
reflexion. So Thdrt.: τὸ γὰρ ἀπαύγασμα
καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πυρός ἐστι, καὶ σὺν τῇ πυρί
ἐστι· καὶ αἴτιον μὲν ἔχει τοὺς πῦρ, ἀχώ-
ριστον δέ ἐστι τοῦ πυρός. . . . καὶ τῇ πυρί
δὲ ὁμοφύεως τὸ ἀπαύγασμα· οὐκοῦν καὶ ὁ
ὕψος τῇ πατρί. (Cf. Athanasius contra
Arianos Orat. i. (ii.) § 12, vol. ii. (Migne)
p. 328: τίς οὕτως ἐστὶν ἀνόητος, ὥς ἀμφι-
βάλλειν περὶ τοῦ αἰεὶ εἶναι τὸν υἱόν; πότε
γὰρ τις εἶδε φῶς χωρὶς τῆς τοῦ ἀπαυγάσ-
ματος λαμπρότητος;) And Thl.: καὶ γὰρ
τὸ ἀπαύγασμα τῷ ἀπαυγάζοντι συνεμφαί-
νεται. οὕτε γὰρ ἥλιος ἀράθη ποτὲ χωρὶς
ἀπαυγάσματος· οὕτε πατὴρ νοεῖται χωρὶς
υἱοῦ. ὅταν οὖν ἀκούσῃς τῶν Ἀρειανῶν
λεγκόντων, ὅτι εἰ ἐκ πατρὸς ὁ υἱός, λοιπὸν
ὑστερος αὐτοῦ· ἀντίθεος αὐτοῖς, ὅτι καὶ τὸ
ἀπαύγασμα ἐκ τοῦ ἡλίου, καὶ οὐχ ὑστερον
αὐτοῦ. ἅμα γὰρ ἥλιος, ἅμα ἀπαύγασμα.
And Origen, tom. xxxii. in Joann. § 18,
vol. iv. p. 450: ὁλης μὲν οὖν οἶμαι τῆς
δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀπαύγασμα εἶναι
τὸν υἱόν, κατὰ τὸν εἰπόντα Παῦλον Ὅς
ὄν ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης· φθάνει μέντοι
γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀπαυγάσματος τούτου τῆς
ὁλης δόξης μερικὰ ἀπαυγάσματα ἐπὶ τὴν
λοιπὴν λογικὴν κτίσιν· οὐκ οἶμαι γὰρ τινα
τὸ πᾶν δύνασθαι χωρῆσαι τῆς ὁλης δόξης
τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπαύγασμα, ἢ τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ.
Hesychius gives as the meaning of ἀπαύ-
γασμα, ἡλίου φέγγος: and the MS. Lexi-

con of Cyril, ἀκτὶς ἡλίου ἡ πρώτη τοῦ
ἡλιακοῦ φωτὸς ἀποβολή. See also Clem-
rom. in ref. and several other authorities
cited in Bleek) of His glory (not simply
His light: nor need ἀπαύγασμα be con-
fined to such literal sense: cf. Clem.-rom.
as above. His glory, in its widest and
amplest reference. It has been at-
tempted to give to ἀπ. τῆς δόξης the
meaning splendor gloriosus, and to make
αὐτοῦ below refer, not to the Father, but
to ἀπαύγασμα. But to this Bleek answers
after Seb.-Schmidt, that ἀπαύγασμα never
is found without a genitive of the ἀπαυγα-
ζόμενον, which genitive here can be no
other than τῆς δόξης (αὐτοῦ, i.e. τοῦ
θεοῦ). Again, Owen (vol. i. p. 85 f.)
supposes the Shechinah to be alluded to;
—Akersloot, the Urim and Thummim. It
is hardly probable that in a preliminary
description, couched in the most general
and sublime terms, any such particular
allusion should be intended. Notice again
the anarthrous predicate, to which the
same remarks will apply as to ὑψὺ above.

Delitzsch remarks, Es ist kein Nimi-
bus um Gott, welchen hier δόξα genannt
wird, sondern die übersinnliche geistige
Feuer und Lichtnatur Gottes selber, welche
er, um sich vor sich selbst offenbar zu werben,
aus sich heraussetzt and impress ("figura,"
vulg.: "figure," Wiclif and Rheims:
"very image," Tyndal and Cranmer: "in-
graved forme," Geneva: "express image,"
E. V. The word **χαρακτήρ**, which by
formation would be the stamp or die itself
on which a device χαράσσεται, and which
stamps it on other things, never appears
to bear this meaning, but always to be
taken for the impression itself so stamped.
Thus Aesch. Suppl. 279, Κύριος χαρακ-
τῆρ τ' ἐν γυναικείοις τύποις εἰκὼς πέπληκ-
ται τεκτόνων πρὸς ἀρρένων. "Aristot.
Ec. ii. p. 689, ἀνερχθέντος δὲ τοῦ ἀργυ-
ρίου ἐπικόψας χαρακτήρα: id. Pol. i. 6,
where χαρακτήρα ἐπιβάλλειν is to stamp
coin, and it is said, ὁ γὰρ χαρακτήρ ἐτέθη
τοῦ πόσου σημεῖον. Diod. Sic. xvii. 66,

u Eph. i. 20.

ch. viii. 1.

x. 12. xii. 2

only. ἐκ δεξ., Matt. xxi. 23 u. Mark xvi. 19. Sir. xxi. 12.

1. 1 Pet. iii. 22 only. Ps. xv. 11. see Mark xvi. 5.

lxviii. 11 al.

x here only. see note.

w ἐκάθισεν^u ἐν^v δεξιᾷ^w τῆς^x μεγαλωσύνης^x ἐν^x ὑψηλοῖς,ABDK
LMPNa b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

v as above (u). Rom. viii. 34. Col. iii.

w ch. viii. 1. Jude 25 only. 2 Kings viii. 21, 23. Ps.

τάλαντα χρυσοῦ, χαρακτήρα δαρεικὸν ἔχοντα. Hence the word is taken, l. generally for any fixed and sharply marked lineaments, material or spiritual, by which a person or an object may be recognized and distinguished. Herod. i. 116, δ χ. τοῦ προσώπου. Diod. Sic. i. 82, τοὺς τῆς ὕψους χαρακτήρας, the lines of the countenance. Lucian, de Amoribus, p. 1061, calls mirrors τῶν ἀντιμορφῶν χαρακτήρων ἀγράφους εἰκόνas, and ib. p. 1056, ἥς δ μὲν ἀληθῶς χ. ἕμορφος. Demosth. (in Stephan.), ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἐσόττοις δ τῆς ὕψους, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὀμιλίαις δ τῆς ψυχῆς χαρακτήρ βλέπεται. Philo, de Mund. Opif. § 4 (vol. i. p. 4), τοὺς χαρακτήρας ἐνσφραγίζεσθαι, to impress on the mind the lines and forms of an intended city: id. Legg. Allegor. i. § 18 (vol. i. p. 55), δ τῆς ἀρετῆς χαρακτήρ, οἰκείος ἂν ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ: id. de Mundi Opif. § 23 (p. 15), τὴν δὲ ἐμφέρειαν (the likeness of man to God) μηδεὶς εἰκαζέτω σώματος χαρακτήρσιν, ib. § 53 (p. 36), τῆς ἐκατέρου φύσεως (viz. of God and the creation) ἀπεμάττετο (scil. man, while he was alone) τῇ ψυχῇ τοὺς χαρακτήρας:—and, 2. of the objects themselves, on which the features of another are expressed,—which bear its peculiar image, so that they appear as if taken off from it by impression of a die. So Philo, Quod Det. Potiori Ins. § 23 (vol. i. p. 217), designates the πνεῦμα imparted by God to man τύπον τινὰ καὶ χαρακτήρα θείας δυνάμεως, Moses naming the same εἰκόν, to shew ὅτι ἀρχέτυπον μὲν φύσεως λογικῆς δ θεός ἐστι, μίμημα δὲ καὶ ἀπεικόνισμα ἡνθρώπου: De Plant. Noë, § 5 (p. 332), he says, Moses named the rational soul τοῦ θείου καὶ ἀαράτου εἰκόνα, δόκιμον εἶναι νομίσας οὕτωςθεῖσαν κ. τυπωθεῖσαν σφραγιῶν θεοῦ, ἥ δ χαρακτήρ ἐστιν ὁ ἀδίδιος λόγος. Here the λόγος is designated as the impress of the seal of God, by the impression of which in like manner on the human soul, this last receives a corresponding figure, as the image of the unseen and divine. Compare also Clem.-rom. ad Cor. c. 33, αὐτὸς δ δημιουργὸς κ. δεσπότης ἀπάντων . . . τὸν . . . ἡνθρώπον ταῖς ἰδίαις αὐτοῦ καὶ ἁμώμοις χερσὶν ἐπλασεν, τῆς ἑαυτοῦ εἰκόνας χαρακτήρα. Hence the usage of χαρακτήρ here will be easily understood." Bleek: see also the word in Palm and Rost's Lex. καθ' ἑαυτὸν γάρ, φησίν, ὑφέστηκεν, ὅλον ἐν ἑαυτῷ δεικνύει πατέρα. τοὺς γὰρ πατρικοὺς περικεῖται χαρακτήρας. τούτῳ εἴκει τὸ ὑπὸ

τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον εἰρημένον, δ ἑωρακὼς ἐμέ, ἑώρακε τὸν πατέρα μου. Thdrt.) of His substance (substantial or essential being: "substance," Wicl., Tynd., Cranm., Rheims: "person," Geneva, and E. V.: Wesen, Luther, &c., De Wette, Bleek, al.: das der Existenzung unterliegende Wesen, der Wesensgrund, Delitzsch. The various meanings of ὑπόστασις are well traced by Bleek, from whom, as so often in this Epistle, I take the account. Etymologically, the word imports the lying or being placed underneath: and this is put in common usage for, 1. substratum or foundation—fundamentum. Diod. Sic. i. 66, ὑπόστασις τοῦ τάφου: id. xiii. 82, κατὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς υποστάσεως: Ezek. xliii. 11, κ. διαγράψει τὸν οἶκον κ. τὰς ἐξόδους αὐτοῦ κ. τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ: Ps. lxxviii. 2, ἐνεπαγγνῆν εἰς ἰλὺν βοθῶν κ. οὐκ ἐστιν ὑπόστασις. Nearly connected with this is, 2. establishment, or the state of being established: hence—*a. firmness*,—to which idea the word approaches in the last citation: but especially in reference to firmness of spirit, confidence: see more on ch. iii. 14.—*β. substantial existence, reality*, in contradistinction to that which exists only in appearance or idea: Aristot. de Mundo iv. 19, τῶν ἐν ἀέρι φαντασμάτων τὰ μὲν ἐστί κατ' ἔμφασιν, τὰ δὲ καθ' ὑπόστασιν: Artemidor. Oneirocrit. iii. 14, φαντασίαν μὲν ἔχειν πλούτου, ὑπόστασιν δὲ μή: Diog. Laert. ix. 91, ζητεῖται δ' οὐκ εἰ φαίνεται ταῦτα, ἀλλ' εἰ καθ' ὑπόστασιν οὕτως ἔχει: id. vii. 135, καὶ κατ' ἐπίνοιαν καὶ καθ' ὑπόστασιν. Hence—*γ. generally, consistence or existence*. So Philo, de In-corrump. Mund. § 18, vol. i. p. 505, αὐτῇ ὑπόστασιν ἰδίαν οὐκ ἔχει, γεννᾶται δ' ἐκ φλογός: Ps. xxxviii. 5, καὶ ἡ ὑπόστασις μου ὥσελ οὐθὲν ἐνώπιόν σου: Ps. lxxxviii. 47, μὴ σθητὶ τίς ὑπόστασις μου (in both places for the existence of man, Heb. הָיָה: hence also, as ὑπαρξίς, for possessions or goods, as Deut. xi. 6: Jer. x. 17). Hence also—*δ. it imports the especial manner of being, the peculiar essence of an object*. Thus 1 Kings xiii. 21, τῇ ἀξίῳ κ. τῷ δρεπάνῳ ὑπόστασις ἦν ἡ αὐτή: Wisd. xvi. 21, ἡ μὲν γὰρ ὑπόστασις σου (τ. θεοῦ) τὴν σὴν γλυκύτητα πρὸς τέκνα ἐνεφάνισε. And this last seems to be the best meaning in our place: His essential being, His substance. For in regarding the history of the word, we find that the well-known theological meaning 'person'

4 ὃ τοσοῦτω^z κρείττων γενόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὃσω^y constr., ch. vii. 20, 22 reff.
 z = Paul, never (1 Cor. xii. 31 rec.), but ch. vi. 9. vii. 7, 10, 22. viii. 6 bis. ix. 23. x. 34. xi. 16, 35, 40. xii. 24 only. Judg. viii. 2 al.

4. [τοσοῦτων P.]

om τῶν B.

was not by any means generally received during the first four centuries. We have it indeed in Origen, tom. ii. in Joann. § 6, vol. iv. p. 61 (ἡμεῖς μέντοι γε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν πατέρα, κ. τὸν υἱόν, κ. τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, κ.τ.λ.): but the usage is by no means constant. The Nicene council itself uses ὑπόστασις and οὐσία in the same sense, and condemns the deriving the Son ἐξ ἑτέρας ὑποστάσεως καὶ οὐσίας from the Father (cited in Bleek, p. 60, note): and so usually (in the genuine works: e.g. Ep. ad Afros, c. 4, vol. ii. (Migne) p. 714: ἡ ὑπόστασις οὐσία ἐστὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄλλο σημαίνονμενον ἔχει ἢ αὐτὸ τὸ ἐν. . . ἡ γὰρ ὑπόστασις καὶ ἡ οὐσία ὑπαρξίς ἐστιν. ἐστὶ γὰρ καὶ ὑπάρχει. See Gieseler, Kirchengesch. i. pt. 2, p. 63) Athanasius. The fact was, that the Easterns most commonly used ὑπόστασις to designate the three separate Persons (cf. e.g. Chrys. de Sacerdot. iv. 4, vol. i. p. 410 Δ, τὴν μὲν θεότητα πατρὸς κ. υἱ. κ. ἁγ. πν. μίαν ὁμολογούντας, προστιθέντας δὲ καὶ τὰς τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις, &c., and especially Basil, whom Gieseler regards as the representative of this view: Ep. 236. 6, vol. iv. p. 363, οὐσία κ. ὑπόστασις ταύτην ἔχει τῇ διαφορᾷ, ἣν ἔχει τὸ κοινὸν πρὸς τὸ καθ' ἑκάστον. See other passages in Gieseler, ubi supra) in distinction from Sabellianism, which acknowledged three πρόσωπα, but not three ὑποστάσεις, i.e. self-subsisting personalities: whereas the Westerns continued to regard ὑπόστασις as = οὐσία, and assumed but one ὑπόστασις: and the Western bishops, assembled with Athanasius at the council of Sardica in 347, distinctly pronounced the assumption of three hypostases heretical, i.e. Arian. Their words, as cited by Suicer from Theodoret, Hist. Eccl. ii. 6, are very decisive: τὸ τῶν αἰρετικῶν σύστημα φιλονεικεῖ, διαφόρους εἶναι τὰς ὑποστάσεις τοῦ πατρὸς, κ. τοῦ υἱοῦ, κ. τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, κ. εἶναι κεχωρισμένας. ἡμεῖς δὲ ταύτην παρελήφαμεν κ. δειδάμεθα, κ. ταύτην ἔχομεν τὴν καθολικὴν παράδοσιν κ. πίστιν κ. δμολογίαν, μίαν εἶναι ὑπόστασιν, ἣν αὐτοὶ οἱ αἰρετικοὶ οὐσίαν προσαγορεύουσι, τοῦ πατρὸς, κ. τοῦ υἱοῦ, κ. τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Subsequently however to this, in the Synod assembled at Alexandria in 362, at which Athanasius, and bishops of Italy, Arabia, Egypt, and Libya were present, the Easterns and Westerns agreed, on examination of one another's meaning, to acknowledge one another as orthodox,

and to allow indifferently of the use of τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις signifying 'Persons,' and μία ὑπόστασις signifying 'substance,' 'essence,' οὐσία. The Epistle from this synod to the bishops of Antioch is among the works of Athanasius, vol. ii. p. 615 ff., and is a very interesting document. But it attempted conciliation in vain, the Miletian schism at Antioch, which began on this point, having been confirmed and perpetuated by external causes. See on the whole subject, Bleek's note: Jerome, Epist. 15 (al. 57) ad Damasum, § 4, vol. i. p. 40; and on the use made of this description by orthodox and heretics in early times, Bleek, Chrys. in loc.: Calvin's note, where he gives some excellent cautions against the speculative pressing of each expression: "Nam hoc quoque notandum est, non hic doceri frivolae speculationes, sed tradi solidam fidei doctrinam. Quare debemus in usum nostrum hæc Christi elogia applicare, sicuti ad nos relationem habent." On all grounds it will be safer here to hold to the primitive meaning of the word, and not to introduce into the language of the apostolic age a terminology which was long subsequent to it), and (τε couples closely clauses referring to the same subject, and following as matter of course on one another) upholding (we have this sense of φέρειν in reff. and in the later Greek writers, e.g. Plut. Lucull. 6, φέρειν τὴν πόλιν. So in Latin, Val. Max. xi. 8. 5, "humeris gestare salutem patriæ." Cic. pro Flacco, c. 38, "quam (remp.) vos universam in hoc iudicio vestris humeris . . . iudices, sustinetis." Senec. Ep. 31, "Deus ille maximus potentissimusque vehit omnia." But the usage is principally found in the Rabbinical writings, as appears from the extracts in Schöttgen,—e.g. Sohar Chadash, fol. ix. 1, "Creator benedictus portans omnes mundos robore suo (וְנוֹשֵׂא כָּל עוֹלָמוֹת בְּכֹחַ), &c. Chrys. says, φέρων, τούτ' ἐστὶ κυβερνῶν, τὰ διαπύπτοντα συγκρατῶν: and so Thl.: "Sursum tenet, ne decident, et in nihilum revertantur," Ps.-Anselm) the universe (the same πάντα as designated by πάντων above: not that the art. expressly refers back to that word, for τὰ πάντα is the ordinary expression for the aggregate of all things. The meaning attempted to be given by some Socinian expositors, "the whole kingdom of grace," is wholly beside the purpose: see reff., esp. Col. i. 17, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συν-

a compar., ch. ^a διαφορώτερον ^b παρ' αὐτοὺς ^c κεκληρονόμηκεν ^d ὄνομα. ABDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47
 1111, 6 only
 = Gen. i. 27.
 Symm. ἐν εἰκόνι διαφορῶ (for θεοῦ).
 c = ver. 14 ch. xi. 12. xii. 17. Matt. xxv. 34. 1 Cor. vi. 9, 10. xv. 50. 1 Pet. iii. 9 al. Isa. lxxv. 9. Sir. iv. 13.
 d = Phil. ii. 9, 10.

ἐστηκεν: Job viii. 3, ὁ τὰ πάντα ποιήσας: Rev. iv. 11, ὅτι σὺ ἐκτίσας τὰ πάντα by the word (*expressed command*: cf. ch. xi. 3, πιστεῖ νοοῦμεν κατηγορίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας ῥήματι θεοῦ) of his (Whose? His own, or the Father's? The latter is held by Cyril-alex. contra Julian. viii. vol. ix. p. 259 c, ὡς γὰρ ὁ πάνσοφος γράφει Παῦλος φέρει τὰ π. ἐν τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυν. αὐτοῦ, τοῦ πατρὸς. And so Grot., al. But Chrys., Thdr., Thl., and the great body of Commentators understand αὐτοῦ to refer to the Son. That it may do so, it is not necessary to write αὐτοῦ, as is done in the cursive mss. (the uncial mss. being mostly without accents) and in many modern editions. Bleek in his note (vol. i. p. 69) makes it probable that the abbreviated writing αὐτοῦ for ἐαυτοῦ had not been adopted in the days of the N. T. Even if it had, his rule seems a good one;—that αὐτοῦ should never be written unless in cases where, if speaking in the 1st or 2nd person, we should use ἐμαυτοῦ or σεαυτοῦ,—i. e. never except where emphatic. Now here, supposing the words addressed to the Son, τοῦ and not σεαυτοῦ would evidently be the word used: and consequently in expressing the same sentence in the 3rd person, αὐτοῦ, not αὐτοῦ (ἐαυτοῦ) ought to be written. The interpretation therefore is independent of this distinction. But the question recurs, which is the right one? The strict parallelism of the clauses would seem to require, that αὐτοῦ here should designate the same person, as it does before, after τῆς ὑποστάσεως. But such parallelism and consistency of reference of demonstrative pronouns is by no means observed in the N. T., e. g. Eph. i. 20, 22, καὶ καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (of the Father), . . . καὶ πάντα ὑπέταξεν ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ (of the Son). In every such case the reference must be determined by the circumstances, and the things spoken of. And applying that test here, we find that in our former clause, ὡν ἀπαύγασμα τ. δόξης κ. χαρακτήρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ, it is quite out of the question that αὐτοῦ should be reflective, referring, as it clearly does, to another than the subject of the sentence. But when we proceed to our second clause, φέρων τε τὰ πάντα τῷ β. τ. δυνάμει αὐτοῦ, we find no such bar to the ordinary reflective sense of αὐτοῦ, but every reason to adopt it as the most obvious. For we have here an action performed by the Son, who φέρει τὰ πάντα. Whereby? τῷ ῥήματι τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ: where we may cer-

tainly say, I. that has another than the subject of the sentence been intended, such intention would have been expressed: and, 2. that the assertion would be after all a strange and unexampled one, that the Son upholds all things by the word of the Father's power. So that, on all accounts, this second αὐτοῦ seems better to be referred to the Son) power (not to be weakened into the comparatively unmeaning τῷ ῥήματι αὐτοῦ τῷ δυνατῷ. His Power is an inherent attribute, whether uttered or not: the ῥῆμα is that utterance, which He has been pleased to give of it. It is a "powerful word," but much more is here stated—that it is the word of, proceeding from, giving utterance to, His power), having made (the vulg. "*faciens*" is an unfortunate mistranslation, tending to obscure the truth of the completion of the one Sacrifice of the Lord. The words δι' ἐαυτοῦ can hardly be retained in the text, in the face of their omission in the three most ancient mss., joined to their internal character as an explanatory gloss. Dr. Bloomfield's strong argument in their favour, that they "are almost indispensable," in fact, pronounces their condemnation. The hypothesis of homeoteleuton suggests itself: but it is hardly likely in so solemn an opening passage, and weighs little against the probability the other way. Meanwhile, the gloss is a good and true one. It was δι' ἐαυτοῦ, in the fullest sense) purification of sins (as Bleek observes, there is no occasion to suppose the genitive here equivalent to ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν, seeing that we may say καθαρίζονται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, as we read, Matt. viii. 3, ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα. Sin was the great uncleanness, of which He has effected the purification: the disease of which He has wrought the cure. This καθαρισμός must be understood by the subsequent argument in the Epistle: for that which the Writer had it in his mind to expand in the course of his treatise, he must be supposed to have meant when he used without explanation a concise term, like this. And that we know to have been, the purifications and sacrifices of the Levitical law, by which man's natural uncleanness in God's sight was typically removed, and access to God laid open to him. Ebrard's note here is so important that, though long, I cannot forbear inserting it:—"καθαρίζειν answers to the Heb. קָדַשׁ, and its ideal explanation must be sought in the meaning which suits the Levitical

5 Τίμι γὰρ εἶπεν ^ε ποτὲ τῶν ἀγγέλων [†] Τίός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ ^{ε = 1 Cor. ix. 7. ver. 13.}

f Acts xiii. 33. ch. v. 5. Psa. ii. 7.

5. των αγγελων bef ποτε D¹ o [Syr].

cleansing in the O. T. cultus. Consequently, they are entirely wrong, who understand *καθαρίζειν* of moral amelioration, and would so take *καθαρισμὸν ποιεῖν* in this place, as if the author wished to set forth Christ here as a moral teacher, who by precept and example incited men to amendment. And we may pronounce those in error, who go so far indeed as to explain the *καθαρισμός* of the propitiatory removal of the guilt of sin, but only on account of later passages in our Epistle, as if the idea of scriptural *καθαρισμός* were not already sufficiently clear to establish this, the only true meaning. The whole law of purification, as given by God to Moses, rested on the assumption that our nature, as sinful and guilt-laden, is not capable of coming into immediate contact with our holy God and Judge. The mediation between man and God present in the most holy place, and in that most holy place separated from the people, was revealed in three forms; α. in sacrifices, β. in the Priesthood, and γ. in the Levitical laws of purity. Sacrifices were (typical) acts or means of propitiation for guilt; Priests were the agents for accomplishing these acts, but were not themselves accounted purer than the rest of the people, having consequently to bring offerings for their own sins before they offered for those of the people. Lastly, Levitical purity was the condition which was attained, positively by sacrifice and worship, negatively by avoidance of Levitical pollution,—the condition in which the people was enabled, by means of the priests, to come into relation with God ‘without dying’ (Deut. v. 26); the result of the cultus which was past, and the postulate for that which was to come. So that that which purified, was sacrifice: and the purification was, the removal of guilt. This is most clearly seen in the ordinance concerning the great day of atonement, Levit. xvi. There we find those three leading features in the closest distinctive relation. First, the sacrifice must be prepared (vv. 1—10): then, the high priest is to offer for his own sins (vv. 11—14): lastly, he is to kill the sin-offering for the people (ver. 15), and with its blood to sprinkle the mercy-seat and all the holy place, and cleanse it from the uncleanness of the children of Israel (ver. 19); and then he is symbolically to lay the sins of the people on the head of a second victim, and send forth this animal, laden with the curse, into the wilderness. For (ver. 30) ‘on that day shall the priest make an

atonement for you, to cleanse you, that ye may be clean from all your sins before the Lord.’ In the atonement, in the gracious covering (כִּפָּר, ver. 30) of the guilt of sin, consists *purification* in the scriptural sense. (And so also were those who had become levitically unclean, e.g. lepers, Levit. xiv., cleansed by atoning sacrifices.) So that an Israelitish reader, a Christian Jew, would never, on reading the words *καθαρισμὸν ποιεῖν*, think on what we commonly call ‘moral amelioration,’ which, if not springing out of the living ground of a heart reconciled to God, is mere self-deceit, and only external avoidance of evident transgression: but the *καθαρισμός* which Christ brought in would, in the sense of our author and his readers, only be understood of that gracious atonement for all guilt of sin of all mankind, which Christ our Lord and Saviour has completed for us by His sinless sufferings and death: and out of which flows forth to us, as from a fountain, all power to love in return, all love to Him, our heavenly Pattern, and all hatred of sin, which caused His death. To speak these words of Scripture with the mouth, is easy: but he only can say Yea and Amen to them with the heart who, in simple truthfulness of the knowledge of himself, has looked down even to the darkest depths of his ruined state, natural to him, and intensified by innumerable sins of act,—and, despairing of all help in himself, reaches forth his hand after the good tidings of heavenly deliverance.” It is truly refreshing, in the midst of so much unbelief, and misapprehension of the sense of Scripture, in the German Commentators, to meet with such a clear and full testimony to the truth and efficacy of the Lord’s great Sacrifice. And I am bound to say that Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, and Delitzsch, recognize this just as fully: the two former however referring on further in the Epistle for the explanation of the expression, and holding it premature to specify or explain it here. Observe now again, before passing on, the mistake of the vulgate in rendering *ποιησάμενος* “*faciens*.” The purification is *completed*, before the action next described takes place: this all seem to acknowledge here, and to find an exception to the ordinary rule that an aorist participle connected with an aorist verb, is contemporary with it. The reason seems to be principally pragmatic—that such session could not well be brought in until such purification

g = Rom. xv. 10, 11, 12.
 1 Cor. iii. 20.
 ch. ii. 13 bis. x 30.

h 2 KINGS vii. 14. 2 Cor. vi. 18. Rev. xxi. 7.

ABDK
 LMPN
 a b c d e
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

om αυτω N¹(supplied by N-corr¹).

had been accomplished: see above), sat down καθίζω is always used intransitively in this Epistle, and always of this act of Christ. In fact it is always intransitive in the N. T., except in the two places, 1 Cor. vi. 4, *τούτους καθίζετε*, and Eph. i. 20, *καθίσας ἐν δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ* on the right hand ('in the right hand,' scil. *portion* or *side*). The expression comes doubtless originally from Ps. cx. (cix.) 1, cited below. Bleek, in the course of a long and thorough discussion of its meaning as applied to our Lord, shews that it is never used of his præ-existent coequality with the Father, but always with reference to His exaltation in his humanity after his course of suffering and triumph. It is ever connected, not with the idea of His equality with the Father and share in the majesty of the Godhead, but with His state of waiting, in the immediate presence of the Father, and thus highly exalted by Him, till the purposes of his mediatorial office are accomplished. This his lofty state is, however, not one of quiescence; for (Acts ii. 33) He shed down the gift of the Spirit,—and (Rom. viii. 34) He maketh intercession for us: and below (ch. viii. 1 ff.) He is, for all purposes belonging to that office, our High Priest in Heaven. This '*sitting at the right hand of God*' is described as lasting until all enemies shall have been subdued unto Him, i. e. until the end of this state of time, and His own second coming: after which, properly and strictly speaking, the state of exaltation described by these words shall come to an end, and that mysterious completion of the supreme glory of the Son of God shall take place, which St. Paul describes, 1 Cor. xv. 28. On the more refined questions connected with the expression, see Delitzsch's and Ebrard's notes here) of majesty (*μεγαλωσύνη*, said to belong to the Alexandrine dialect, is often found in the LXX, and principally as referring to the divine greatness: see reff.) on high (*in high places*, i. e. *in heaven*). Cf. Ps. xcii. 4, *θαυμαστὸς ἐν ὑψηλοῖς ὁ κύριος*, and xcii. 5, *ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν*: and the singular *ἐν ὑψηλῳ*, Isa. xxxiii. 5: *ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ*, Isa. xxxii. 15: Jer. xxxii. (xxv.) 30. In the same sense we have *ἐν ὑψίστοις*, Luke ii. 14: xix. 38: Job xvi. 20: *ἥλιος ἀνατέλλων ἐν ὑψίστοις κυρίου*, Sir. xxvi. 16: and *ἐν τοῖς ὑψ.*, Matt. xxi. 9: Mark xi. 10. Cf. Ebrard: "HEAVEN, in Holy Scripture, signifies never unbounded space, nor omni-

presence, but always either the starry firmament, or, more usually, that sphere of the created world of space and time, where the union of God with the personal creature is not severed by sin,—where no Death reigns, where the glorification of the body is not a mere hope of the future. Into that sphere has the Firstling of risen and glorified manhood entered, as into a place, with visible glorified Body, visibly to return again from thence." There is a question whether the word should be joined with *ἐκάθισεν*, or with *τῆς μεγαλωσύνης*: which again occurs at ch. viii. 1, where we have *ὡς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς*. The strict grammarians contend for the connexion with the verb, on account of the omission of the art. *τῆς*. But the order of the words in both places makes the other connexion the more natural; and no scholar versed in N. T. diction will object to it. Cf. *τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα*, Eph. vi. 5, and note, also John vi. 32. The omission of the art. here gives majesty and solemnity—its insertion would seem to hint at other *μεγαλωσύναι* in the background). 4.] *having become (γενόμενος, distinct from ὦν ver. 3: that, importing His essential, this, His superinduced state. This is denied by Chrys. (τὸ γενόμενος ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδείχθαι, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, ἔστιν)*, Thl. (but not very clearly: *ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀποδείχθαι ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγει Ὁ ὁπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονε τούτέστιν ἐντιμωτέρος μου ἀπεδείχθη* οὐ γὰρ δὴ περὶ οὐσιώσεως ἐνταῦθα λέγει), Estius ("Significatur tum Christum angelis majorem effectum, i. e. exerevisse super angelos in hominum estimatione et fide, postquam cœpit sedere ad dexteram Dei") : but they certainly are wrong. For we are now, in the course of the enunciation,—which has advanced to the main subject of the argument, the proving of the superiority of the New Covenant,—treating of the post-incarnate majesty of the Son of God. He was all that has been detailed in ver. 3: He made purification of sins, and sat down at the right hand of the majesty on high, and thus BECAME this which is now spoken of. This is recognized by Thdr̄t., but in a form not strictly exact: *κ. τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπειον εἶρκεν ὡς γὰρ θεός, ποιητῆς ἀγγέλων κ. δεσπότης ἀγγέλων ὡς δὲ ἄνθρωπος, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν κ. τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀνάβασιν κρείττων ἀγγέλων ἐγένετο* ἔπειδὴ καὶ ἐλάττων ἦν ἀγγέλων

¹ εἰς πατέρα καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι ¹ εἰς υἱόν; ⁶ ὅταν δὲ πάλιν ^{i = (chiefly in citations) Matt xix.}

5 (from Gen. ii. 24). xxi. 42 al., from Ps. cxvii. 22, ch. viii. 10.

διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου (ch. ii. 9). ὥσπερ τοίνυν ἐλάττων ἦν ἀγγέλων ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐπειδὴ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν ἀθάνατον ἔχουσι φύσιν, αὐτὸς δὲ τὸ πάθος ὑπέμεινεν, οὕτω μετὰ τὴν εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀνάβασιν κρείττων ἀγγέλων ἐγένετο. To this Bleek very properly objects, that the making this exaltation belong only to Christ's human nature, and supposing Him to have while on earth possessed still the fulness of the majesty of his Godhead, is not according to the usage of our Writer, nor of the N. T. generally, and in fact induces something like a double personality in the Son of God. The Scriptures teach us, that He who was with God before the creation, from love to men put on flesh, and took the form of a servant, not all the while having on Him the whole fulness of his divine nature and divine glory, but having really and actually emptied himself of this fulness and glory, so that there was not only a hiding, but an absolute *κένωσις*, a putting off, of it. Therefore His subsequent exaltation must be conceived of as belonging, not to his Humanity only, but to the entire undivided Person of Christ, now resuming the fulness and glory of the Godhead (John xvii. 5), and in addition to this having taken into the Godhead the Manhood, now glorified by his obedience, atonement, and victory. See Eph. i. 20—22: Phil. ii. 6—9: Acts ii. 36: 1 Pet. iii. 21, 22. Œcumenius, as an alternative, has given this well: ἡ τὸ γενόμενος οὐκ ἐπὶ σαρκὸς ἐκλάβοις, ἵνα μὴ διαίρειν νομισθῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ ἐν μὲν ὑποστάσει προσκυνουμένου, καὶ μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ. The Son of God before his Incarnation was Head *over* Creation; but after his work in the flesh He had become also Head *of* Creation, inasmuch as his glorified Body, in which He triumphs sitting at God's right hand, is itself created, and is the sum and the centre of creation) **so much** (reff. Bleek cites from Philo, *νομίζοντες ὅσα θεὸς ἀνθρώπων διαφέρει κατὰ τὸ κρείττον, τοσοῦτα καὶ βασιλείας ἀρχιερασίην*. Leg. ad Cai. § 36, vol. ii. p. 586. In the classics, the idiom is common enough: see Palm and Rost's Lex. It is wholly unknown to the writings of St. Paul) **better than** (the usual word of general and indefinite comparison in our Epistle, whether of Christian with Jewish (ch. vii. 19, 22; viii. 6; ix. 23), heavenly with earthly (x. 34; xi. 16; xii. 24), eternal with temporal (xi. 35): see also vi. 9; vii. 7; xi. 40. It is used only three times by St. Paul, and never (unless 1 Cor.

xii. 31 rec. be counted) in this sense: but thirteen times in this Epistle. "The Greeks used *οἱ κρείττονες*, to signify superhuman beings, gods and demi-gods," Bl. So on *κρείττονας*, Æsch. fragm. Ætn. 2, Hesych. s.v., *τοὺς ἥρωας. καὶ οἱ θεοὶ δέ*. See also Eurip. Orest. 709: Plato, Sophist. p. 216 (civ. init.): and Philo above) **the angels** (of God: the heavenly created beings; afterwards, ver. 14, called *λειτουργικά πνεύματα*. All attempts to evade this plain meaning are futile; and proceed on ignorance of the argument of our Epistle, and of the Jewish theology: see some such noticed in Bleek. But *why* should the angels be here brought in? and why should the superiority of the Incarnate Son of God to them be so insisted on and elaborated? Bl. gives a very insufficient reason, when he says that the mention of God's throne brought to the Writer's mind the angels who are the attendants there. The reason, as Ebrard remarks, lies far deeper. The whole O. T. dispensation is related to the N. T. dispensation, as the angels to the Son. In the former, mankind, and Israel also, stands separated from God by sin; and angels, divine messengers (cf. "the angel of the covenant"), stand as mediators between man and God. And of these there is, so to speak, a chain of two links: viz. Moses, and the angel of the Lord. The first link is a mere man, who is raised above his fellow-men by his calling, by his office, the commission given to him,—and brought nearer to God; but he is a sinner as they are, and is in reality no more a partaker of the divine nature than they are. The second link is the angelic form in which God revealed himself to his people, coming down to their capacity, like to man, without being man. So that Godhead and Manhood approximated to one another; a man was commissioned and enabled to hear God's words: God appeared in a form in which men might see Him: but the two found no point of contact; no real union of the Godhead and the Manhood took place. Whereas in the Son, God and the Manhood not only approximated, but became personally one. God no longer accommodates Himself to the capacities of men in an angelophany or theophany, but has revealed the fulness of His divine nature in the man Jesus,—in that He, who was the *ἀπαύγασμα* of His glory, became man. The argument of the Writer necessarily then leads him to shew how *both* Mediators, the angel of the O. T. covenant, and Moses, found their

κ (see note)
 — here only.
 (elsew. Luke
 only, exc. John xviii. 16.)
 23. Rev. i. 5 only. absol., here only. prob. from Ps. lxxxviii. 27. (—καί, ch. xii. 16.)
 xvi. 31. Ps. xcvi. 4. m see esp Acts

higher unity in Christ. First, he shews this of the angel or angels (for it was not always one individual angelic being, but various) by whom the first covenant was given: then of Moses, ch. iii. iv. This first portion is divided into two: vv. 4—14, in which he shews that the Son, as the eternal Son of God, is higher than the angels (see the connexion of this with the main argument below): then, after an exhortation (ii. 1—4) founded on this, tending also to impress on us the superior holiness of the N. T. revelation, the second part (ii. 5—18) in which he shews that in the Son, the manhood also is exalted above the angels (mostly from Ebrard), in proportion as (see above) he hath inherited (as his own (γνήσιον): the word *κεκληρονόμηκεν* being perhaps chosen in reference to the O. T. prophecies, which promised it to Him: see below. The *perfect* is important, as denoting something belonging to His present and abiding state, not an event wholly past, as *ἐκάθισεν* above, indicating the first 'setting himself down': though that word might also be used of a permanent state of session, as in *κεκάθικεν*, ch. xii. 2) a more distinguished (or more excellent, as E. V. This sense of *διάφορος* is confined to later writers, as Polybius and Plutarch: e. g. Polyb. vi. 23. 7, *ἔχει δ' αὐτῇ (ἡ μάχαιρα) κέντρον διάφορον*. So also Symm. in reff. The comparative is found only, besides reff., in Sextus Empir. Phys. i. 218, *δ' Αἰνισίδης διαφορώτερον ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἔχρητο ταῖς περὶ τῆς γενέσεως ἀπορίαις*. For the construction, see below on *παρά* name (to be taken in its proper sense, not understood, with Beza, Calov., al., to mean precedence or dignity; as ver. 5 shews: whence also we get an easy answer to the enquiry, *what name* is intended: viz. that of *υἱός*, in the peculiar and individual sense of the citation there. The angels themselves are called "*sons of God*," Job i. 6; ii. 1; xxxviii. 7: Dan. iii. 25, and Gen. vi. 2 (notwithstanding Ebrard's denial of this sense: see Delitzsch in loc., Jude 6, note, and Proleg. to Jude, § v. 11); but the argument here is, that the title '*SON OF GOD*' is bestowed on Him individually, in a sense in which it never was conferred upon an angel. This view is far more probable than that of Bleek, who thinks that the Writer used only the LXX, in which *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ* stands in all these places except Gen. vi. 2, and there in the alex. ms. and Philo: and that he inter-

preted Ps. xxviii. 1; lxxxviii. 6, of other than the angels. To say nothing of *à priori* considerations, the canon to be followed in such cases is clearly never to suppose partial knowledge in a sacred writer, except where the nature of the case compels us in common honesty so to do: and here that canon is not applicable. See as a parallel, Phil. ii. 9 ff. Still it must be remembered, as Delitzsch beautifully remarks, that the fulness of glory of the peculiar name of the Son of God is unattainable by human speech or thought: it is, Rev. xix. 12, *ἀν ὄνομα δ' οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός*. And all the citations and appellations here are but fragmentary indications of portions of its glory: are but beams of light, which are united in it as in a central sun. Der überengelische Name selber, den der auf dem Wege der Geschichte zu Gottes Thron Emporsteigende auf immer zu eigen bekommen, liegt jenseit der begrifflich zersplitternden Sprache der Menschen. Die folgenden Schriftworte sind nur wie aufwärts weisende Fingerzeige, die uns ahnen lassen, wie herrlich er ist. Since *when* has Christ in this sense inherited this name? The answer must not be hastily made, as by some Commentators, that *κεκληρονόμηκεν* implies the glorification of the humanity of Christ to that Sonship which He before had in virtue of his Deity: e. g. Ec. (altern.): *ἡ κληρονομία κυρίου τῶν προσεγκόντων γίνεται, ἀλλ' οὐ τῶν ἡλλοτριωμένων ἐκληρονόμησεν οὖν, ὅπερ ἀνωθεν ἐνὶ τῷ λόγῳ, τοῦτο πανταχόθεν δι' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ προληφθεῖσα σάρξ. τί δέ ἐστι τοῦτο; τὸ υἱός,—τὸ λέγεσθαι τὸν τῶν ὄλων θεὸν πατέρα αὐτῆς,—τὸ γεγεννηκᾶ σε*. Evidently so partial a reference cannot be considered as exhausting the sense of the Writer. Nor again can we say that it was at the time of His incarnation, though the words of the angel in Luke i. 35, *τὸ γεννᾶμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ*, seem to favour such a reference: for it was especially at His incarnation, that He was made a little *lower than the angels*, ch. ii. 9. Rather would the sense seem to be, that the especial name of *SON*, belonging to Him not by ascription nor adoption, but by his very Being itself, has been ever, and is now, His: *inherited* by Him, "*quā γνήσιον*," as Chrys. says: the O. T. declarations being as it were portions of the instrument by which this inheritance is assured to Him, and by the citation of which it is proved.

καὶ ὁ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ. 7 καὶ ^{Ps. xcvi. 7.} ^{also Deut. xxxii.}

43 Ed-vat (υἱοὶ θ. AB).

o w. dat., Matt. ii. 2, 8, 11. John iv. 21, 23. Rev. iv. 10 al. Ps. xxviii. 2.

Observe, that the κρείττων γενόμενος is not identical with the κεκληρονόμηκεν, but *in proportion* to it: the triumphant issue of his Mediation is consonant to the glorious name, which is His by inheritance: but which, in the fulness of its present inconceivable glory (see above), has been put on and taken up by Him in the historical process of his mediatorial humiliation and triumph) *than* (this construction of a comparative with *παρά* is never found in St. Paul (Rom. xiv. 5, is a somewhat doubtful exception, and ἄλλος *παρά* occurs 1 Cor. iii. 11), but often in this Epistle; and once in St. Luke (reff.). It occurs in Esdr. iv. 35, ἡ ἀλήθεια . . . ἰσχυροτέρα *παρά* πάντα: and in Thuc. i. 23: Herod. vii. 103) *they*. 5—13.] *Proof from Scripture of this last declaration.* 5.]

For (substantiation of διαφορώτερον κεκλ. ὄνομα) **to whom** of (among) the angels **did He** (God, the subject of vv. 1, 2; as the subsequent citation shews) **ever say** (this citation from Ps. ii., has brought up in recent German Commentators the whole question of the original reference of that Psalm, and (as in Bleek) of O. T. citations in the N. T. altogether. These discussions will be found in Bleek, De Wette, and Ebrard. The latter is by far the deepest and most satisfactory: seeing, as he does, the furthest into the truth of the peculiar standing of the Hebrew people, and the Messianic import of the theocracy. Those who entirely or partially deny this latter, seem to me to be without adequate means of discussing the question. Ebrard's view is, that the Psalm belongs to the reign of David. The objection, that ver. 6 will not apply to David's anointing, inasmuch as that took place at Bethlehem in his boyhood, he answers, by regarding that anointing as connected with his establishment on Mount Zion, not as having locally taken place there, but as the first of that series of divine mercies of which that other was the completion. (Even Hupfeld gives up this objection.) He further ascribes the Psalm to that portion of David's reign when (2 Sam. viii.) Hada-dezer, and many neighbouring nations, were smitten by him: which victories he looked on as the fulfilment to him of Nathan's prophecy, 2 Sam. vii. 8—17. In that prophecy the offspring of David is mentioned in the very words quoted below in this verse, and in terms which, he contends, will not apply to Solomon, but must be referred to the great promised Seed of David. He regards this trium-

phant occasion as having been treated by the royal Psalmist as a type and foretaste of the ultimate ideal dominion of the 'Son of David' over the kings of the earth. But I must refer the reader to his long note, which is well worth reading: and to Bleek's, in which are several suggestions, valuable as notices of the way in which the present and the future, the political and Messianic ideas, are intermingled in the Psalms. See also Delitzsch, h. 1. Even Hupfeld, who denies Messianic reference wherever he can, is obliged to acknowledge that the Psalm "probably applies to no particular king, but is a glorification of the theocratic kingdom in general, with poetic reference to the universal dominion promised to it:" and confesses, that this is in fact the Messianic idea. He also connects the Psalm with the prophecy in 2 Sam. vii. We may observe, that the connexion here of the two, the triumphant expression of the Psalm, and the prophecy of Nathan, is a strong presumption in favour of Ebrard's view), **Thou** (the seed of David, anointed in God's counsels as king on His holy hill of Zion: see above) **art my Son** (according to the promise presently to be quoted, finding its partial fulfilment in Solomon, but its only entire one in the Son of David who is also the Son of God), **I** (emphatic: 'I and no other:' expressed also in the Hebrew) **this day have begotten thee**: (First, what are we to understand by **γεννηκα**? Bleek says, "As Sonship, in the proper sense, is dependent on the act of begetting, so may, especially by the Hebrews, 'to beget' be figuratively used to express the idea of 'making any one a son,' in which derived and figurative reference this also may be meant. And we get an additional confirmation of this meaning from Jer. ii. 27, where it is said of the foolish idolatrous Israelites, τῷ ξύλῳ εἶπαν ὅτι ὁ πατήρ μου εἰ σύ, καὶ τῷ λίθῳ Σὺ ἐγέννησάς με. Accordingly, the meaning here is,—'I have made Thee my son' (so Ps. lxxxix. 20, 26, 27: 'I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him: . . . He shall cry unto me, Thou art my Father . . . Also will I make him my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth') :—namely, by setting Thee on the throne of my people: and the **σήμερον** will most naturally be referred to the time of the anointing of the King on Zion, as the act whereby he was manifested as Son of God in this sense." And so Calvin, whom Bl. cites, in his comm. on Ps. ii.:

p = Rom. x
21. Luke
xx. 19.

p πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους λέγει
q Psal. ciii. 4.

r = Matt. xxi. 13 xxiii. 15. John ii. 16. vi. 15 al. Gen. xiv. 9.

ABDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h i k l
m n o
17. 47

7. aft 1st αγγελους ins αυτου D¹ 71 [æth] Chr₂.

“David genitus a Deo fuit, dum clare apparuit ejus electio. Itaque adverbium *hodie* tempus illud demonstrationis notat, quia, postquam innotuit creatum divinitus regem, prodit tanquam nuper ex Deo genitus.” The above remarks seem pertinent and unobjectionable, as long as we regard them as explaining the supposed immediate reference to David and present circumstances: but it is plain that, according to the above view of Ps. ii., and indeed to the usage of the N. T., in applying this passage to our Lord, we want another and a higher sense in which both words, **γενέννηκα** and **σήμερον**, may be applicable to Him: a sense in which I should be disposed to say that the words must in their fulness of meaning be taken, to the neglect and almost the obliteration of that their supposed lower reference. For, granting the application of such sayings to our Lord, then must the terms of them, suggested by the Holy Spirit of prophecy, which is His testimony, bear adequate interpretations as regards His person and office. It has not therefore been without reason that the Fathers, and so many modern divines, have found in this word **γενέννηκα** the doctrine of the generation of the Son of God, and have endeavoured, in accordance with such reference, to assign a fitting sense to **σήμερον**. As the subject is exceedingly important, and has been generally passed over slightly by our English expositors, I shall need no apology for gathering from Bleek and Suicer the opinions and testimonies concerning it. 1. One view refers **σήμερον** to the eternal generation of the Son, and regards it as an expression of the “*nunc stans*, as they call it” (Owen) of eternity. Thus Origen very grandly says, in Joann. tom. i. 32, vol. iv. p. 33: *λέγεται πρὸς αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὃ αἰεὶ ἐστὶ τὸ σήμερον· οὐκ ἐνὶ γὰρ ἐσπέρα θεοῦ, ἐγὼ δὲ ἡγοῦμαι, ὅτι οὐδὲ πρῶτα, ἀλλ’ ὁ συμπαρακτείνων τῇ ἀγενήτῳ καὶ αἰδίῳ αὐτοῦ ζῳῇ, ὡς οὕτως εἶπω, χρόνος ἡμέρα ἐστὶν αὐτῷ σήμερον, ἐν ᾗ γενέννηται ὁ υἱὸς ἀρχῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ οὕτως οὐχ εὐρισκομένης, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς ἡμέρας.* And so Athanasius (de Decret. Nicæn. Syn. § 13, vol. i. p. 172, adv. Arian. iv. § 24, vol. ii. (Migne) p. 503), Basil (contra Eunom. ii. 24, vol. i. p. 260), Aug. (on the Psalm: “Quamquam etiam possit ille dies in prophetia dictus videri, quo Jesus Christus secundum hominem natus est: tamen *hodie* quia præsentiam significat, atque in æter-

nitate nec præteritum quidquam est, quasi esse desiderit, nec futurum, quasi nondum sit, sed præsens tantum: quia quidquid æternum est, semper est: divinitus accipitur secundum id dictum *Ego hodie* genui te, quo sempiternam generationem virtutis et sapientiæ Dei, qui est unigenitus Filius, fides sincerissima et catholica prædicat”), Primasius, Thom. Aq.; of the Commentators on this place, Thl. (οὐδὲν ἕτερον δηλοῖ ἢ ὅτι ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς, ἐξ οὗ ἐστὶν ὁ πατήρ. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὦν λέγεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐνεστώτος καιροῦ, οὗτος γὰρ μάλιστα ἀρμόζει αὐτῷ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ σήμερον): and so Corn.-a-lap., Est., Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, Schöttg., al. 2. A second, to the generation, *in time*, of the Incarnate Son of Man, when Jesus assumed the divine nature on the side of his *Manhood also*: so Chrys. (curiously enough using the illustration from ὦν, which Thl. afterwards, copying verbatim from him, turns to the opposite purpose: ὥσπερ δὲ ὦν λέγεται κ.τ.λ. as above under Thl. to ἀρμόζει αὐτῷ· οὕτω καὶ τὸ σήμερον ἐνταυθὰ μοι δοκεῖ εἰς τὴν σάρκα εἰρηῇσθαι), Thdr. (οὐ τὴν αἰώνιον δηλοῖ γέννησιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τῷ χρόνῳ συνεγενεμένην. And even more expressly on the Psalm: ταύτην δὲ τὴν φωνὴν οὐκ ἔν τις τῇ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος διδασκαλίᾳ πειθόμενος, τῇ θεότητι προσῶμι τοῦ δεσπότου χριστοῦ), Euseb., Cyr.-alex., Greg.-nyss. (see these in Suicer), Ec., Kuinoel, Stuart, &c. 3. A third, to the period when Jesus was manifested to men as the Son of God, i. e. by most, to the time of the Resurrection, with reference to Acts xiii. 33, where St. Paul alleges this citation as thus applying (so, recently, Delitzsch): by some, to that of the Ascension, when He was set at the right hand of God and entered on His heavenly High-priesthood (ch. v. 5): so Hilary (on the Psalm, § 30, vol. i. p. 48, “Id quod nunc in psalmo est, Filius meus es tu, hodie genui te, non ad virginis partum, neque ad lavacri generationem, sed ad primogenitum ex mortuis pertinere apostolica autoritas est:” and again, “Vox ergo hæc Dei patris secundum Apostolum (Acts i. c.) in die resurrectionis exstitit”), Ambrose (de Sacr. iii. 3, vol. iii. p. 362: “Pulchre autem Pater dixit ad Filium: ‘Ego hodie genui te,’ hoc est, quando redemisti populum, quando ad cœli regnum vocasti, quando implesti voluntatem meam: probasti meum esse te Filium”), Calv. (“Frigida Augustini argutia est, qui *hodie* æternum et continuum fingit. Christus

u as above (t).
Luke xvi. 24
only. Isa.

xxx. 30.

29. Mark ix. 25 Luke viii 54. xii. 32. xvi. 11, 13 al. Winer, § 29. 2.

v Psal xliv 6 (Β εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος, but Α ἀδικίαν).

w - voc, Matt. xxvii.

ABDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

^{tu} φλόγα. 8 πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱὸν ^v Ὁ θρόνος σου ^w ὁ θεὸς εἰς

trary suppositions have preceded: ὁ δὲ νοῦν τὸν Ἰδιον ἀπολείπων . . . ὁ δὲ πάλιν ἀποδιδρ. κ.τ.λ.: ἡ μὲν γὰρ τὸν ἐπὶ μέρους, τὸν γεννητὸν κ. θνητὸν ἀπολιπούσα . . . ἡ δὲ πάλιν κ.τ.λ.: and consequently in both, πάλιν has the meaning of *e contra*, and necessarily stands after the subject of the sentence, as δὲ would: and as we find it repeatedly in Plato, e. g. Gorg. § 83, νῦν δὲ πάλιν ἀδθῖς (or αὐτὸς) ταῦτόν τοῦτο ἔπαλε: Laches, § 22, νῦν δ' αὖ πάλιν φαρμέν κ.τ.λ.: Rep. x. § 11, ἐπειδὴ τοῖνυν κεκριμέναι εἰσίν, ἐγὼ πάλιν ἀπαιτῶ κ.τ.λ. Now manifestly no such meaning can here have place (notwithstanding that Storr and Wahl so give it): nor can I find any analogous instance in prose of a transposition of πάλιν in its ordinary sense. In this Epistle, when it is joined to a verb, it always has the sense of 'a second time': e. g. ch. iv. 7; v. 12; vi. 1, 6. This being the case, I must agree with those who join πάλιν with εἰσαγγῆ. And of the meanings which they assign to the phrase πάλιν εἰσαγ., I conceive the only allowable one to be, the second coming of our Lord to judgment. See more below) hath ('shall have,' this rendering, the 'futurus exactus,' is required by grammar: cf. the same verb in Exod. xiii. 5, 11, καὶ ἔσται ἡνῖκα ἐὰν (ὡς ἂν) εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Χαναανίων κ.τ.λ.: Luke xvii. 10, ὅταν ποιήσῃτε πάντα . . . λέγετε, "when ye shall have done," &c.: Matt. xxi. 40, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ κύριος . . . τί ποιήσῃ; See numerous other instances cited in Winer, § 42. 5. It would certainly appear from all usage that the *present* rendering is quite inadmissible) introduced (in what sense? See some of the interpretations above. But even those who hold the trajectory of πάλιν are not agreed as to the introduction here referred to. Some hold one of the above-mentioned meanings, some another. I have discussed the meaning fully below, and gathered that the word can only refer to the great entering of the Messiah on His kingdom. At present, the usage of εἰσαγεῖν must be considered. It is the 'verbum solenne' for the 'introducing' the children of Israel into the land of promise, the putting them into possession of their promised inheritance: see Exod. above, and indeed Exod., Levit., Num., Deut., passim: also Ps. lxxvii. 54. It is sometimes used *absolutely* in this sense: e. g. Exod. xxiii. 23, εἰσάξει σε πρὸς τὸν Ἀμορραῖον κ. Χετταῖον κ.τ.λ. We have it again in Neh. i. 9, of the second introduction, or restoration of Israel to the

promised land. The Prophets again use it of the ultimate restoration of Israel: cf. Isa. xiv. 2; lvi. 7: Jer. iii. 14: Ezek. xxxiv. 13; xxxvi. 24; xxxvii. 21: Zech. viii. 8. This fact, connected with the circumstances to be noted below, makes it probable that the word here also has this solemn sense of 'putting in possession of,' as of an inheritance. The sense ordinarily given, of 'bringing into the world,' the act of the Father corresponding to the εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὸν κόσμον (ch. x. 5) of the Son, appears to be unexampled. Estius remarks, "Juxta hunc sensum (that given above) magis apparet ἐνέργεια vocis 'introducere': quatenus ea significatur id quod jurisperiti vocant *inducere* seu *mittere in possessionem*" the firstborn (only here is the Son of God so called absolutely. It is His title by *præ*-existence, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, Col. i. 15 (where see the word itself discussed):—by prophecy, Ps. lxxviii. 27, πρωτότοκον θήσονται αὐτόν, ὑψηλὸν παρὰ τοῖς βασιλεῦσι τῆς γῆς:—by birth, Luke ii. 7, see also Matt. i. 18—25:—by victory over death, Col. i. 18, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν: Rev. i. 5:—and here, where he is absolutely ὁ πρωτότοκος, it will be reasonable to regard all these references as being accumulated—Him, who is the *Firstborn*,—of the universe, of the new manhood, of the risen dead. And thus the inducting Him in glory into His inheritance is clothed with even more solemnity. All angels, all men, are but the younger sons of God, compared to HIM, THE FIRSTBORN) into the earth (not = κόσμον, ch. x. 5: the 'inhabited earth': and very frequently used by the LXX in prophetic passages, where the future judgments of God on mankind are spoken of. Cf. Ps. ix. 8; xcv. 13: Isa. x. 23; xiii. 5, 9; xiv. 26; xxiv. 1 al. fr., and see below on the citation. The usage would not indeed be decisive against referring the words to Christ's entrance into the human nature, but is much more naturally satisfied by the other interpretation), He (i. e. God, the subject of ver. 5) saith, And let all the angels of God worship Him—(there are two places from which these words might come; and the comparison of the two will be very instructive as to the connexion and citation of prophecy. 1. The words themselves, including the καί, which has no independent meaning here, come from Deut. xxii. 43, where they conclude the dying song of Moses with a triumphant description of the victory of

τὸν ^x αἰῶνα τοῦ ^x αἰῶνος, καὶ ἡ ^y ῥάβδος ^z ἐνθύτητος ἡ ^x aug. here only. Ps. lxxii. 17.

al. see Eph. iii. 21. plur., ch. xiii. 21 al. fr.
z here only. — Josh. xxiv. 14. Ps. ix. 8. xxv. 12 al. fr.

y 1 Cor. iv. 21. Rev. ii. 27 al. fr. Ps. ii. 9.

8. om *του αἰωνος* B 17. rec om *και* (see note, so LXX), with D³KL[P] rel vulg-
ed (with fuld demid) syrr [æth] Chr Cyr₂ Thdrt Damasc Chron, [Euthal. ms]: ins AB
D¹M⁸ 17 am (with tol) [copt Cyr₁]. rec om *η* (bef 1st *ραβδος*) (as LXX), with
DKL[P] rel gr-lat-fr: ins ABM⁸ 17 Cyr₁. (om from *ραβδ.* to *ραβδ.* N¹.) ins της

God over His enemies, and the avenging of His people. It will cause the intelligent student of Scripture no surprise to find such words cited directly of Christ, into whose hand all judgment is committed: however such Commentators as Stuart and De Wette may reject the idea of the citation being from thence, because no trace of a Messianic reference is there found. One would have imagined that the words *οὐτε ἔστιν ἡς ἐξελεύται ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν μου*, occurring just before, ver. 39 (cf. John x. 28), would have prevented such an assertion. But those who see not Christ every where in the Old Testament, see Him no where. The fact of the usual literal citation of the LXX by our Writer, decides the point as far as the place is concerned from which the words are immediately taken. But here a difficulty arises. The words in the LXX, Deut. xxxii. 43, *εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοὶ ἅμα αὐτῷ, καὶ προσκυνήσατέον αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*, do not exist in our present Hebrew text. It is hardly however probable, that they are an insertion of the LXX, found as they are (with one variation presently to be noticed) in nearly all the MSS. The translators probably found them in their Heb. text, which, especially in the Pentateuch, appears to have been an older and purer recension than that which we now possess. It is true that AB have here *υἱοὶ θεοῦ*, and in the third clause of the verse *ἄγγελοι θεοῦ*: while the Ed-vat. reads as here. But our Writer cites from the Alexandrine text: and it has been noticed that the Alexandrine MS. itself in a second copy of this song, subjoined to the Psalter, reads *ἄγγελοι*, only prefixing to it *οἱ*. And Justin Martyr, Dial. 130, p. 222, quotes the words as here. 2. The other passage from which they might come is Ps. xcvi. 7, where however they do not occur verbatim, but we read *προσκυνήσατε αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ*. This, especially the omission of the *καὶ*, which clearly belongs to the citation, is against the supposition of their being taken from thence: but it does not therefore follow that the Psalm was not in the sacred Writer's mind, or does not apply to the same glorious period of Messiah's triumph in its ultimate reference. Indeed the similarity of the two expressions of triumph is re-

markable, and the words in the Psalm must be treated as a reference to those in Deut. at least in the LXX rendering, for the Heb. seems rather (as Delitzsch in loc.) to regard the gods of the heathen nations ("Worship Him, all ye gods"). As a corroboration of the view, that the Psalm was in the Writer's mind, it may be mentioned, that in introducing the description of the divine Majesty in ver. 4, we read *ἔφαναν αἱ ἀστραπαὶ αὐτοῦ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*. Ebrard denies the reference to the Psalm, but has some valuable remarks on the Messianic import of the passage in Deut. See also the whole subject and context of it set forth in Delitzsch.

ΠΡΟΣΚΥΝΕΩ classically governs the accus. Some exceptions are found in which it has a dat., e. g. Hippocrates, Præcept. i. p. 29, *κακοτροπήν προσκυνεῦντες*: and more among the later authors, and in Philo and Josephus. See Bernhardt, Synt. p. 113 and 266, and Kypke on Matt. ii. 8).

7.] And (with reference) indeed to (*πρὸς* as in reff.: but not exactly correspondent in the two cases *πρὸς τ. ἀγγέλους* and *πρὸς τὸν υἱόν*: the fact being, as Bl., that *πρὸς* with a person, after *λέγειν* and similar verbs, implies direction of the saying towards the person, usually by direct address, but sometimes by indirect reference. So Bengel here: "Ad angelos indirecto sermone, ad filium directo sermone." **ΜΕΝ**, corresponding to **ΔΕ** below) the angels He (God) saith, Who maketh his angels winds (see below) and his ministers a flame of fire (the citation is after the LXX according to the Alexandrine MS., which indeed commonly agrees with the citations in this Epistle. And as the words stand in the Greek, the arrangement and rendering of them is unquestionably as above (see this argued below). But here comes in no small difficulty as to the sense of the original Hebrew. It stands thus: after stating, vv. 2, 3, that God takes light for His raiment, and the heavens for a tent, and the clouds for a chariot, we read, *וְעַתָּה יִלְבָּשׁוּ קִשְׁתֹּי וְיִרְחֹמוּ מַלְאָכָיו*, ver. 4. And it is usually contended that these words can only mean, from the context, "who maketh the winds his messengers, and flames of fire his servants." But, granting that this is so, the argument from the context can only be brought in as sub-

ἡ ῥάβδος τῆς βασιλείας σου ἡ γάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ

ABDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

bef ευθυτ., and om η (bef 2nd ραβδος) ABM
L[P] rel gr-lat-ff. for σου, αὐτου BN.

N-corr¹ 17[from the space] Cyr₁: txt DK

sidiary to that from the construction of the passage. And it will be observed that in this verse the order of the Hebrew words is not the same as that in the former verses, where we have וְשָׂרָפִים וְכַרְוֹת, "who maketh clouds his chariots." For this transposition those who insist as above have given no reason: and I cannot doubt that the LXX have taken the right view of the construction: that ἡ γάπησας is the object, and ἡ γάπησας the predicate, and so in the other clause: and that the sense is, "who maketh his messengers winds, his servants flames of fire," whatever these words may be intended to import. And this latter enquiry will I imagine be not very difficult to answer. He makes his messengers winds, i. e. He causes his messengers to act in or by means of the winds; his servants flames of fire, i. e. commissions them to assume the agency or form of flames for His purposes. It seems to me that this, the plain sense of the Hebrew as it stands, is quite as agreeable to the context as the other. And thus the Rabbis took it, as we see by the citations in Schöttgen and Weststein. So Schemoth Rabba, § 25, fol. 123. 3: "Deus dicitur Deus Zebaoth, quia cum angelis suis facit quaecumque vult. Quando vult, facit ipsos sedentes, Jud. vi. 11. Aliquando facit ipsos stantes, Isa. vi. 2. Aliquando facit similes mulieribus, Zech. v. 9. Aliquando viris, Gen. xviii. 2. Aliquando facit ipsos spiritus, Ps. civ. 4. Aliquando ignem, ib.:" and many other Rabbinical testimonies. The construction maintained above is also defended by Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. p. 283, and proved to be the only admissible one by Delitzsch, whose commentary has been published since this note was written. The only accommodation of the original passage made by the Writer, is the very slight one of applying the general terms "His messengers" and "His servants" to the angels, which indeed can be their only meaning. And this I should be bold to maintain, even though it be against Calvin ("Locus quem citat, videtur in alienum sensum trahi . . . nihil certius est quam hic fieri mentionem ventorum quos dicit a Domino fieri nuntios . . . nihil hoc ad angelos pertinet"), Kuinoel ("Verum enimvero Psalmi i. l. de angelis, tanquam personis, sermo esse non potest"), De Wette (on the Psalm: Sinn: er bedient sich der Winde u. Feuerflammen als seine Werkzeuge: von Engeln als himmlischen Wesen ist hier gar nicht die Rede), Bleek, Ebrard,

Lünemann, al. See the whole literature of the passage in the three last. Singularly enough, the ancient Commentators confine their attention to the part. ποιῶν, and seem simply to have taken the accusatives as epithets in apposition: e. g. Chrys.: ἰδοὺ, ἡ μεγίστη διαφορά: ὅτι οἱ μὲν κτιστοὶ, ὁ δὲ ἄκτιστος· κ. διὰ τί πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ φησιν ὁ ποιῶν, πρὸς δὲ τὸν υἱόν, διὰ τί οὐκ εἶπεν, ὁ ποιῶν; Similarly Thl. and Thdrt. (on the Psalm also). The sense of the words I have endeavoured to give in some measure above. It is evident that πνεύματα must be rendered **winds**, not "*spirits*," from both the context in the Psalm and the correspondence of the two clauses, and also from the nature of the subject. πάντες εἰσὶν πνεύματα, as asserted below, ver. 14: therefore it could not with any meaning be said, that He *maketh them spirits*: but to (that this πρὸς is used of direct address, and not, as Delitzsch, al., of indirect reference, is manifest by ὁ θεός σου following: see also above. The difficulty mentioned by Ebrard, that thus we shall have the Writer implying that Ps. xlv. is a direct address to the Son of God, is not obviated by the indirect understanding of πρὸς, but is inherent in the citation itself, however the preposition is rendered) **the Son,—Thy throne, O God** (ὁ θεός is probably vocative: both here and in the Hebrew: and is so taken even by modern Unitarians (see Yates, Vindication of Unitarianism, p. 183, and notes), who seek their refuge by explaining away θεός. To suppose the words a parenthetical exclamation to God, or the meaning "Thy God-like Throne," or "Thy throne of God" (see De W. in Psal.), i. e. 'the throne of Thy God,' seems forcing them from their ordinary construction. The rendering of Grot., adopted by some modern Socinians, "Thy throne is God for ever and ever," is not touched by any of the principal Commentators on the Psalm, and seems repugnant to the decorum (for Ps. lxxii. 26, ἡ μερίς μου ὁ θεός εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, is no case in point, the idea being wholly different) and spirit of the passage. I need hardly adduce instances of ὁ with a nom. as a form of the vocative: they will be found in the ref.) (is) for **ever and ever** (see Ps. ciii. 5; cx. 3, 8, 10; and fuller still ix. 5, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κ. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος); and (see var. readd.

Hofmann, Schriftbeweis i. 148, maintains that this καὶ, splitting as it does the

ἐμίσησας ^a ἀνομίαν διὰ τοῦτο ^b ἔχρισέν σε ὁ θεός ὁ θεός ^{a opposed to δίκ., 2 Cor.}

vi. 14.

b Luke iv. 18, from Isa. lxi. 1. Acts iv. 27. x 38. 2 Cor. i. 21 only.

9. ἀνομίας D¹: ἀδικίαν AN 17 Eus Chr₁-mss Cyr₁ Chron₁, so also A Eus₂ Ath₁(in

citation into two, is intended by the Writer to mark off the former portion as addressed to Jehovah, and the latter only to the King, as indicated by *ὁ θεός σου*. But, as Delitzsch well replies, he would thus be cutting asunder the thread of his own argument, which depends on the address to the Son as *ὁ θεός*, as exalting Him above the angels) the rod (i. e. sceptre: see especially Esth. iv. 11: Judg. v. 14 (see Bertheau in loc.): Amos i. 5 (this latter in Heb. and E. V., not in LXX), where the same Heb. word מַדְבָּע occurs) of thy kingdom is the rod of straightness (i. e. righteousness, justice: see ref. to LXX. Notice that the position of *ἡ βάβδος τῆς ἐδούτης* in all probability, according to usage, points it out as the *predicate*; and the other, *ἡ β. τ. β. σου*, is the subject). Thou lovedst (the Writer refers the words to the whole life of our Lord on earth, as a past period) righteousness, and hatedst lawlessness (in AN &c. (see var. readd.) and in LXX-A, iniquity: which is therefore very probably the right reading, but is hardly strongly enough attested): for this cause (as *διό*, Phil. ii. 9: because of His love of righteousness and hatred of lawlessness, shewn by his blameless life and perfect obedience on earth. Some take *διὰ τοῦτο* here, and מַדְבָּע in the Psalm, as introducing not the consequence, but the *reason* of what has preceded: so Aug. Enarr. in Ps. xlv. § 19, vol. iv. pt. i., "Propterea unxitte, ut diligeres justitiam, et odires iniquitatem:" Thos. Aq., Schöttgen, al. In ver. 2 of the same Ps. the same ambiguity occurs: and there Bl. pronounces the sense to be decidedly "*because*" and not "*therefore*," which latter however the E. V. has, and De W. without remark: and so also Aug. But the sense in both places seems decidedly "*therefore*," and not "*because*:" the eternal blessing of ver. 2, and the anointing with the oil of gladness here, being much more naturally results of the inherent beauty and merit of the high Person addressed, than means whereby these are conferred) God, thy God (many Commentators of eminence, both ancient and modern, maintain that the first *ὁ θεός* here is as before, vocative. Some of them use the strongest language on the point: e. g. Aug. on the Psalm,—with regard to the *Greeks*: "O tu Deus, unxit te Deus tuus. Deus ungitur a Deo. Etenim in Latino putatur idem casus nominis repetitus: in Græco autem evidentissima distinc-

tio est, quia unum nomen est quod compellatur et alterum ab eo qui compellatur, unxit te Deus. O tu Deus, unxit te Deus tuus: quomodo si diceret, Propterea unxit te o tu Deus, Deus tuus. Sic accipite, sic intelligite, sic in Græco evidentissimum est." And it is also assumed by Thl. (ὅτι δὲ τὸ 'Ὁ θεός, ἀντὶ τοῦ 'Ω θεός ἐστὶ, μάρτυς ἀξιώπιστος ὁ ἐχθρός Σύμμαχος, ἐκδοὺς οὐτως διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισέ σε, θεός, ὁ θεός σου ἔλαιον χαράς παρὰ ἑταίρους σου), Ps-Anselm ("Sicut et in Hebæo et Græco patet, primum nomen Dei vocativo casu intelligendum est, sequens nominativo"), Wolf, Bengel, Kuinoel, De Wette, Bleek, Lünemann, Stier, Ebrard, &c. The last goes so far as to say that the Heb. will not bear the construction of the two nominatives in apposition: "It is impossible that מֵיִיָּהּ can be in apposition with מֵיִיָּהּ: even in a vocative address, such a juxtaposition would be foreign to the spirit of Hebrew idiom: certainly here in a nominative sentence, or connexion of *subjects*, such a redundancy would be the more out of place, that an emphasis of this kind would be entirely aimless and uncalled for." But against such a dictum I may set the simple fact that, in a *vocative* sentence, the apposition does occur in Ps. xliii. 4 (xlii. LXX), both in the Heb. and in the Gr.—*יְיָ הֵי הֵי, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου*, "O God, my God:" and in a nominative sentence again, with the very same words as here, in Ps. l. (xlix.) 7, *יְיָ הֵי הֵי, ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός σου εἰμι ἐγώ*, "I am God, (even) thy God." See also Ps. lxxvii. (lxvi.) 7, *ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός ἡμῶν*, "God, (even) our God." So that I confess I am unable to see the necessity of interpreting either the Hebrew or the Greek in the way proposed. I take both as giving two nominatives in apposition, "God, thy God." And so Origen appears to have taken it, Contra Cels. vi. § 79, vol. i. 692, *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισεν καὶ αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἔλαιον ἀγαλλιάσεως* (Chrys. and Thdr. do not touch it), Grot., Estius (Calvin does not touch it), Owen, al. Delitzsch leaves it undecided, conceding that the vocative acceptance is inconsistent with the usage of the "Elohimpalmen," but balancing this by the consideration that the sense would be consistent with the usage of references to the Messiah, as Isa. ix. 5; xi. 2) anointed thee (*how?* and *when?* We must distinguish this anointing from the *ἐχρίσεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός πνεύματι*

c Mark vi 13 σου ^c ἔλαιον ^d ἀγαλλιᾶσεως ^e παρὰ τοὺς ^f μετόχους σου. AB DK
 James ii 14 al. Deut xxviii. 40 4 Kings iv. 2 constr., Amos i 6 al Winer, § 32 4 d Luke i 14, 44 Acts ii 46 Jude
 24 only, Ps lxi 12 e = ver 4. f Heb (ch iii 1, 14 vi 4 xii 8) only, exc Luke
 7 Eccl ii 10. (xvii 2 Cor ii 14) g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

Ps xlv. 7). for ελαιον, ελεον (*itacism*) B¹L, ελεος D¹.

ἀγίῳ κ. δυνάμει of Acts x. 38, and the ἔχρισέν με of Isa. lxi. 1. For it is a consequent upon the righteous course of the Son of God in his Humanity, and therefore belongs to his triumph, in which He is exalted above his μέτοχοι (see below). Again the 'oil of gladness' below seems rather to point to a festive and triumphant, than to an inaugurative unction. We should therefore rather take the allusion to be, as in Ps. xxiii. 5; xcii. 10, to the custom of anointing guests at feasts: so that, as the King in the Psalm is anointed with the oil of rejoicing above his fellows, because of his having loved righteousness and hated iniquity, so Christ, in the jubilant celebration of His finished course at his exaltation in heaven, is anointed with the festive oil παρὰ τοὺς μετόχους αὐτοῦ (see below). There is of course an allusion also in ἔχρισεν to the honoured and triumphant Name χριστός) with (χρίω is found with a double accus. in the N. T. and LXX (reff.); usually elsewhere with a dative. But, as Bl. remarks, the construction is in accordance with Greek idiomatic usage. He compares Aristoph. Acharn. 114, ἵνα μὴ σε βιάσῃ βάμμα Σαρδανικόν: Pind. Isthm. vi. 18, πίσσω σφε Δίρκας ἀγνὸν ὕδωρ) oil of rejoicing (see above: oil indicative of joy, as it is of superabundance: cf. Isa. lxi. 3) beyond thy fellows (i. e. in the Psalm, "other kings," as De W., Ebrard, al.: hardly "brothers by kin" (other sons of David), as Grot., al. But to whom does the Writer apply the words? Chrys. says, τίνες δὲ εἰσιν οἱ μέτοχοι, ἀλλ' ἢ οἱ ἄνθρωποι; τούτῃ, τὸ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου ἔλαβεν ὁ χριστός: Thdrt., μέτοχοι δὲ ἡμεῖς καὶ κοινωνοὶ οὐ τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος: as so Bengel, citing ὥραϊος κάλλιε παρὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ver. 2 (3) of this Psalm. Thdrt. on the Psalm (Bl.), Calvin ("Nos sibi adoptavit consortes"), Beza, al., think of believers, the adopted into God's family: Wittich, Braun, Cramer (in Bl.), of the high-priests, prophets, and kings, in the O. T., anointed as types of Christ: Klee, of all creatures: Kuinoel and Ebrard, as in the Psalm, of other kings. Camero says, "μετόχους in officio nullo, in natura humana omnes homines, in gratia omnes fideles habet Christus." Still we may answer to all these, that they do not in any way satisfy the requirements of the context. Were it the intent of the Writer to shew Christ's superiority over his human

brethren of every kind, we might accept one or other of these meanings: but as this is not his design, but to shew His superiority to the angels, we must I think take μετόχους as representing other heavenly beings, partakers in the same glorious and sinless state with Himself, though not in the strict sense, His 'fellows.' De Wette objects to this sense, that the Writer places the angels far beneath Christ: Delitzsch, that the angels are not anointed, whereas there is no necessity in the text for understanding that the μέτοχοι are also anointed: the παρὰ may consist in the very fact of the anointing itself:—and Ebrard, speaking as usual strongly, says that "neither the Psalmist, nor our author if in his senses, could have applied the word to the angels." But this need not frighten us: and we may well answer with Lünemann, "1. that the general comparison here being that of Christ with the angels, the fresh introduction of this point of comparison in ver. 9 cannot of itself appear inappropriate. 2. Granted, that just before, in ver. 7, the angels are placed far beneath Christ,—we have this very inferiority here marked distinctly by παρὰ. 3. The angels are next to Christ in rank, by the whole course of this argument: to whom then would the Writer more naturally apply the term μέτοχοι, than to them?" I may add, 4. that the comparison here is but analogous to that in ver. 4, of which indeed it is an expansion: and, 5. that thus only can the figure of anointing at a triumphant festival be carried out consistently: that triumph having taken place on the exaltation of the Redeemer to the Father's right hand and throne (ver. 8), when, the whole of the heavenly company, His μέτοχοι in glory and joy, being anointed with the oil of gladness, His share and dignity was so much greater than theirs. This meaning is held by Peirce, Olshausen, Bleek, Lünemann. Some, as Grot., Limborch, Böhme, Owen, join the interpretations—"angels and men." Certainly, if the former, then the latter; but these are not present in the figure here used). It remains that we should consider the general import, and application here, of Ps. xlv. From what is elsewhere found in this commentary, it will not be for a moment supposed that I can give in to the view of such writers as De Wette and Hupfeld, who maintain that it was simply an ode to some king, uncer-

10 καὶ ὁ Σὺ ἡ κατ' ἡ ἀρχάς, κύριε, τὴν γῆν ἑθεμελίωσας, ὁ Πα. ci. 25-27.
καὶ ἔργα χειρῶν σου εἰσὶν οἱ οὐρανοί· 11 αὐτοὶ ἄπο- h. hereonly. Ps. cxviii. 162.
λοῦνται, σὺ δὲ ἑδιαμένεις καὶ πάντες ὡς ἰμάτιον ἡ Matt vii. 25.
m πα- (Luke vii. 48 v. r.). Eph. i. 10.
11 18 Col. i. 23 1 Pet. v. 10 only. Ps. xxiii. 2. lxxviii. 69, &c. k 1 Pet i. 7 reff. m Luke xii. 33 ch. viii.
1. 22 xxii. 28. Gal. ii. 5. 2 Pet iii. 4 only. Jer. xxxix. (lxxxi) 14.
13 lxx only. Deut. xxix. 5. Josh. ix. 13. Neh. ix. 21. Job xlii. 28.

11. διαμενεῖς D³M 67² latt: txt (elder mss uncert, having no accents) L.

tain whom, and has no further reference whatever. Granting that in its first meaning it was addressed to Solomon (for to him the circumstances introduced seem best to apply, e. g. the palace of ivory, ver. 9, cf. 1 Kings x. 18: the gold from Ophir, ver. 10, cf. 1 Kings ix. 28: the daughter of Tyre with her gift, ver. 13, cf. 2 Chron. ii. 3-16),—or even, with Delitzsch, to Joram, on his marriage with the Tyrian Athaliah,—we must yet apply to it that manifest principle, without which every Hebrew ode is both unintelligible and preposterous, that the theocratic idea filled the mind of the Writer and prompted his pen: and that the Spirit of God used him as the means of testifying to that King, who stood veritably at the head of the theocracy in the divine counsels. Thus considered, such applications as this lose all their difficulty; and we cease to feel ourselves obliged in every case to enquire to whom and on what occasion the Psalm was probably first addressed. And even descending to the low and mere rationalistic ground taken by De Wette and Hupfeld, we are at least safer than they are, holding as we do a meaning in which both Jews and Christians have so long concurred, as against the infinite diversity of occasion and reference which divides their opinions of the Psalm.

10.] And (πρὸς τὸν υἱὸν λέγει: see a similar καὶ introducing a new citation in Acts i. 20. The comma, or colon, or capital letter, as in text, should be retained after καὶ),—Thou in the beginning (Heb. בְּרִאשִׁית, *ad faciem, antea*; probably here rendered κατ' ἀρχάς by the LXX with reference to Gen. i. 1. The expression is found in Philo, and often in the classics: cf. Herod. iii. 153, 159, and instances in Westst.; and see Kuhner, Gr. Gr. § 607.1), Lord (κύριε has no word to represent it in the Hebrew. But it is taken up from ἡς in ver. 25; and indeed from the whole strain of address, in which ἡς has been thrice expressed—in vv. 1, 12, 15. The order of the words in this clause is somewhat different in our text from that of the LXX in either of the great mss.; B having κατ' ἀρχὰς τὴν γῆν, σὺ, κύριε, A κατ' ἀρχὰς σὺ, κύριε, τὴν γῆν, and N omitting σὺ κύριε. The transposition has apparently been made from the alex. text, and for the sake of throwing the κύριε into

emphasis. On the bearing and interpretation of the Psalm, see below), *foundedst* ("A primis fundamentis terram fecisti, et simul eam firmam et stabilem fundasti." Corn.-a-lap., in Bleek, who remarks that the verb *ἑθεμελίω*, is not so usual of the heavens, as of the earth. Still in Ps. viii. 3, we have the Greek verb *ἑθεμελίωσας*, applied to the heavens: but the Heb. is *הִקְוִיָּה* the earth, and the heavens ("Nil obstat," says Bengel, "quominus sub *cœlis* angeli innuantur, quemadmodum creatio hominis innuitur sub *terra* prætereunte.") The same thought is implied in Theodoret's *διὰ γὰρ οὐρανοῦ κ. γῆς πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς περιέλαβεν*. Still, I would rather view the citation as made in proof of the eternal and unchangeable power and majesty of the Son, than as implicitly referred to the angels by the word *οὐρανοί*. And so most Commentators. The plur. *οὐρανοί*, representing the Heb. *שָׁמַיִם*, evidently includes in the Greek also the idea of plurality: see Eph. iv. 10: 2 Cor. xii. 2) *are works of thine hands* (see Ps. viii. 3. Bl. mentions an opinion of Heinrichs that the *ἔργα τῶν χειρ.* alludes to textile work, the heavens being considered as a *veil* spread out. But there does not seem sufficient warrant for this).

11.] They (seems most naturally to refer to *οἱ οὐρανοί* immediately preceding. There is no reason in the Psalm why the pronoun should not represent both antecedents, the heavens and the earth. Here, however, the subsequent context seems to determine the application to be only to the heavens: for to them only can be referred the following image, *ὥσπερ περιβάλοιον ἐλίξεις αὐτούς*) shall perish (as far as concerns their present state, cf. ἀλαλήθησαν below. *ἐδήλωσε* καὶ τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ κρίττον μεταβολὴν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ γεννησομένην, αὐτοῦ δὲ τὸ ἄναρχον καὶ ἀνάλεθρον. Thdr. On this change, see the opinions of the Fathers in Suicer, vol. ii. pp. 151-2, 365, and 520 B), but thou remainest (Bleek prefers the fut. *διαμενεῖς*, see var. readd., on the ground of the verbs being all future in the Heb. text. But perhaps the consideration alleged by Lünemann, that the Writer, using only the LXX, seems to place *σὺ δὲ διαμενεῖς* and *σὺ δὲ ὁ αὐτός* εἰ as parallel clauses, is of more weight than the other. De Wette, on the Ps., renders the Hebrew

n 1 Cor. xi. 15 only. Job xxvi. 6 Ps. ciii. 6
 o Rev. vi. 14 only. 1 c. (see note.) Job xxviii. 8 Isa. xxiv. 4 only. xlii. 8.
 4, 7. x. 9, 15. v Matt. xx. 21, 23 xxv. 33, 34. Mark xvi. 19 al. 3 Kings ii. 19 Ps. xv. 8 al.
 12. for ωσει, ως D¹ Damasc. for ελιξεις, αλλαξεις D¹N¹ 43 latt(not fuld harl¹) Tert[from Ps, so also Bas, Iren-int₁, Orig-int₁]. aft αυτους ins ως ιματιον (gloss? explaining ωσει περιβ.) ABD¹N fuld æth arm: om D³KLM[P] rel [vulg(with am denid al) syri copt] ff. aft δε ins και N¹(marked with dots eadem manu).
 13. for ελξεις, αλλαξεις D¹N¹ 43 latt(not fuld harl¹) Tert[from Ps, so also Bas, Iren-int₁, Orig-int₁]. aft αυτους ins ως ιματιον (gloss? explaining ωσει περιβ.) ABD¹N fuld æth arm: om D³KLM[P] rel [vulg(with am denid al) syri copt] ff. aft δε ins και N¹(marked with dots eadem manu).
 14. for ελξεις, αλλαξεις D¹N¹ 43 latt(not fuld harl¹) Tert[from Ps, so also Bas, Iren-int₁, Orig-int₁]. aft αυτους ins ως ιματιον (gloss? explaining ωσει περιβ.) ABD¹N fuld æth arm: om D³KLM[P] rel [vulg(with am denid al) syri copt] ff. aft δε ins και N¹(marked with dots eadem manu).

verbs present: Dieselben vergehen, doch du bestehst. διαμένω, as in reff. and Ps. cxviii. 90, ἐθεμελίωσας τὴν γῆν καὶ διαμένει. The preposition gives the sense of endurance through all changes: and they all shall wax old as a garment (see besides reff. Isa. li. 6, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιωθήσεται: ib. l. 9; and Sir. xiv. 17, πάντα σὰρξ ὡς ἱμάτιον παλαιούται), and as a mantle (περιβόλαιον (reff.) is a word of unusual occurrence, found principally in the later classics; but also in Eurip. Herc. Fur. 549, θανάτου περιβόλαι' ἀνήμεθα, and 1269, σαρκὸς περιβόλαια ἡβώντα. It, as περιβολή, Gen. xlix. 11, signifies any enveloping, enwrapping garment) shalt thou fold them up (the Heb. here and apparently some copies of the LXX have the same verb as below: ἔπηλιν ὀρθῶν, — ἀλλάξεις αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀλλαγήσονται, — "thou shalt change them, and they shall be changed." See also var. readd. here. LXX-A (not F.), with which BN agree, reads as our text: and there can be little doubt that the Writer of this Epistle followed that text as usual. Grot. thinks ἐλίξεις has come into the Greek text from ref. Isa., ἐλιγήσεται ὁ οὐρανὸς ὡς βιβλίον. See also ref. Rev.), and they shall be changed (viz. as a mantle is folded up to be put away when a fresh one is about to be put on. Bleek quotes, as illustrating the idea, Philo de Profug. § 20, vol. i. p. 562, ἐνδύεται δὲ ὁ μὲν πρεσβύτατος τοῦ ὄντος λόγος ὡς ἐσθῆτα τὸν κόσμον· γῆν γὰρ καὶ ὕδωρ καὶ ἄερα καὶ πῦρ κ. τὰ ἐκ τούτων ἐπαμπίσχεται): but Thou art the same (Heb. כִּי יִהְיֶה, "and Thou art He:" viz. He, which Thou hast ever been: cf. Isa. xlii. 4 Heb. and E. V. Bleek compares Philo, de Profug. § 11, p. 554: ἥλιος γὰρ οὐκ ἀλλαττόμενος ὁ αὐτὸς ἐστιν ἀεὶ κ.τ.λ.), and thy years shall not fail (Heb., "Thy years end not," are never completed: so LXX render the same verb ὀρθῶν by ἐκλείπειν, Ps. ciii. 35: 1 Kings xvi. 11: 4 Kings vii. 13, &c.). The account to be given of Ps. cii. seems to be as follows: according to its title it is "a prayer of the afflicted,

when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord." It was probably written during the Babylonian exile (cf. vv. 14, 15) by one who "waited for the consolation of Israel." That consolation was to be found only in Israel's covenant God, and the Messiah Israel's deliverer. And the trust of Israel in this her Deliverer was ever directed to the comfort of her sons under the immediate trouble of the time, be that what it might. As generations went on, more and more was revealed of the Messiah's office and work, and the hearts of God's people entered deeper and deeper into the consolation to be derived from the hope of His coming. Here then we have this sorrowing one casting himself on the mercy of the great Deliverer, and extolling His faithfulness and firmness over, and as distinguished from, all the works of His hands. To apply then these words to the Redeemer, is to use them in their sense of strictest propriety. See Delitzsch's note, where the whole matter is discussed.
 13.] But (the contrast is again taken up from ver. 8. Δὲ is often found after the second word of a sentence and even later, when a preposition begins it: so κατὰ πόλεις δὲ, Herod. viii. 68. 2: ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις δὲ Ἀθηναῖσι, Thuc. i. 6: . . . οὐχ ὑπὸ ἐραστοῦ δὲ κ.τ.λ., Plato, Phædr. 227 D: ζὴν τύχῃ δὲ πρόσφερε, Soph. Philoct. 764: πρὸς κακῶν δ' ἀνδρῶν μαθὼν, ib. 959: ἐν νυκτὶ δυσκίμαντα δ' ὠρώρε κακά, Æsch. Agam. 653. See also other cases without the prepositional construction, in Klotz ad Devar. p. 379: Hartung, Partikellehre, i. p. 190: the account to be given being, that the particle may be thus postponed, whenever for any reason the previous words can be considered as one) to whom of the angels hath He (God, as before) ever said, Sit thou on my right hand (see above on ver. 3. The phrase ἐκ δεξιῶν is not found in classical writers: but we have in Diod. Sic. iv. 56, τὴν γῆν ἔχοντας ἐξ εὐωνύμων. It is very common of standing or sitting or being on the right hand of another, in Hellenistic Greek: see

σου ^w ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου; ¹⁴ οὐχὶ πάντες εἰσὶν ^w Matt. v. 35.
^x λειτουργικὰ ^y πνεύματα, εἰς ^z διακονίαν ^a ἀποστελλόμενα ^{vii. 49. ch.}
^{δια} τοὺς μέλλοντας ^b κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν; II. ¹ διὰ ^x 13. James
^{τοῦτο} δεῖ ^c περισσοτέρως ^d προσεῖχεν ἡμᾶς τοῖς ἀκούσ- ^u 3 only.
^{12, 26. vii. 5. 2 Chron. xxiv 14. (-γός, ver. 7.)} ^y = Luke xxiv. 37, 39. ^{Acts xxiii 8. 3 Kings}
^{xxii. 21.} ^z = 2 Cor. xi. 8 al (Esth vi. 3 A. 1 Macc xi. 58 only) ^a Luke i.
^{19, 26 Rev. v. 6. Isa vi. 6.} ^b ver. 4 reff. ^{Matt. xix 29} ^c Paul, 2 Cor. i. 12. ii.
^{4 al⁸. ch. xiii. 19 (Mark xv. 14 v r; only t.} ^d = and constr., Acts vii. 6, 10, 11. xvi. 14. 1 Tim.
^{i. 4 iii. 8. iv. 1, 13. Tit. i. 14. ch. vii. 13. 2 Pet. i. 19. Prov i. 30. Sir xxiii. 27.}

14. διακονίας B Orig₂(txt₅).

CHAP. II. 1. περισσοτέρως bef δεῖ N [aft προς. ημ. 17]. rec ημας bef προσερχεν,
 with KL[P] rel D-lat Thdrt [Damasc]: txt ABDN 17 vulg Ath₁ [Euthal-ms] Aug₁.

reff.) until I place thine enemies (as) a foot-stool (ὑποπόδιον, a word of later Greek, found in Athenæus, v. p. 192 E, ὁ γὰρ θρόνος . . . ἐλευθέρους ἐστὶ καθέδρα σὺν ὑποποδῖν: and xii. p. 514 f, Sextus Empir., al. The allusion is to the custom of putting the feet on the necks of conquered enemies, see Josh. x. 24 f.) of thy feet? Hardly any Psalm is so often quoted in the N. T. with reference to Christ, as Ps. cx. And no Psalm more clearly finds its ultimate reference and completion only in Christ, as even those confess, e.g. Bleek and De Wette, who question its being immediately addressed to Him at first: and regard the argument of our Lord to the Pharisees, founded on this place, as merely one 'ex concessio.' On the theocratic principle of interpretation, there is not the slightest difficulty in the application of the words directly to Him who is (and was ever regarded, even in David's time, as Ebrard well shews against Bleek) Israel's King, the Head and Chief of the theocracy. And see this further carried out in the note on ch. v. 6. Delitzsch, in loc., has devoted several pages to the discussion of the subject and arrangement of the Psalm.

14.] Are they not all (all the angels) ministering (in reference probably to λειτουργοὺς in ver. 7. The word λειτουργικός, not found in the classics, is used in the LXX (reff.) of any thing pertaining to the λειτουργοί or their service; the instruments, vessels, garments, or offerings for the ministry: here, of those devoted to or belonging to the ministry of God) spirits (unembodied beings, even as God Himself, but distinguished by the epithet λειτουργικά. The idea of "angels of service" or "of the ministry," is familiar to the Rabbis: see quotations in Wetstein) sent forth (mark the present participle, so also in ref. Rev.: he does not mean that angels have before now, in insulated cases, been sent forth, but that they are ever thus being sent forth,—it is their normal work and regular duty through all the ages of time) for ministry (in order to the ministration which is their work. The E. V. "sent

forth to minister for them," gives a wrong idea of the meaning. The διακονία is not a waiting upon men, but a fulfilment of their office as διάκονοι of God. See Rom. xiii. 4. Schlichting observes, "Noluit dicere, ut ministrent iis qui &c. Non enim proprie ministratur et servitur illis, qui imperandi aut jubendi jus nullum habent, licet ministerium alteri præstitum in alterius commodum sæpe suscipiatur atque vertatur. Angeli proprie ministrant Deo et Christo, sed tamen in piorum usum et commodum. Idcirco maluit dicere, propter eos" &c. It may fairly be questioned whether the same idea, that of 'ministering to God in behalf of,' is not to be traced in such expressions as εἰς διακονίαν τοῖς ἁγίοις ἔταξαν ἑαυτοὺς, 1 Cor. xvi. 15: εἰς διακονίαν πέμψαι τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, Acts xi. 29. Compare with this expression Col. i. 7, πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος τοῦ χριστοῦ) on behalf of those who are about to inherit salvation (σωτηρία, in the highest sense—eternal salvation: not, as Kuin., al. "deliverance from dangers:" in so solemn a reference, that meaning would be quite beside the purpose. Those spoken of are the elect of God, they who love Him, and for whom all things work together for good, even the principalities and powers in heavenly places. And if it be said, that the ministration of angels has often been used for other immediate purposes than the behoof of the elect, we may answer, that all those things may well come under the διακονία διὰ τοὺς μέλλ. κληρον. σωτηρίαν: for all things are theirs; and for them, in and as united to Christ, all events are ordered)? Thus the Son of God is proved superior to the angels—i. e. to the highest of created beings: who, so far from being equal with Him, worship Him, and serve His purposes.

CHAP. II. 1—4.] Practical inference from the proved superiority of the Son of God to the angels. 1.] On this account (viz. because Christ, the mediator of the New Covenant, is far above all the angels, who were the mediators of the former Covenant) it behoves us (ταύτην τὴν διαφορὰν ἐπι-

e here only.
Prov. xii 21
Isa. xlii 4 only.

θεῖσιν, μή ποτε * παραρῶμεν. ² εἰ γὰρ ὁ δι' ἀγγέλων

ABDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k
m n o
17 47

(παρaruωμεν, so AB¹D¹L[P]X n 17 [47] syr-marg-gr.)

σταμένους, Thdrt. : δεῖ, of moral necessity arising from the previous premises: so Matt. xviii. 33; xlv. 27: 2 Tim. ii. 6 al. There is no stress on ἡμᾶς according to the reading of the text) to give heed (προσέχειν usually in the classics is transitive, with τὸν νοῦν following: so e.g. Aristoph. Nub. 566, ὃ σοφώτατοι θεαταί, δεῦρο τὸν νοῦν προσέχετε, and Plut. 113, 151, al. In Demosth. both usages are found: c.g. p. 21. 266, εἰ τις ὑμῖν προσέξει τὸν νοῦν:—p. 132. 9, προσέχουσιν ἅπαντες, οὐχ οἷς εἴπομεν ποτε ἢ νῦν ἂν εἴπομεν, ἀλλ' οἷς ποιοῦμεν. And later, intrans. usage prevailed: see ref.) more abundantly (some as Grot. ("eo magis par est"), Kuin., al. would join περισσotέρως with δεῖ: but if so intended, it would certainly have been before that verb. We must not understand after the comparative, τοῦ νόμου, "than we did to the law," as Chrys., al.; or the aim of the Writer to be, to shew the superiority of the gospel over the law, as Thdrt.: but the adverb intimates how much our attention ought to be increased and intensified by our apprehension of the dignity of Him whose record the gospel is, and who is its Mediator) to the things heard (by us) (ἀκουσθεῖσιν is better taken neuter than masc., "the persons whom we have heard." Bleek remarks, after Böhme, the difference between the tone of exhortation here and in St. Paul, e.g. Gal. i. 6 ff.: but perhaps the remark is hardly just to the Pauline hypothesis: for difference of circumstances should be taken into consideration. Even the same person would not exhort in the same tone, converts to whom he stood in such different relations as St. Paul did to the Galatians and the Jewish converts. A similar criticism will apply to Bleek's second remark, that the Writer here classes himself absolutely with his readers who had heard the gospel from others. There may have been reasons for his descending to the level of those whom he was addressing. But see below on ver. 3, and on the authorship, the Prolegomena), lest haply (the ποτε is not to be pressed as meaning 'at any time': it simply generalizes and renders indefinite the μή,—'ne forte,' das nicht etwa) we be diverted (παρaruωμεν is the 2nd aor. subj. passive (ἐρύην) from παραρέω, which latter verb is not in use. The orthography with one ρ only is characteristic of the Alexandrine Greek: which usually wrote double consonants single.

(See Sturz. de Dial. Maced.) The verb signifies to flow by: so Xen. Cyr. iv. 5. 2, πείν ἀπὸ τοῦ παραρρέοντος ποταμοῦ: ref. Isa. ὡς ἰτέα ἐπὶ παραρρέον ὕδωρ. Bleek gives an example from Artemidorus viii. 27, where dreams of running water are interpreted to signify change and instability, διὰ τὸ μὴ μένειν τὸ ὕδωρ ἀλλὰ παραρρεῖν. Aristotle, de Part. Animal. iii. 3, uses this same passive form to indicate that which we familiarly call food going the wrong way in course of swallowing: ἐὰν γὰρ τι παρεισρῇ ξηρὸν ἢ ὑγρὸν εἰς τὴν ἄρτηριαν, πνιγμοὺς καὶ πόνους κ. βηχὰς ἰσχυροὺς ἐμποιεῖ—συμβαίνει γὰρ φανερώς τὰ λεχθέντα πᾶσιν οἷς ἂν παραρρῇ τι τῆς τροφῆς: see also numerous instances of the same or a similar meaning, from Galen, in Wetst. Plut. Amator, p. 754 A, says of fear lest a ring should fall off, ὥς μὴ παραρρῇ δεδιώς. Elsner quotes similar Latin usages, among which notice Cicero pro Balbo, c. i., "Oratio quæ non prætervecta aures vestras, sed in animis omnium penitus insederit." The meaning of the verb παραρρεῖν seems then to be clear—to flow past, or away, or aside, to fall off, deflect from a course. But it is to one part of that verb that our attention is here directed,—the 2 aor. passive: and it may be noticed that whereas in the above examples that which flows away or flows aside is said παραρρεῖν, that which is carried away or aside by floating on it, or which is caused to fall off or away, is said παραρρῆναι: cf. also νιέ, μὴ παραρρῆς in ref. Prov. And so must the word be taken here. We, going onward in time, living our lives in one or another direction, are exhorted προσέχειν τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσι, 'to adhere to the things we have heard' (see above), and that, μή ποτε παρaruώμεν, 'that we do not at any time float past them,' be not carried away beside them, led astray from the course on which they would take us. Two mistakes respecting the word are to be avoided: 1. that of Bos, Valcknaer, al., and the E. V., "ne quando præterfluere ea sinamus;" "lest at any time we should let them slip." From what has been above said of the tense and voice, it will be clear that such cannot be the meaning. 2. Still worse is that of those who, misled by the vulgate "perefluamus," have thought of a comparison with a sieve, or leaking vessel. So Est. (preferring however the other, the "ne defluamus" of Aug.), Calv. ("Attenta

λαληθεῖς ^f λόγος ἐγένετο ^g βέβαιος, καὶ πάντα ^h παραβασίς ^{f = Acts xxi. 15, 2 Tim. 1. 13, Tit. i. 9, ii. 8, 1 John ii. 7, g Rom. ix. 16, 2 Cor. i. 7, ch. iii. 14, ix. 19, ix. 17, 2 Pet. i. 10, 19 only, 7. Wisd. vi. 23 only, h Rom. ii. 23, ix. 15, ix. 14, Gal. iii. 19, 1 Tim. ii. 14, ch. ix. 15 only. Ps. c. 3. Wisd. xiv. 31, 2 Macc. xv. 31 only. (βαυειν, Matt. xv. 2, 3. -βάτης, James ii. 9.)}

mens similis est vasi bene obstructo: vaga autem et ignava, perforato”), Owen, ul.: and I find it reproduced in Tait’s commentary on the Hebrews: “lest . . . we should run out as leaking vessels.” The meaning is as untenable, as the simile (after προσέχειν) is irrelevant. And, as Kuim. and Bleek remark, the passage of Terence cited in justification, Eun. i. 2. 25, “Plenus rimarum sum, hac atque illac perfluo,” has reference not to forgetfulness, but to indiscreet loquacity. The Greek expositors, whose authority in matters of Greek verbal usage is considerable, all explain it as above:—so Chrys., *τουντεςτι, μη ἀπολώμεθα, μη ἐκπέσωμεν. καὶ δείκνυσιν ἐνταῦθα τὸ χαλεπὸν τῆς ἐκπτώσεως, ὅτι δύσκολον τὸ παραρῆν πάλιν ἐπανελθεῖν, καθότι ἐκ ῥαθυμίας τοῦτο συνέβη. ἔλαβε δὲ τὴν λέξιν ἀπὸ τῶν παροιμιῶν* “*νιὲ*” γάρ, φησί, “*μη παραρῆης*.” Thdr̄t., *μη τινα ὀλισθον ὑπομείνωμεν*: (Ec., *τουτέστιν, ἐκπέσωμεν τοῦ καθήκοντος καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ σωτηρίαν ὁδοῦ*: Hesych., *ἐξολισθῶμεν*: Suidas, *παρπέσωμεν*. So also all the more accurate of the moderns) (from them) (such is the most natural object to supply after παρά: turned aside from and floated away from the course on which the προσέχειν to them would have carried us).

2.] For (introduces an argument (vv. 2—4) *a minori ad maius*. The law was introduced by the mere subordinate messengers of God, but was enforced with strict precision: how much more shall they be punished who reject that Gospel, which was brought in by the Son of God Himself, and continues to be confirmed to us by God’s present power) if the word which was spoken by means of angels (i. e. the law of Moses: not as mentioned by way of alternative in Chrys., Ec., Thl., and adopted by Calv., al., *all commands in the O. T. delivered by angels* (excluding the law: or as Chrys., including it). For this would more naturally be οἱ . . . λόγοι: and besides, in similar exhortations in our Epistle, the law and the gospel are so prominently set against one another, that there can be little doubt the same is the case here: see ch. iii. 1 ff., 7 ff.; iv. 2, 11; x. 23, 29; xii. 18—25. This will become even plainer still, when we enter on the consideration of δι’ ἀγγέλων λαληθεῖς. These words seem to point especially at the law, which was διαταγῆς δι’ ἀγγέλων, Gal. iii. 19, where see note: cf. also Acts vii. 53, and Deut. xxxiii. 2,

κύριος ἐκ Σινᾶ ἔκει καὶ . . . κατέσπευσεν ἐξ ὅρουσιν Φαράν σὺν μυριάδι Καθῆς: ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ ἄγγελοι μετ’ αὐτοῦ: on which see Elbrard’s note: and Ps. lxxviii. 17, E. V. The co-operation of angels in the giving of the law at Sinai was not merely a Rabbinical notion, but is implied in both the Old and New Testaments. There can consequently be little doubt that the Writer, in mentioning ὁ δι’ ἀγγέλων λαληθεῖς λόγος, had reference to the law of Moses, and not to the scattered messages which were, at different times in O. T. history, delivered by angels. And so Origen, in Matt. tom. xvii. cap. 2, vol. iii. p. 767: Thdr̄t., *δείκνυσιν ὅσον ὑπέρκειται τῶν νομικῶν διατάξεων ἡ τῶν εὐαγγελικῶν διδασκαλία. τῇ γὰρ θέσει τοῦ νόμου ἄγγελοι διεκόνουν κ.τ.λ.* It has been sometimes supposed that the ἄγγελοι spoken of here are not angels, but merely human messengers. Chrys. says, *τινὲς μὲν οὖν τὸν Μωυσέα φασὶν αἰνίττεσθαι: ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔχει λόγον: ἀγγέλους γὰρ ἐνταῦθα πολλοὺς φησι.* And Olearius, *Analys. Ep. ad Hebr. § v., says, “Per ἀγγέλους hic maxime intelligi existimem prophetas, doctores et Sacerdotes: qui sunt ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, et ita passim vocantur.”* But this latter point wants proof. The difficulty as to whether God Himself, or an angel, is to be understood as giving the law in Exodus, raised by Cameron (see also Schlichting in Bleek), hardly seems legitimately to arise here, where the words are δι’ ἀγγέλων λαληθεῖς, and the angels may manifestly be considered as the inferior agents, acting and speaking in God’s name. Bl. remarks that the Writer would hardly have used this argument of depreciating contrast, had he regarded the law as given either to Moses or to the people by the direct ministry of the Son of God Himself) was made (“*factus est*” vulg., “*constitutus est*” Grot., “*became*,” on being thus spoken by angels. The aorists point, hardly, as Lünemann, to the legal dispensation being past and gone by, but, since the same tenses are presently used of the gospel, to two historic periods compared with one another,—the giving of the law, and the promulgation of the gospel) binding (see reff.: *firm, ratified*: “*stedfast*,” as E. V.: as applied to commands, —imperative,—not to be violated with impunity. Bleek quotes from Philo, Vit. Mos. ii. § 3, vol. ii. p. 136, τὰ δὲ τούτου μόνου (Μωυσέως νόμιμα) βέβαια, ἀσάλευτα, ἀκράδαντα, καθάπερ σφραγίσαι φύσεως

1 Rom. v. 19 καὶ ἡ παρακοή ἔλαβεν ἑνδικον ἡ μισθαποδοσίαν, ὅπως ἂν
 2 Cor. x. 6 only + ABDE
 3 Rom. iii. 8 ἡμεῖς ἐκφευξόμεθα τῇ τηλικαύτης ὁ ἀμελήσαντες σωτηρίας, LMPN
 only + a b c d e
 1 ch. x. 35 xi. 26 only + m Luke xxi. 36 Act. xvi. 27, xix. 16 Rom. ii. 3. 2 Cor. xi. 33. 1 Thess.
 r. 3. ch. iii. 25 only. L.P.H. Judg. vi. 11 2 Cor. i. 10 James iii. 4 Rev. xvi. 18 only + 2 Macc.
 xii. 3 o Matt. xxii. 5. 1 Tim. iv. 14 ch. iii. 9 (from Jer. xxxviii. [xxx.] 32) only. Jer. iv.
 17. Wisd. iii. 10. 2 Macc. iv. 14 only. f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

αὐτῆς σεσημασμένα), and every transgression (overstepping of its ordinances, or more properly, walking alongside of, and therefore not in, the path which it marked out. See above on παραρῶμεν, an allusion to which the prepositions in παραβ. and παρακ. seem to contain. Cf. Rom. iv. 15 and note there. The substantive does not occur in this sense in the classics, and only once in the Canonical LXX, ref. Ps.: but the verb is found in Plato, Crito, p. 52 D, 53 A, and Legg. 714 D, and Demosth. p. 624. 1, παραβὰς τοῖς ὅρκους κ. τὰς συνθήκας: and in the LXX passim) and disobedience ("παρακούειν imports etymologically, 'to hear beside': and hence the Greeks use it principally in two senses: 1. to hear any thing by stealth, to overhear, as Aristoph. Ran. 749, καὶ παρακούων δεσποτῶν θῆαν (ἄττ' ἄν, Belker) λαλώσι: and, 2. to hear any thing inaccurately, to mis-hear, as Plato, Theætet. p. 195 A, παραοράσι τε κ. παρακούουσι κ. παρανοοῦσι πλείστα. From this last meaning of the word comes the Hellenistic usage, in which it betokens a more intentional mis-hearing, a reluctance to hear (εἰν ὧς δὲ ἤδεναι, wöllen), and hence includes also the idea of non-compliance, of disobedience. So Isa. lxx. 12, ἐκάλεσα ὑμᾶς κ. οὐχ ὑπηκούσατε, ἐλάλησα κ. παρηκούσατε: Esth. iii. 8, τῶν δὲ νόμων τοῦ βασιλέως παρακούουσιν. See also Matt. xviii. 17, ἐὰν δὲ παρακούσῃ αὐτῶν, εἰπὲ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας παρακούσῃ κ.τ.λ. So also in Josephus. Accordingly, παρακοή in the N. T., where it occurs thrice only (see reff.: never in the LXX), is used of practical mis-hearing, not listening to, a teaching, or law, or person. The relation of these two words to one another in point of sense seems accordingly to be, that παράβασις denotes the outward act of transgression of the law, the practical withstanding of its precepts,—while παρακοή occurs when we fulfil not, and have no mind to fulfil, the precepts of the law: the former expresses, viewed *ab externo*, more something positive, the latter something negative, while at the same time it regards more the disposition of the man. Still, the distinction, as regards the moral region here treated of, is not of such a kind that each παράβασις may not also be treated as a παρακοή, and each παρακοή include or induce a παράβασις." Bleek) received just (ἐνδικος,

found twice only (reff.) in N. T. and not at all in LXX, is a good classic word: see lexx.) recompense of reward (used only in this Epistle, and every where else in a good sense: cf. also μισθαποδοτής, ch. xi. 6. The classical writers use μισθοδοσία (Thuc. viii. 83: Xen. Anab. ii. 5. 22: Polyb. i. 69. 3: Diod. Sic. xvi. 73) and μισθοδότης (Xen. Anab. i. 3. 9: Plato, Rep. v. p. 463 B: Æschin. p. 85. 10: Theocr. xiv. 59). In the passage of Diod. Sic., μισθαποδοσία is a various reading.

To what does the Writer refer? To the single instances of punishment which overtook the offenders against the law, or as Grot. suggests, to the general punishment of the whole people's unbelief, as in ch. iii. 8; iv. 11; xii. 21, and see 1 Cor. x. 6 ff. I should be disposed to think, to the former: such penalties as are denounced in Deut. xxxii. 35, and indeed attached to very many of the Mosaic enactments: as Owen: "The law was so established, that the transgression of it, so as to disannul the terms and conditions of it, had by divine constitution the punishment of death temporal, or excision, appointed unto it").

3.] how shall we (emphatic: including Christians in general, all who have received the message of salvation in the manner specified below) escape (φεύγω and its compounds belong to that class of verbs which take the future middle, not using the active form of that tense. See a list of such in Kruger, Gr. Sprachlehre, § 39. 12. We may here either supply an object after the verb, such as ἐνδικον μισθαποδοσίαν, as in ref. Rom. 2 Macc. vii. 35, οὕτω γὰρ τὴν τοῦ . . . θεοῦ κρίσιν ἐκπέφυγας, and ib. vi. 26,—or take ἐκφ. absolutely, as in the two last reff. and Sir. vi. 13, οὐκ ἐκφέζεται ἐν ἀρπάγμασιν ἀμαρτωλός. The latter seems best, inasmuch as τὴν ἐνδ. μισθ. does not fulfil the perfectly general motive of the hypothesis, and we are hardly justified in inserting any other object, such as τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ in ref. Rom. The forensic sense of ἐκφεύγειν, to be acquitted, founded on that of φεύγειν, to be accused, maintained here by Wolf, appears to be merely imaginary, the forensic word being ἀποφεύγειν, not ἐκφ. So Thom. Mag.: φεύγω, τὸ κατηγοροῦμαι. κ. φυγή, ἡ κατηγορία. ἀποφεύγω δέ, ὅταν νικήσας ἀπολυθῇ τις τῆς κατηγορίας. In the passage of Aristophanes which he quotes to support his view, Vesp. 993, ἐκπέφυγας, ὦ Ἀδβης,—

ἡ ἤτις ἡ ἀρχὴν ἡ λαβοῦσα λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπὸ ^{p = 1 Cor. v. 1}
 τῶν ἀκουσάντων ^s εἰς ἡμᾶς ^t ἐβεβαιώθη, ^{4 u} συνεπιμαρτυ- ^{q here only.}
 γενέσθαι λαβὼν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, Philo, Vit. Mos. ii § 14, vol. i. p. 93. ^{r absol., = in this Ep., ch. xii.}
 14 only. Mark xvi. 20. Luke xxiv 34 al. see ch. vii 14. xiii. 20. ^{s so 2 Cor. x. 16 1 Pet.}
 i. 25. ^t Mark xvi. 20. ¹ Rom. xv. 8. ¹ Cor. i. 6, 8. ² Cor. i. 21. ^{Col. ii. 7. ch. xiii. 9 only. Ps.}
 xl. 12. cxviii. 28 only. ^u here only ^t. ^{Clem. 1 Cor. § 23, 43.}

4. for συνεπιμαρτ., συμμαρτ. B¹, συμμ. B².

the word, occurring as it does in the midst of the forensic use of ἀποφεύγειν (cf. vv. 985, 997), may very well be only in its ordinary meaning, 'thou hast escaped') if we have neglected (the anarthrous participial construction implies a logical, i. e. here a hypothetical condition: the aor., that that condition will have been fulfilled at the date to which the fut. ἐκφ. refers) so great (καλῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ τηλικαύτης προσέθηκεν. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολέμιων, φησίν, ἡμᾶς διασώσει νῦν, οὐδὲ τὴν γῆν κ. τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ ἀγαθὰ παρέξει, ἀλλὰ θανάτου κατὰ λυσις ἔσται, ἀλλὰ διαβόλου ἀπώλεια, ἀλλ' οὐρανῶν βασιλεία, ἀλλὰ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Chrys.: and Theod.-inops. even more to the point,—ἐκείνο νομῶν δόσις ἦν μόνον, ἐνταῦθα δὲ κ. χάρις πνεύματος κ. λύσις ἀμαρτημάτων κ. βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἐπαγγελία κ. ἀθανασίας ὑπόσχεσις: ὅθεν κ. δικαίως τηλικαύτης εἶπεν. τηλικαύτης might belong to ἤτις below, as Thol., assuming ἤτις = ὥστε, and referring to Matthiæ, Gr. Gr. § 479, obs. 1. The instances there given of relatives after οὕτως, ὥδε, τηλικούτος, τοιοῦτος, amply justify such a construction, e.g. Isocr. Epist. p. 408 D, χρὴ ἐπιθυμῆν δόξης . . . τηλικαύτης τὸ μέγεθος, ἦν μόνος ἂν σὺ τῶν νῦν ὄντων κτησασθαι δυναθείης: Xen. An. ii. 5. 12, τίς οὕτω μαίνεται, ὥστις οὐ σοι βούλεται φίλος εἶναι; But it seems better here, and more befitting the majesty of the thing spoken of, to take τηλικαύτης absolutely, leaving the greatness and exalted nature of the salvation to be filled up, as Bleek says, in the consciousness of the readers. Still of course the ἤτις introduces, both by the sense and by its own proper meaning (ut quæ), an expegegesis of that which was unwrapped in τηλικαύτης) salvation (σωτηρία as in ch. i. 14; no need, as many Commentators, to supply λόγον before it), the which (= 'seeing that it,' in a direct construction) having begun (ἀρχὴν λαβοῦσα = ἀρξαμένη. The phrase is found in the classics: e.g. Eur. Iph. in Aul. 1111, τίν' ἂν λάβοιμι τῶν ἑμῶν ἀρχὴν κακῶν; Ælian, Var. H. ii. 28, πόθεν δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν ὅδε ὁ νόμος, ἐρῶ: Polyb. iv. 28. 3, τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ἱταλίαν . . . τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς τῶν πολέμων τούτων ἰδίας εἰλήφει: see more instances in Bleek, Raphael, and the same usage of λαβεῖν in Plato, Rep. p. 497 E, λαβέτω τέλος ἡ ἀπόδειξις τούτου φανεροῦ γενομένου: Thuc.

i. 91, ὅτι τειχίζεται τε κ. ἤδη ὕψος λαμβάνει. Cf. Palm and Rost's Lex. in λαμβάνω) to be spoken (the construction is a mixed one; the inf. after the substantive would naturally have the art., τοῦ λαλεῖσθαι, but it is put without it as if ἀρξαμένη had preceded) by means of (He was the instrument in this case, as the angels in the other; but both, law and gospel, came at first hand not from the mediators, but from God. See Ebrard's mistaken antithesis treated below) the Lord (διὰ τ. κυρίου is to be joined with the whole ἀρχ. λαβ. λαλ., not with λαλεῖσθαι alone. τοῦ κυρίου, as Bl. remarks, has here an especial emphasis setting forth the majesty and sovereignty of Christ: αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης πρῶτος τὴν σωτήριον διδασκαλίαν προσήνεγκε, Thdrt. See reff.), was confirmed (see reff. Mark, where the word is used exactly in the same sense and reference. It seems to be used to correspond to ἐγένετο βέβαιος above, signifying a ratification of the gospel somewhat correspondent to that there predicated of the law: as also λαλεῖσθαι here answers to λαλῆθεις there. Thl. explains it, διεπορθευθῆ ἐἰς ἡμᾶς βεβαίως κ. πιστῶς) unto us (not = the simple dative, which would be a dat. commodi, but implying the transmission and its direction; see reff.: nor, as Wolf, Wahl, al., to be rendered "usque ad," a meaning of eis only to be assumed when defined by some indication of time or space in the context. Nor again must it be confounded with the idiom ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν, "among you," 1 Cor. i. 6. The construction is a pregnant one) by those who heard (it? or Him? In the sense, the difference will be but little: in either case, those pointed at will be as Thdrt. οἱ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀπολαύσαντες χάριτος: the αὐτόπται κ. ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου of Luke i. 2. From the usage, however, of the Writer himself, I prefer understanding 'it': cf. ch. iii. 16; iv. 2; xii. 19) it (Ebrard (with whom Delitzsch partly agrees) arranges this whole sentence strangely, and I cannot doubt, wrongly, thus: "was confirmed to us by those who heard it, as having been from the beginning spoken by the Lord:" and brings out a contrast between the law, which was given-through a mediator, and the gospel, which came direct from the Lord Himself. But thus all the parallel,

v Mark xvi. 20.
w in N. T. alw.
w. σῆμ.,
Matt. xxiv.
24 || Mk.
John iv. 48.
Acts ii. 19
(from Joel ii. 30), 22 al.
xxix. 2.
10 F (not A) compl. Ezra vi. 18. Eccl. ii. 10 Ald only.
ch. x 7, 9, 10)

ροῦντος τοῦ θεοῦ ὧ σημείοις τε καὶ ὦ τέρασιν, καὶ ὧ ποικί-
λαις ὧ δυνάμεσιν, καὶ πνεύματος ἀγίου ὧ μερισμοῖς κατὰ
τὴν αὐτοῦ ὧ θέλησιν ;

C μερισ-
μοῖς...
ABCDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

[om τε MP 17 vulg arm Chr.]

θερισμοῖς N¹(txt N-corr¹).

for αὐτου, του θεου D¹.

and with it the true contrast, is destroyed. Both law and gospel, proceeding from God, were λαλθέντα to men: the former by angels, the latter by the Lord. Both were βεβαιωθέντα—the former absolutely, as exemplified by the penalties which followed its neglect, the latter relatively to us, as matter of evidence requiring our hearty reception; delivered by eye and ear witnesses, and further witnessed to by God Himself. And in proportion as the Mediator of the new covenant is more worthy than were the mediators of the old covenant, will our punishment be greater if we neglect it. So there can be no doubt that the Writer meant to convey the sense against which Ebrard protests, and that the beginning of the promulgation of the gospel by the Lord, and the handing down of it by those who were its first hearers, are alleged by him as two separate and co-ordinate circumstances. On the evidence furnished by this verse as to the Writer of the Epistle, see Prolegg. § i. parr. 130 ff.), God also bearing witness to it (nothing can be further from the truth than what Kuinoel, al., maintain, “συν-επιμαρτυρεῖν pro simplici μαρτυρεῖν positum esse.” In his own rendering of the word, the force of both prepositions is to be traced: “Deo simul confirmante.” μαρτυρεῖν is simply to *bear witness*: ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν to *attest*, to bear witness to: συνεπιμαρτυρεῖν to *join in, attesting*, or bearing witness to. The double compound is not uncommon in the later Greek writers: e. g. Aristot. de Mundo, v. 22, συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ δ βίος ἄπας: Polyb. xxvi. 9. 4, παρόντων δὲ τῶν Θεοτάλων, κ. συνεπιμαρτυρούντων τοῖς Δαρδανίοις. See examples from Sextus Empir., Galen, Philo, &c., in Bleek. On the sense, Chrys. remarks: πῶς οὖν ἐβεβαιώθη; τί οὖν εἰ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐπλάσαν φησιν; τούτο τοῖνυν ἀταίρων καὶ δεικνύς οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην τὴν χάριν, ἐπήγαγε “συνεπιμ. τ. θεοῦ.” οὐκ ἂν γάρ, εἰ ἐπλάσαν, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐμαρτύρησε; μαρτυροῦσι μὲν ἁκέτινοι, μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ θεός. οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἐπιστεῖσθαι ἐκείνοις, ἀλλὰ διὰ σημείων καὶ τεράτων, ὥστε οὐκ ἐκείνοις πιστεύομεν, ἀλλ’ αὐτῷ τῷ θεῷ) with signs and wonders (Bleek remarks that these words are very commonly joined together, and cites numerous

instances from the later classics, the LXX, and the N. T. His remarks are: “As regards the relation of the two expressions to each other in their combination here, as divine confirmations of human testimony, it is this: σημεῖον is a more general and wider idea than τέρας. Every τέρας, religiously considered, is also a σημεῖον, but not always *vice versa*. τέρας always includes the idea of something marvellous, something extraordinary in itself, betokens something which by its very occurrence raises astonishment, and cannot be explained from the known laws of nature. On the other hand a σημεῖον is each and every thing whereby a person, or a saying and assertion, is witnessed to as true, and made manifest: and thus it *may* be something, which, considered in and of itself, would appear an ordinary matter, causing no astonishment, but which gets its character of striking and supernatural from the connexion into which it is brought with something else, e. g. from a heavenly messenger having previously referred to some event which he could not have foreseen by mere natural knowledge. But it may also be a τέρας, properly so called. Still, it is natural to suppose that the biblical writers, using so often as they do the words together, did not on every occasion bear in mind the distinction, but under the former word thought also of events which of themselves would be extraordinary and marvellous appearances”) and various (this adj. belongs only to δυνάμεις, not also, as Bleek, to the following clause, in which the μερισμοῖς of itself includes the idea of variety) miraculous powers (so δυνάμεις are used in reff.; and in Acts ii. 22: 2 Cor. xii. 22: 2 Thess. ii. 9, we find them joined with σημεῖα κ. τέρατα as here; and with σημεῖα only, in Acts viii. 13. See also 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28 f. In some of these places it is taken for the miraculous acts themselves which followed on the exercise of the powers: and so perhaps it may be here: but I prefer the other rendering on account of the near connexion with the following clause, which if we break by joining it to the foregoing, we destroy the grouping in couples, and also violate the proper construction of the σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν) and distributions (the rare word

⁵ Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλοις ^b ὑπέταξεν τὴν ^c οἰκουμένην τὴν ^{b ver 8 reff.} ^{c = and w.}
μέλ. here only. see ch. i. 5.

5. aft υπεταξεν ins ο θεος C vulg(with am demid hal agst fuld harl¹ tol) Chron¹.

μερισμός (see reff.) is in strict analogy with the usage of the verb: e. g. Rom. xii. 3, ἐκάστω ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως: 1 Cor. vii. 17, ἐκάστω ὡς ἐμέρισεν ὁ κύριος . . . περιπατέω: 2 Cor. x. 13, κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὗ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεὸς μέτρον. But both, in their simple classical meaning, merely signify *division*, as in ch. iv. 12, and not *distribution*, which is a later sense, found in Polyb. xi. 28. 9, Diog. Laert., Herodian, &c. See Palm and Rost's *Lexicon* of the Holy Spirit (is this a genitive of the object distributed, or of the subject distributing? The latter is held by Camerar., al., and κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ θέλησιν also referred to the will of the Holy Spirit. And so St. Paul certainly speaks, 1 Cor. xii. 11, πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἐνεργεῖ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα, διαιροῦν ἰδίᾳ ἐκάστω καθὼς βούλεται. But it does not thence follow that such is the sense here: and it seems much more natural to refer the pron. αὐτοῦ to God, the primary subject of the sentence. Otherwise we should have expected ἐκείνου. Still, it may be said that the reference of this genitive is independent of that of the pronoun αὐτοῦ, and that the clause πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς should be considered on its own ground. But thus considered, if it be once granted that αὐτοῦ refers to God, we should have, on the supposition of the subjective genitive, an awkwardly complicated sense, hardly consistent with the assertion of absolute sovereignty so prominently made in the following clause. I take then the genitive with most Commentators, as objective, and the Holy Spirit as that which is distributed according to God's will, to each man according to his measure and kind. The declaration in John iii. 34, of Him whom God sent, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα, speaks of the same *giving*, but of its unmeasured fulness, as imparted to our glorious Head, not of its fragmentary distribution to us the imperfect and limited members), according to His (God's: see above) will (θέλησις is a rarer word (reff.) than θέλημα, both being Alexandrine forms. Pollux says of it, v. 165, βούλησις, ἐπιθυμία, ὄρεξις, ἔρως· ἡ δὲ θέλησις ιδιωτικόν. It is best to refer this clause, not to the whole sentence preceding, with Böhme, nor to the two clauses, ποικ. δυν., κ. πν. ἁγ. μερ., as Bleek, Lünem., but to the last of these only, agreeably to 1 Cor. xii. 11, and to the free and sovereign agency implied in μερισμοῖς. See on the whole sense,

Acts v. 32)? 5—18.] *The dogmatic argument now proceeds. The new world is subjected, by the testimony of the Scriptures, not to angels, but to Christ: who however, though Lord of all, was made inferior to the angels, that He might die for, and suffer with, being made like, the children of men.* 5.] The proposition stated. For (the connexion is with the sentence immediately preceding, i. e. with vv. 2—4. That former λόγος was spoken by angels: it carried its punishment for neglect of it: much more shall this σωτηρία, spoken by . . . &c., confirmed by . . . &c. For this whole state of things, induced by the proclamation of that salvation, is not subjected to angels, but to Christ, the Son of God. Then the fact that it is to MAN, and to Him AS MAN, that it is subjected, is brought in, and a new subject thus grafted on the old one of His superiority to the angels. See Bleek and Ebrard (not to angels (ἀγγέλοις stands in the place of emphasis, as contrasted with ἄνθρωπος below) did He subject (aor.: at the date of His arrangement and laying out of the same. The subjection of this present natural world to the holy angels, as its administrators, is in several places attested in Scripture, and was a very general matter of belief among the Jews. In Deut. xxxii. 8, we read in the LXX, ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕμνος ἐθνῶν, ὡς δίσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ, ἔστησεν ὄρια ἐθνῶν κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ. There, it is true, the Heb. text has, as E. V., “according to the number of the children (more properly, *the sons*, in the stricter sense) of Israel.” Origen, on Numbers, Hom. xxviii. 4, vol. ii. p. 385, says, “Secundum numerum angelorum ejus, vel ut in aliis exemplaribus legimus, secundum numerum filiorum Israel:” but perhaps, as Bleek suggests, it was not Origen that was pointing to a various reading in the Heb. text, but only his translator that was noticing that the Latin versions differed from the LXX. But the doctrine rests on passages about which there can be no such doubt. See Dan. x. 13, 20, 21; xii. 1, for this committal of kingdoms to the superintendence of angels: Rev. ix. 11; xvi. 5 al., for the same as regards the natural elements: Matt. xviii. 10, as regards the guardianship of individuals: Rev. i. 20 &c., for that of churches (for so, and not of chief bishops, is the name to be understood: see note there). See also Dan. iv. 13. In the apocryphal and Rab-

d = Matth. xii 32. Acts xxiv. 25. Rom. v. 14. viii. 38. ch. vi. 5 al. Isa ix 6 A al 17 1 Thess. iv. 6. 1 Tim. v. 21. 2 Tim. ii. 14. iv. 1) only. Jer vi. 10. e elsw L.P (Luke xv. 28 Acts viii 25 LMPN a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

binical writings we find the same idea asserted, and indeed carried out into minute details. So in Sir. xvii. 17, *ἐκάστω ἔθνει κατέστησεν ἡγούμενον, κ. μερὶς κυρίου Ἰσραὴλ ἐστίν*. The Rabbinical authorities may be found in Bleek and Eisenmenger. See also a very elaborate article—"Engel"—by Böhme in Herzog's Encyclopädie: and testimonies to the view of the early church from Eusebius (Demonstr. Evang. iv. 2, vol. iv. p. 146), Justin Martyr (Apol. ii. 5, p. 92), Irenæus (iii. 12. 11, p. 197), Athenagoras (Legat. 24, p. 302), and Clement of Alexandria (Strom. vii. 2, p. 831 P) in Whitby's note. The idea then of subjection of the world to angels was one with which the readers of this Epistle were familiar) the world to come (the reference of this expression has been variously given by expositors. 1. Many imagine it to refer to the world which is, strictly speaking, *to come*, as distinguished from this present world. So Thdrt. (οἰκουμ. μέλλ. τὸν μέλλοντα βίον ἐκάλεισεν), Eccl. (μέλλ. οἰκ. φησὶ τὸν ἐσόμενον κόσμον, περὶ οὗ φησὶν ὁ ἅπας λόγος ἡμῶν αὐτὸς γὰρ κριτὴς ὁ χριστὸς ἐκείνης καθεδέσεται οἰκουμένης, οἱ δὲ ἄγγελοι ὡς λειτουργοὶ κ. δοῦλοι παρίστανται), Cajetan, Estius, a-Lapide, al. This meaning, as Bl. remarks, will hardly tally with the γάρ, nor with περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν: though it might be said that the future life, being the completion of the state of salvation by Christ, might very well here be spoken of as the subject of the present discourse. 2. Some have supposed a direct allusion to ch. i. 6. So Thl. (περὶ ἧς λαλοῦμεν, τούτῃ περὶ ἧς ἡνωτέρω εἰπομεν ὅτι ὅταν εἰσαγάγῃ τὸν πρωτότοκον εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην), Schlichting, Grot. ("λαλοῦμεν, id est ἐλάλησαμεν . . . Respicitur enim id quod præcessit i. 6"), Böhme, al. But certainly in this case the verb would have been past; and besides, the addition of the epithet μέλλουσαν sufficiently distinguishes it from the mere οἰκουμένη, the inhabited world, in the other place. 3. Others again have thought of the heaven, which is to us future, because we are not yet admitted to its joys. So Cameron ("Mundus ecclesiæ desertum est, οἰκουμένη ecclesiæ est in celo, sicut Israelitarum in terra Canaan"), Calov., Limborch, Grot. ("In regione illa superætherea sunt quidem angeli, sed non illi imperant ut Christus. Vocat hanc οἰκ. μέλλ., non quia jam non exstat; sed quia nobis ea non plene nota est, nec adhuc contigit"), al. But this again would not

agree with the γάρ and λαλοῦμεν. 4. The most probable account to be given is that the phrase represents the Heb. *אשר יהיה* (see note on ch. i. 1), and imports the whole new order of things brought in by Christ,—taking its rise in His life on earth, and having its completion in his reign in glory. So Calvin ("Nunc apparet non vocari orbem futurum duntaxat qualem e resurrectione speramus, sed qui cœpit ab exordio regni Christi: complementum vero suum habebit in ultima redemptione"), Beza, Cappellus (adding a remark, "Sed nec contemnendum discrimen illud quod videmus inter veteris et novi testamenti sæcula, sub vetere Abraham, Josue, Daniel coram angelis procumbentes non reprehenduntur: sub novo Johannes idem bis faciens bis reprehenditur, Apoc. xix. et xxii."). Chrys. and Thl. are commonly quoted for this view even by Bleek: but if I understand Chrys., he means, as Thl. certainly does, that the οἰκουμένη here is identical with that in ch. i. 6, and that the Writer calls it μέλλουσαν, because at the time of the divine decree here spoken of, it was not yet created: μέλλουσαν δὲ αὐτὴν φησὶ, διότι κ. μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἦν ἂν, αὐτὴ δὲ ἐμελλε γίνεσθαι, μὴ οὕσα πρότερον δηλαδὴ. ὅσον οὖν πρὸς τὴν αἰδίον ὑπαρξιν τοῦ υἱοῦ, μέλλουσα ἦν ἡ οἰκουμένη. And nearly so Chrys., but not so plainly.

This last-mentioned view is by far the best, agreeing as it does with the connexion, for he has been speaking of the gospel above,—with the usus loquendi,—with the whole subject of the Epistle.

The word μέλλουσαν has by some been supposed to be used "ex prospectu veteris Test. prophetico in Novum Test.," as Bengel, who again says, "*Futurus dicitur, non quin jam sit, sed quia olim prædictus*." And so Bleek (as an additional reason why the word was used, besides that the completion of the state is yet to come), al. I should be disposed, standing as the expression does here without emphasis, to regard μέλλουσαν rather as a well-known and well-understood designation of the latter dispensation, here technically adjoined, than as requiring minute explanation in this place. All reference to the future need not be excluded: we Christians are so eminently "prisoners of hope," that the very mention of such a designation would naturally awaken a thought of the glories to come: but this reference must not be pressed as having any prominence. With this latter view agrees in the main that of Delitzsch, which I have seen since this note

τις λέγων 'Τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, ὅτι εἰ μιμηθήσκη αὐτοῦ, ἡ ^{f Psa. viii. 4—}
^{g μίμν., ch. xiii. 3 only. Isa. lxii. 6.}

6. for *τις*, *τις* (as LXX-A) C¹[P] lect-2 tol D-lat copt [Euthal-ms] Damasc.

was first written. He concurs with Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erf. ii. 23, in requiring a more concrete sense for the words, and understands them to point to the new world of Redemption, as distinguished from the old world of Creation, which by reason of sin is subject to death and decay. So that μέλλουσα is not used from the O. T. standing-point, but from the N. T. also, and points to the times of the Messiah in their ideal perfection which shall one day be realized), of which we are speaking (which forms the subject of our present argument: viz. that urged in vv. 1—4. The sense is strictly *present*; not past (see Grot. above), nor future ("enallage temporis; de quo in sequenti testimonio loquemur," as Vatablus). Bleek has here some excellent remarks: "As regards the whole thought, the non-subjection of the new order of the world to angels, it respects partly what is already present, partly what we have yet to wait for. Certainly, here and there in the N. T. history angels are mentioned: but they come in only as transitory appearances, to announce or to execute some matter which is specially entrusted to them: they never appear as essential agents in the introduction of the kingdom of God, either in general, or in particular: they do not descend on earth as preaching repentance, or preparing men to be received into God's kingdom. This is done by *men*, first and chiefly by Him who is Son of Man *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, and after Him by the disciples whom He prepared for the work. Even the miraculous conversion of Paul is brought about not by angels, but by the appearing of the Lord Himself. Our author has indeed in ch. i. 14, designated the angels as fellow-workers in the salvation of men: but only in a serving capacity, never as working or imparting salvation by independent agency, as does the Son of Man in the first place, and then in a certain degree his disciples also. So that we cannot speak with any truth of a subjection of this new order of things to the angels. Rather, even by what we see at present, does it appear to be subjected to the Redeemer Himself. And this will ever more and more be the case; for,—according to the prophetic declaration of the Psalm,—the whole world shall be put under His feet (ver. 8). Thus, by reminding them of the will of God declared in the holy Scriptures, does the Writer meet at the same time the objections of those of his readers and countrymen, to

whom perhaps this withdrawal of the agency of the angels with the introduction and growing realization of the new order of things might appear an important defect").

6.] But ("δέ introduces a contrast to a preceding negative sentence frequently in our Epistle: cf. ch. iv. 13, 15; ix. 12; x. 27; xii. 13. It makes a more sharply marked contrast than ἀλλά, as our aber or vielmehr as compared with sonst, denn." Bleek. Cf. Thuc. i. 125, ἐνῆναι τὸς μὲν οὐ διετρίβη, ἔλασσον δέ: ib. 5, οὐκ ἔχοντός πω αἰσχύνῃ τούτου τοῦ ἔργου, φέροντος δέ τι καὶ δόξης μᾶλλον: id. iv. 86, οὐκ ἐπὶ κακῷ, ἐπ' ἐλευθερώσει δὲ τῶν Ἑλλήνων παρελήλυθα: Herod. ix. 8, οὐκ ἀποτετείχιστο, ἐργάζοντο δέ: and see many other examples in Hartung, Partikellehre, i. 171. δέ then here introduces the positive in contradistinction to the negative sentence preceding. An ellipsis follows it, to be supplied in the thought, 'it is far otherwise, for' . . .) one somewhere (no inference can be drawn from this indefinite manner of citation, either that the Writer was quoting from memory, as Koppe, Schulz, al., or that he did not know who was the author of the Psalm, as Grot. Rather may we say, that it shews he was writing for readers familiar with the Scriptures, and from whom it might well be expected that they would recognize the citation without further specification. He certainly is not quoting from memory, seeing that the words agree exactly with the LXX: and Ps. viii. both in the Heb. and LXX has a superscription indicating that it was written by David. Chrys. says, τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ οἶμαι τὰ κρύπτειν κ. μὴ τίθεναι τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἀλλ' ὥς περιφερομένην κ. κατὰ δὴλον οὖσαν εἰσάγειν, δεικνύοντός ἐστιν αὐτοὺς σφόδρα ἐμείρους εἶναι τῶν γραφῶν. And Thl., οὐ λέγει τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ εἰπόντος ὅτε πρὸς ἐπιστήμονας τῶν γραφῶν διαλεγόμενος. Bleek quotes numerous instances of the same formula citandi from Philo, as applied both to Scripture writers and profane authors. Thus De Ebrietate, § 14, vol. i. p. 365 end, εἶπε γὰρ ποῦ τις, viz. Abraham, in Gen. xx. 12: De Opif. Mund. § 5, p. 5, ὅπερ καὶ τῶν ἀρχαίων εἶπέ τις, viz. Plato: al. And our Writer has again, ch. iv. 4, εἴρηκε γὰρ σου περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης οὕτως, viz. Gen. ii. 2. In all such cases the indefiniteness is designed and rhetorical. We can hardly infer, with Bleek and De Wette, that the Writer meant to express his feeling that

h = Matt. xxv. υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου, ὅτι ἡ ἐπισκέπη αὐτόν; 7 ἡ λήλαττος αὐτόν
 36, 43. Luke
 i. 68. vii. 16. James i. 27. Sir. vii. 35. i ver. 9 John iii. 30 only. 1 Kings xxi. 15. Philo de Opif. § 29,
 vol. i. p. 21, ἀνθρώπος διὰ τὴν τάξιν ἡλάττωται.

the O. T. books had no human authors, but God Himself: for in this case, as Lünemann remarks, the personal *τις* would hardly have been used, but a passive construction adopted instead) testified (the word *διαμαρτυρέω* has in Attic law the technical sense of appearing as a witness previously to the admission of a cause into court, for the plaintiff or defendant, to substantiate or oppugn its admissibility: so Harpocration, *πρὸ τοῦ εἰσαχθῆναι τὴν δίκην εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον, ἐξῆν τῷ βουλομένῳ διαμαρτυρῆσαι ὡς εἰσαγωγίμους ἐστὶν ἡ δίκη, ἢ οὐκ εἰσαγωγίμους*. Hence the deponent middle, *διαμαρτύρομαι*, is to *call in*, or *invoke witnesses* to the justice of one's cause or truth of one's assertion. And thus it acquires its less proper senses of *conjuring*, *earnestly beseeching*, on the one hand: and *affirming*, *positively asserting*, either absolutely, as here, or with an accusative of reference, on the other. Both these two are found in the N. T. See *reff.*: the former occurs chiefly in the pastoral Epistles, the latter in *reff.* Acts, 1 Thess., Jer.), *saying* (this seems the proper place for a few remarks on the sense of the citation which follows, and on the connexion of thought in the rest of the chapter. The general import of the *eighth Psalm* may be described as being, to praise Jehovah for His glory and majesty, and His merciful dealing with and exaltation of mankind. All exegesis which loses sight of this general import, and attempts to force the Psalm into a direct and exclusive prophecy of the personal Messiah, goes to conceal its true prophetic sense, and to obscure the force and beauty of its reference to Him. This has been done by Bleek and others, who have made 'the Son of Man' a direct title here of Christ. It is MAN who in the Psalm is spoken of, in the common and most general sense: the care taken by God of *him*, the lordship given to *him*, the subjection of God's works to *him*. This high dignity he lost, but this high dignity he has regained, and possesses potentially in all its fullness and glory, restored and for ever secured to him. How? and by whom? By one of his own race, the MAN Christ Jesus. Whatever high and glorious things can be said of man, belong *de proprio jure* to Him only, *propria personā* to Him only, but derivatively to us His brethren and members. And this is the great key to the interpretation of all such sayings as these: whatever belongs to man by the constitution of his nature, belongs *κατ'*

ἐξοχήν to that MAN, who is the constituted HEAD of man's nature, the second Adam, who has more than recovered all that the first Adam lost. To those who clearly apprehend and firmly hold this fundamental doctrine of Christianity, the interpretation of ancient prophecy, and the N. T. application of O. T. sayings to Christ, become a far simpler matter than they ever can be to others. And so here, it is to MAN, not to angels, that the 'world to come' is subjected. This is the argument: and, as far as the end of ver. 8, it is carried on with reference to *man*, properly so called. There is *here* as yet no personal reference to our Lord, who is first introduced, and that in his lower personal human Name, at ver. 9. This has been missed, and thus confusion introduced into the argument, by the majority of Commentators. To hold that our Lord is from the first intended by *ἄνθρωπος* and *υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου* here, is to disturb altogether the logical sequence, which runs thus: 'It is *not to angels* that He has subjected the latter dispensation, but to *man*. Still, we do not see man in possession of this sovereignty. No; but we do see Jesus, whose humiliation fulfilled the conditions of manhood, crowned with glory and honour, and thus constituted the Head of our race, so that His death and sufferings were our deliverance and our perfecting. And for this to be so, the Sanctifier and the sanctified must be all of one race.' And the rest of the chapter is spent in laying forth with inimitable beauty and tenderness the necessity and effect of Jesus being thus made like us. The whole process of this second chapter stands without parallel for tender persuasiveness amidst the strictest logical coherence. And yet both of these are concealed and spoiled, unless we take these words of the Psalm, and the argument founded on them, of man generally, and then, and not till then, of Jesus, as man like ourselves. And so Clem. alex. (Strom. iv. 3, pp. 566 f. P), Chrys., Thl., Thdr. (τὸ δὲ "τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος" εἰρηται μὲν περὶ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως, ἀρμόττει δὲ τῇ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἀπαρχῇ, ὡς οἰκείουμένη τὰ πάσης τῆς φύσεως. See also on the Psalm): so Pellicanus, Calvin, Piscator, Schlichting, Grot., Jansen, Bengel, and almost all the moderns, including Delitzsch. The principal upholders of the other view are Beza (in part), Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, and the Lutheran Commentators, and recently Bleek), **What is man** (some, e. g. Kuinoel, have understood this

^k βραχύ τι ¹ παρ' ἀγγέλους, δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ^m ἔστεφάνωσας ^k = (see note) ver. 9. John vi. 7. 1 Kings xvi. 29. 2 Kings xix. 36. 1 = ch. i. 4 reff. m ver. 9. 2 Tim. ii. 5 only. Ps. v. 12.

to mean, "How great, how noble, is man; who even amongst the immensity of all these heavenly works of God, yet is remembered and visited of Him!" but against this are the words here used in the Heb.: וְיָזַק in the first member of the parallel, and $\text{וְיָזַק$ in the second, both betokening man on his lower side, of weakness and inferiority. There can be little doubt that the ordinary view is right—not '*quantus est homo*,' but '*quantulus est homo*.' This agrees far better also with the wonder expressed at God's thinking of and visiting him, below), that thou art mindful of him (i. e. objectively,—as shewn by Thy care of him), or (in the Heb. וְיָזַק is here doubtless substituted for it by the LXX, to indicate that the second member of the parallelism does not point to another subject additional to the first. Bleek is hardly right, when he says, that the וְיָזַק has *here* a meaning somewhat modified from *καὶ*, as bringing out more definitely 'the Son of Man,' the Messiah, who follows. For (see above), the thought of Him is as yet in the background,—nay, carefully kept back; and the reference as yet to man generally) the son of man (proceeding on the same view as that given above, it would be irrelevant here to enter on an enquiry as to the application of this title to our Lord, by others and by Himself,—inasmuch as it is not here appropriated to Him, but used of any and every son of Adam. It is true, our thoughts at once recur to Him on reading the words—but, if we are following the train of thought, only as their ulterior, not as their immediate reference), that Thou visitest (reff.: the common word by which the LXX express the Heb. וְיָזַק , and almost always in a good sense (see exceptions, Jer. v. 9, 29 al., in Trommius). The good sense is never departed from in the N. T. It is often found in the classics: e. g. in Ajax's celebrated speech, Soph. Aj. 854, δ θάνατε θάνατε, νῦν μ' ἐπισκέψαι μολών: Eur. Heracl. 869, δ Ζεῦ, χρόνῳ μὲν τὰμ' ἐπεσκέψω κακά. It is very commonly used of a physician or other visiting the sick; so Xen. Cyr. v. 4. 10, ω s ἐπισκέψαιτο τὸν Γαδάταν πῶς ἔχει ἐκ τοῦ τραύματος: Mem. iii. 11. 10. See Palm and Rost's Lex.) him? 7.] Thou madest him a little lower than the angels (Heb., $\text{וְיָזַק מִמְּנוֹתַיִם מֵאֲנֹכְחַיִם$: which is literally, "Thou lettest him be little inferior to God." "רָחַק in Kal betokens 'to be without,' 'to fall short of,' and has, like

all other verbs of abounding and wanting, the thing wanted in the accusative: see Gesen. § 135. 3. b. The causative Pihel, 'to make or let want,' takes consequently a double accusative, of the person (here וְיָזַק) and of the thing (here וְיָזַק): see Gesen. § 136. 1. וְיָזַק is usually taken comparative, 'in comparison of God:' according to Hupfeld, it is properly partitive, 'of God:' of the attributes which constitute the essence of God." De Wette: and thus also Calvin: "Tot decoribus ornatos esse dicit ut eorum conditio divina et celestis gloria non longe sit inferior." But when De W. goes on, in treating of וְיָזַק , to say that some understand it, *with the LXX*, of time, and refers to Heb. ii. 6, 7 to confirm this, I must venture to doubt, though I find the same very generally assumed (e. g. by Calvin,—"Videtur apostolus verba trahere in diversum sensum quam intellexerit David. Nam βραχύ τι videtur ad tempus referre ut sit paulisper, et imminutionem intelligit quum exanimatus fuit Christus, et gloriam ad resurrectionis diem restringit, quum David generaliter extendat ad totam hominis vitam." And then he defends this method of quotation on the ground of there being "nihil incommodi si allusiones in verbis quaerat ad ornandam praesentem causam." Similarly Schlichting, Grotius, Hammond, Limborch, and most of the moderns: and, maintaining the sense of time in the Psalm also, Beza, Gerhard, Calov., Peirce, Michaelis, al.), whether this is so certain after all. The expression βραχύ τι is used both in the classics and in Hellenistic Greek, just as much of space and quantity, as of time; as the following examples (besides reff.) will shew, gathered from Wetst., Bleek, and from various indices: Hippocrat. de Natur. Hominum i., τὸ μὲν ὅλον βιβλίον σχεδὸν εἰς χ' στίχους ἢ βραχύ τι ἦττον ἐκτεταμένον: Thucyd. i. 63, βραχὺ μὲν τι προῆλθον ὡς βοηθήσοντες: 2 Kings xvi. 1, καὶ Δαυεὶδ παρῆλθε βραχὺ τι ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώας: Galen, de Usu Part. xiv., ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ διαπλάσει βραχὺ τι πλην-μεληθῇ: id. de Facult. Med. Simpl. v., ὑπερβάλλουσιν βραχὺ τι ῥητίνῃ κ. πίττῃ: ib. vi., φαίνεται μὲν γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ βραχὺ τι τὸ δριμύ, πλείστον δὲ τὸ πικρόν. Also Plato, Legg. x. p. 906 B, βραχὺ δέ τι καὶ τῆς ἅν τις τῶν τοιούτων ἐνοικοῦν ἡμῖν σαφές ἴδωι. It is used of time in Luke xxii. 58: Acts v. 34; xxvii. 28: Isa. lvii. 17. This being the case, I do not see why it should be at once set down that the LXX or our Writer

ⁿ Luke x 17, ^{20.} Rom. ^{viii. 20.} ¹ Cor. xv. 27 (from 1. c.) ¹ Pet. iii. 22 Ps. xvii. 47. Matt. xiii. 41. cf. fr. ^o Matt. xxii. 43. ^q ch. i. 3 reff. ^{Mark vi. 11.} ^{Rev. xii. 1.} ^p ch. iii. 15. ^{viii. 13.} ^{see} ^r = Acts xiv. 17. ¹ Macc. i. 48. ^{see} ^{ch. vi. 1.} ^{ABCDK} ^{LMPN} ^{a b c d e} ^{f g h k l} ^{m n o} ^{17. 47}

7. rec at end ins καὶ κατέστησας αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου (prob addn from LXX), with ACD¹M[P]J^h b m 17 latt [Syr(ed-widm)] syr-w-ast [copt æth arm Euthal-ms] Thdr̄t Sedul: om BD³KL rel Syr-mss-eedd Chr Damasc (C^h Thl.

8. rec γὰρ bef τῷ, with ACKL[P] rel [Chr Euthal-ms Thdr̄t]: txt BDM^h. τὰ πάντα bef υποτ. αὐτῷ D syr [copt].—om αὐτῷ B D-lat [arm-usc: ins syr-w-ob].

necessarily referred it to time, either here or in ver. 9: see below. So also Kuinoel, Heinrichs, Wahl, and Bretschneider. The only point remaining for discussion is ἀγγέλους, the LXX rendering of עֲמָלָאִים, and the meaning understood also by the Chaldee paraphrast. The best Hebrew scholars seem to agree that it represents, not the personal God, but the abstract qualities of Godhead, in which all that is divine, or immediately connected with the Deity, is included. This, as Hupfeld himself confesses, the angels may well be, in so far as they may be called עֲמָלָאִים, or עֲמָלָאִים בְּרִי. If so, then the rendering of the LXX and our text is, though not exhaustive of the original, yet by no means an inaccurate one. The angelic nature, being the lowest of that which is divine and heavenly, marks well the terminus just beneath which man is set. And it must be remarked, that the stress of the argument here is not on this mention of the angels, but on the assertion of the sovereignty of man. The verb ἐλαττοῦν is in frequent classical use: see Palm and Rost's Lex.: and notice the parallel from Philo in reff.: thou crown-**edst him with glory and honour** (I must remind the reader of what has been said before; that the quotation is adduced *here* not of the Messiah but of *man*, and that on this the whole subsequent argument depends. With this view vanish the difficulties which have been raised about the original and the here-intended meaning of this clause. It is, in fact, a further setting forth of the preceding one. Man, who was left not far behind the divine attributes themselves, was also invested with kingly majesty on earth, put into the place of God Himself in sovereignty over the world. That this has only been realized in the man Jesus Christ is not brought out till below, and forms the central point of the argument. Hupfeld remarks, that עֲמָלָאִים בְּרִי, here rendered δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ, is a common expression for the divine majesty, and thence for the kingly, as a reflection of the divine: and the crowning represents the kingly majesty, with which man is adorned as with a kingly crown: Calv., "Decoratum esse honoris insignibus quæ

non longe a divino fulgore absint"): 8.] thou didst put (the Heb. is *perfect*: on which Hupfeld remarks, "The imperfect is at first continued from the foregoing verses, but in the concluding sentence all is finished with the perfect עָמַלְתָּ, and treated as a standing arrangement and permanent ordering of things: 'all things hast thou put under his feet.'" So that our E. V., though imperfectly representing the Greek, is true to the original Heb.) all things under his feet (these words form in the Heb. and LXX the second member of a parallelism, the first of which, καὶ κατέστησας αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα τῶν χειρῶν σου, is found indeed in our rec. text, but (see var. readd.) must be omitted on critical principles. The probable cause why the Writer omitted it, has been discussed by Bleek. He thinks that it was unnecessary to the argumentation, the latter clause expressing more definitely the same thing. This he gathers, believing the whole to apply to our Saviour: but the same will hold good on our understanding of the passage also.

The words themselves are plain. Universal dominion is bestowed on man by his constitution as he came from God. That that bestowal has never yet been realized, is the next step of the argument: the Redeemer being at present kept out of sight, but by and by to be introduced as the real fulfiller of this high destiny of man, and on that account, incarnate in man's nature. It is, as Ebrard remarks, astonishing that a thorough Commentator like Bleek should have so entirely misread and misunderstood the logical connexion of so clear a passage: while he himself confesses, that it looks as if the Person were first introduced in ver. 9, to whom vv. 6, 7, have been pointing: and yet denies that in ver. 6 ὁ ἄνθρωπος can mean 'man-kind.' Besides all other objections, on Bleek's view, the question τί ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος κ.τ.λ. loses all appropriate meaning. The connexion was first laid out by Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erfüll. ii. 23 ff.: Schriftbeweis i. 185—188; ii. 1. 38 ff., and is adopted by Ebrard and Delitzsch).

For (Bleek thinks that the γὰρ rather repeats the former γὰρ, ver. 5, than has any

αὐτῷ ὁ ἀνυπότακτον ὡς νῦν δὲ οὕτω ὁρῶμεν αὐτῷ ὅτι τὰ πάντα ὡς ἡμεῖς ἴδμεν
 ὡς ὑποτεταγμένα. ὅτι τὸν δὲ ὡς βραχὺ τι παρ' ἀγγέλων

1 Tim. i. 9.
 Tit. i. 6, 10
 only τ.
 ver. 6 (reff.).

logical force of its own here. This peculiar use of γάρ, he says, is characteristic of our Epistle: see ch. iv. 2, 3; iv. 15; v. 1; vii. 12, 13: see his vol. i. p. 330. Hofmann however protests strongly against this view (Weissag. ii. 26, &c. as above), holding the γάρ to be ratiocinative, and justificative of the Psalm, as referring back to Gen. i. 28 to substantiate the ὑπέταξας. But, as Delitzsch remarks, this would be but to prove *idem per idem*; for the ὑπέταξας itself necessarily refers back to Gen. i. 28. He therefore prefers Bleek's view, which is also that of Tholuck, De Wette, and Winer,—that γάρ grounds, or rather begins to ground, that already asserted in ver. 5) in that he (viz. God: not the writer of the Psalm, as Heinrichs: unless indeed we are to understand ὑποτάξαι to mean εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὑποτέτακται, as St. Paul expresses it 1 Cor. xv. 27: but the other is much simpler, more analogous to usage, and more in the sense of the Psalm, which is a direct address to God) put all things (the universe: not πάντα, as before, merely, but τὰ πάντα) under him (Man, again: not, Christ: see above, and remarks at the end of the verse) He left (aor. as in E. V.; not perfect, which would be ἀφείκεν) nothing ("Nec coelestia videtur excepisse nec terrestria," Primasius: and so Estius, al. Possibly: and in the application itself, certainly: but we can hardly say that such was his thought here. The idea that angels are especially here intended, has arisen from that misconception of the connexion, which I have been throughout endeavouring to meet) unsubjected (see reff. where, as in *viol* ἀνυπότακτοι, Symm. 1 Kings ii. 12, it is in the sense of rebellious. The word belongs to later Greek: we have, Arrian, Epictet. ii. 10, ταύτη (to the will of man) τὰ ἅλλα ὑποτεταγμένα, αὐτῇ δ' ἀδούλων κ. ἀνυπότακτον: Porphy. Oneirocrit. 196, ἀνυπότακτος ἔσται πᾶσι: Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hæc. § 1, vol. i. p. 473. ἀνυποτάκτω φορῶ χρήσθαι: and in Polyb. several times, ἀνυπότακτος διήγησις, "narratio quæ non habet notitiam antecedentem in animo discentis cui ceu fundamento et basi innitatur." Casaubon) to him: but (contrast bringing out the exception) now ('ut nunc est: in the present condition of things: not strictly temporal, but as the νῦν, ch. xi. 16, and the νυνί, ch. ix. 26) we see not yet (cf. on the whole, 1 Cor. xv. 24—27) all things (τὰ π., again) put under him (the αὐτῷ in all three places referring to MAN: man has not yet attained

his sovereignty. That the summing up of manhood in Christ is in the Writer's mind, is evident throughout, and that he wishes it to be before his readers' minds also; but the gradual introduction of the humiliation and exaltation of Christ in His humanity is marred by making all this apply personally to Him. Manhood, as such, is exalted to glory and honour, and waiting for its primæval prerogative to be fully assured, but it is IN CHRIST, and in Him alone, that this is true: and in Him it is true, inasmuch as He, being of our flesh and blood, and having been Himself made perfect by sufferings, and calling us His brethren, can lead us up through sufferings into glory, freed from guilt by His sacrifice for our sins.)

9) We do not see man, &c.: but (δέ, strong contrast again: 'but rather'—see on ver. 6) him who is made (better than 'was,' or 'hath been, made'; His humanity in its abstract position being in view) a little (not necessarily, here either, of time (as Delitzsch here, though not above): nor are we at liberty to assume such a rendering: though of course it is difficult to say, when the same phrase has two analogous meanings both applicable, as this, how far the one may have accompanied the other in the Writer's mind) lower than (the) angels, we behold (notice the difference between the half-involuntary ὁρῶμεν above, the impression which our eyes receive from things around us,—and the direction and intention of the contemplating eye (here, of faith: cf. ch. iii. 19; x. 25) in βλέπομεν), (namely) Jesus (Lünemann is quite right against Ebrard here. The latter would take the words thus: "But we behold Jesus (object) τὸν βρ. τι παρ' ἁγγ. ἡλαττ. (adjectival attribute to 'Ἰησοῦν), ἐστειφανωμένον (predicate).") But this would be to throw 'Ἰησοῦν into a position of emphasis: and would have been expressed 'Ἰησοῦν δὲ τὸν κ.τ.λ., or, τὸν δὲ βρ. τ. π. ἁγγ. ἡλ. 'Ἰησοῦν βλέπομεν. As it is, 'Ἰησοῦν, standing as it does behind the verb, is, as Lünemann well remarks, altogether unemphasized, and is merely an explicative addition, to make it clear who is intended by τὸν βρ. τι παρ' ἁγγ. ἡλαττωμένον. So that this latter clause is the object, διὰ τοῦτο. (see below) the predicate, and 'Ἰησοῦν an appositional elucidation of the object. So Hofmann now, Schriftb. i. 187. Formerly he took it as Ebrard; Weissag. u. Erfüll. ii. 28. Delitzsch takes 'Ἰησοῦν as the object and τὸν ἡλαττωμένον κ.τ.λ. as the appositional clause. But I prefer as above: see more

u see διό, Phil. ^ε ἡλαττωμένον βλέπομεν Ἰησοῦν ^υ διὰ τὸ ^{vw} πάθημα τοῦ
 ii. 9.
 v ver 10. ch.
 x 32 elsw. Paul (Rom. vii 5 al⁸) and 1 Pet. (i. 11 al³) only t.
 13 al. Winer, edn. 6, § 30. 2. β.

w gen., John v 29. 2 Cor. ix. a b c d e
 LMPN
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

below), on account of his suffering of death (it has been much doubted whether these words belong, 1. to the foregoing clause, *βραχύ τι παρ. ἀγγ. ἡλαττ.*, or, 2. to the following, *δόξη κ. τιμῇ ἐστεφανώμενον*. The former connexion is assumed without remark by the ancient Commentators: so Origen in Joann. tom. ii. 6 (vol. iv. p. 62), *ἀγγέλων ἐλάττονα διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου*: Augustine, contra Maximin. ii. 25, vol. viii. (misquoted in Bleek), „Eum autem modico minus quam angelos minoratum vidimus Jesum propter passionem mortis. Non ergo propter naturam hominis, sed propter passionem mortis.” Chrys., Thdrt. (see below), (not Thl. as Bleek: see below), Beza, Schlichting, Justiniani, a-Lapide, Cameron (but interpreting it “per illud tempus quo passus est mortem”), Calov., Limborch, Owen, Michaelis, Baumgarten, Semler, Dindorf, Wakefield. And these interpret the words two ways: α. on account of the suffering of death, i. e. because He has suffered death (οὐ τῇ φύσει τῆς θεότητος τῶν ἀγγέλων ἡλάττωται, ἀλλὰ τῷ πάθει τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος, Thdrt.),—thus making *βραχύ τι* refer to the time of His sufferings and death, or as Chrys. (τὸ βραχύ αὐτῷ ἂν ἀρμόσειε . . . τῷ τρεῖς ἡμέρας γενομένῳ ἐν τῷ ᾄδῳ μόνῳ), αl., to the three days of His being in the grave: β. for the sake of the suffering of death, = *eis τὸ πάσχειν τ. θ.* So Aug. above, and most of the foregoing list. But, 2. the latter connexion, with the following clause, is adopted by Theophylact (as Thl. has been said by Bleek to maintain the other connexion, I give his note entire: σπουδάζει δεῖξαι τὰ ρηθέντα τῷ χριστῷ προσαρμόζοντα, καὶ φησιν ὅτι εἰ καὶ τὰ πάντα ὑπέταξεν οὐπω δοκεῖ ἀρμόζειν αὐτῷ, καίτοι ἐδείξαμεν ὅτι πάντως καὶ τοῦτο ἐκβήσεται. ἀλλ’ οὖν τὸ βραχύ τι ἡλαττώσθαι παρ’ ἀγγέλους, τοῦτ’ ἀρμόζει ἢ ἡμῖν. καὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν τρεῖς ἡμέρας γεγονώς ἐν τῷ ᾄδῳ ὡς ἀνθρωπος, βραχύ ἡλάττωται τὸν ἀγγέλων, ἅτε μὴδ’ ὅλως θανάτῳ ὑπαγομένον ἐκείνων ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ πολὺ φθειρόμενοι, οὐ βραχύ ἀλλὰ πάμπαν αὐτῶν ἡλαττώμεθα. καὶ τὸ δόξῃ καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανώσθαι διὰ τὸ πάθος, ἐκείνῳ μᾶλλον ἀρμόζει ἢ ἡμῖν. πάθημα δὲ θανάτου εἰπών, τὸν ἀληθῆ θάνατον ἐδήλωσεν. οὐ φαντασία γὰρ θάνατον, ἀλλὰ πάθημα ᾧ ἐνεργον. ἀνεμνησε δὲ τοῦ σταυροῦ κ. τοῦ θανάτου, ἵνα πείσῃ αὐτοὺς γενναίως φέρειν τὰς θλίψεις, *eis τὸν διδάσκαλον ἀφορώντας*. ἀλλὰ καὶ δόξα, φησί, καὶ τιμὴ ὁ σταυρὸς

αὐτῷ γέγονεν’ οὐκοῦν καὶ οὖν αἱ θλίψεις κ. τὰ πάθη τί οὖν ἀποπηδᾶτε τῶν στεφανούντων; ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ σοῦ τοῦ δούλου ἔπαθε σὺ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀνέχῃ θλιβῆναι τοῦ δεσπότη; Here, although he partially adopts the notion of *βραχύ τι* referring to the three days, it is evident both from the words which I have noted by different type, and by the application which he makes to ourselves, that he joins *διὰ τὸ πάθ. τ. θ.* with *δόξῃ κ. τιμῇ ἐστεφανώμενον*, not with the preceding clause), Luther, Calvin, Estius, Grot., Seb.-Schmidt, Bengel, Wetst., Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Bleek, Tholuck, Ebrard, Lüdemann, Delitzsch, al. The question must be determined by the arrangement of the words, and by the requirements of the context. And both these seem to require the latter, not the former connexion. The words *διὰ τὸ πάθ. τ. θ.* are emphatic; they are taken up again in the next sentence by *διὰ παθημάτων τελειῶσαι* (which words themselves are a witness that suffering and exaltation, not suffering and degradation, are here connected). But emphatic they could not be in the former connexion, coming as they would only as an explicatory clause, after *βραχύ τι παρ’ ἀγγ. ἡλαττωμένον*. Again, the former connexion hardly satisfies the *διὰ* with an accusative; certainly not if the sense α., because *He has suffered death*, be taken; and if the other, β., we should have expected rather *eis τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θ.*, or *eis τὸ παθεῖν τὸν θ.* Whereas the latter connexion entirely satisfies the context, the sufferings of Christ being treated of as necessary to His being our perfect Redeemer: entirely also fulfils the requirements of *διὰ* with an accusative; wherein, which is no small consideration in its favour, it is in strict analogy with the construction in ref. Phil., *γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. διὰ καὶ ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸν ὑπερύψωσεν κ.τ.λ.* And this connexion will be made even clearer by what will be said on the next clause, *ὄρας κ.τ.λ.*), crowned with glory and honour (viz. at His exaltation, when God exalted Him to His right Hand: not, as some (e.g. Hofmann, ubi supra: see also Schriftbeweis i. 271, um des Lobes willen ist Jesus mit der Berufsherrlichkeit und Berufshöhe gefüllt), at His incarnation, or His establishment as Saviour of the world: see above, ver. 7): in order that (how is this *ὅπως* logically constructed? In answering the question, we may at once dismiss all impossible senses of *ὅπως*, invented to

^ω θανάτου δόξη καὶ τιμῇ [×] ἐστεφανωμένον, ὅπως ^γ χάριτι ^{π ver. 7.}
dat., Rom.
 iii. 24. xi. 6. 1 Cor. xv. 10. Eph. ii. 5, 8. Tit. iii. 7. P. H.

9. for χάριτι, χωρίς M 67² Syr-mss ("The common text of the Syriac has χάριτι. This reading has been considered to be Monophysite; and another which is found in some mss and in the edn of Tremellius, is equally supposed to be preferred by the Nestorians, 'for he apart from God (or except God) should taste death,' &c. But this latter reading is much more ancient than all questions about the Eutychian and Nestorian controversy; it is simply the rendering of χωρίς θεοῦ found in some authorities. Nestorians might prefer this, but they did not (as Ec Thl say) invent it." Treg. in Horne iv. 262) [syr-ms] Orig(χωρίς θεοῦ . . ἢ ὑπὲρ ἐν τισι κεῖται . . ἀντιγρ. χάριτι θεοῦ, and elsw ὅπως χάριτι ἢ χωρίς θεοῦ κ.τ.λ.) Thdor-mops(expr: γελιοτάτον δὲ τι πάσχουσιν ἐνταῦθα τὸ χωρίς θεοῦ ἐναλλάττοντες καὶ ποιούντες χάριτι θεοῦ οὐ ποιεῖ-
 έχοντες τῇ ἀκολουθίᾳ τῆς γραφῆς κ.τ.λ.) Thdr², Ambr¹, Fulg¹, Vig-taps¹. (Storr Griesb Kuin Scholz Mey Tischd^f Delitzsch think that it may have been a marginal gloss on ver 8, arising from comparing οὐδεν ἀφηκ. αὐτῶ αὐντ. with 1 Cor xv. 27; and then erroneously taken into the text here: on the whole see note.)

escape the difficulty: such as the supposed ecclastic sense, "so that" (Erasm. (paraphr.), Valck., Kuinoel, &c.), "postquam mortem gustavit," Schleusner; &c. &c. ὅπως has no such ecclastic sense any where: and its temporal sense is altogether unexampled by the subjunctive mood. It can have here none but its constant telic sense: "in order that." And as to its dependence we must have recourse to no inversions of construction, but take it simply as we find it, however difficult. It depends then on the last clause, which clause it will be best to take in its entirety, διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένον. The full connexion we cannot enter into, till the three other questions arising out of our clause are disposed of: χάριτι θεοῦ—ὑπὲρ παντός—καὶ γεύσεται θανάτου) by the grace of God (here comes into question the very important various reading χωρίς θεοῦ, the authorities for which see in the digest. That it does not owe its origin to the Nestorians, whatever use they may have made of it, is evident from Origen reading and expounding it. In his time it was the prevalent reading, the present ἐν χάριτι θεοῦ being found only ἐν τισιν ἀντιγράφοις. Theodoret here, and on Eph. i. 10 (see below), knew of no other reading: nor did Ambrose, nor Fulgentius. Jerome on Gal. iii. 10 says, "Quia Christus gratia Dei, sive ut in quibusdam exemplaribus legitur, absque Deo, pro omnibus mortuus est." In the Greek Church, the Nestorians mostly held fast to the old reading, as favouring their views. It may be well to cite Theophylact on this point: οἱ δὲ Νεστοριανοὶ παραποιούντες τὴν γραφὴν φασί: "χωρίς θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντός γεύσεται θανάτου," ἵνα συστήσωσιν ὅτι ἐσταυρωμένῳ τῷ χριστῷ οὐ συνῆν ἡ θεότης, ἀτε μὴ καθ' ὑπόστασιν αὐτῷ ἡνωμένη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ σχῆσιν. πρὸς οὓς ὀρθόδοξός τις χλευάζων τὴν ἀνοησίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν: ὅτι ἐχέτω, ὡς φατε, ἡ γραφή, καὶ οὕτως

ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐστι τὸ λεγόμενον· χωρίς γὰρ θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντός ἄλλου ἀπέθανεν ὁ κύριος, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτῶν, ἵνα λύσῃ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐχθρὰν αὐτῶν καὶ χαρὰν αὐτοῖς περιποιήσῃται. And similarly Eusebius. In our copies of the Peschito this reading is not now found, but the passage runs "Nam ipse Deus per gratiam suam pro omni homine gustavit mortem" ("For He Aloha in his grace for every man hath tasted death," Etheridge's version): but (see digest) in certain mss., we have a combination of the readings, "Ipse enim excepto Deo per gratiam suam pro omni homine gustavit mortem," [but this combination appears to be due to Editors only, and not to mss.] Bleek adduces, from the 8th century, Anastasius Abbas, a writer of Palestine: "Absque Deo: sola enim divina natura non egebat." In modern times, the reading has been defended by Camerarius, Colomesius, Bengel, Ch. Fr. Schmid, Paulus, and more recently Ebrard and Baumgarten. Hofmann once defended it, Weissag. u. Erfüll. i. 92; but has now given it up;—Entstehungsgeschichte, u.s.w. p. 338. By those who have adopted it, it has been interpreted three different ways: 1. as Origen (ὑπὲρ πάντων χωρίς θεοῦ), Thdr². (πάντα γὰρ ὅσα κτιστὴν ἔχει τὴν φύσιν, ταύτης εἰδεῖτο τῆς θεραπείας· τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν ὅπως χωρίς θεοῦ ὑπὲρ παντός γεύσεται θανάτου. μόνῃ φησὶν ἡ θεὰ φύσις ἀνευδεῖς, τὰλλα δὲ πάντα τοῦ τῆς ἐνανθρωπήσεως εἰδεῖτο φαρμάκου), Thl. and Ec. (hypothetically, see above), and Ebrard; and in a modification, Bengel and Schmid ("Omne, præter Deum, Christo subjectum est," Beng. : in accordance with 1 Cor. xv. 27). 2. as Ambrose, Fulgentius, and the Nestorians, and Colomesius ("Ut divinitate tantisper deposita, ut homo mortem subiret pro omnibus"). 3. as Paulus and Baumgarten,—"forsaken of God," as witnessed by the cry on the cross. In considering the

ε = John x. 11, θεοῦ ὡς ὑπὲρ α παντὸς β γένεσθαι γ θανάτου. 10 δ Ἐπρεπεν
 15. 2 Cor. v. a so sing., ch. iii 4 iv. 12. v. 1, 13 vii 3. x. 11. xii. 11. b Matt xvi. 28 ii.
 15. 1 Tim. ii. c ch. vi 4, 5. 1 Pet. ii. 3 al. Job xx. 18 Ps xxxiii. 8 d Matt. iii. 15. 1 Cor. xi. 13 Eph. v. 3. 1 Tim. ii.
 4. Tit. ii. 1. ch. vii. 26 only. Ps. lxxiv. 1.

probability of this reading, as to, α. external evidence, and, β. internal probability, it must, α. be confessed, that such instances as this, where an important reading, prevalent in the early ages, is found only in two or three of our present mss., tend considerably to shake the trustworthiness of mere manuscript evidence as to the original text of the N. T., and to enhance the testimony of those sources which are anterior to any of our present mss., viz. the earlier Fathers. In treating of (β), we must deal with each of the assigned meanings separately. Of (1) it may be said, that however true in fact,—the thought that Jesus died for every rational being (παντὸς λογικοῦ as Origen), or for every thing (neut.), except God, is quite alien from the present context, where the sovereignty of MAN in the new world is the subject—of man, in and through the Son of man, Jesus Christ; cf. the πολλοὺς υἱοὺς ver. 10, τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου ver. 12; &c. &c. And as to (2), it is even more alien from the context, as it also is from the N. T. Christology. We have no analogous expression whereby to justify it, nor any safeguard against such a view being carried out at once into the bi-personality of the Nestorians. It is hardly to be imagined that the Writer here, with no end in view at all requiring such a severance of the two natures in Christ, should thus gratuitously have introduced a sentiment of the most novel and startling character. And with regard to (3) it may well be said, that we have no right to press the exclamation of our Redeemer in His agony to so bare and strong a dogmatic fact as that He really was χωρὶς θεοῦ on the cross. We no where find Himself so speaking, nor His Apostles: may the Writer of our Epistle would be the first to testify against such an understanding of his words: cf. ch. v. 7, and indeed our next verse here. So that it does not seem possible to assign to the words χωρὶς θεοῦ a meaning in accordance with the demands of the context, and the analogy of Scripture. This indeed would be no argument against a reading universally and unobjectionably attested by external authorities; but where no such attestation exists, may well be brought in to guide us to a decision. If so then, and we reject χωρὶς θεοῦ, how are we to understand the rec. reading, χάριτι θεοῦ? At all events we have strong Scripture analogy for such an expression. In Gal. ii. 21, the Apostle's confession of faith

in the Son of God, he says, οὐκ ἀθετῶ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ γὰρ διὰ νόμου δικαιώσιν, ἄρα χριστὸς δωρεὰν ἀπέθανεν. And in Rom. v. 8, we read, συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς (ὁ θεός), ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν. And in Titus ii. 11, ἐπεφάνη γὰρ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις. So that, in point of meaning, no difficulty need be found in the words. It was by the love and grace, the χρηστότης and φιλανθρωπία of the Father, that all Redemption was effected, and above all that one sacrifice which was the crowning act of Redemption. Bleek's account of the origin of the reading χωρὶς in a mistake of a scribe, copying an illegible χάριτι, and Origen's possessing this copy or one made from it, and the further progress of the reading being due to his mention of it,—is perhaps a shade more probable than that mentioned in the digest,—but at the same time far from satisfactory. I may mention, as a curious instance of the helplessness of those who read Scripture in a version only, that (see Bleek) Primasius and Thom. Aquinas, in the sentence "Ut gratia dei pro omnibus gustaret mortem," take "gratia dei" as nominative, and interpret it as a title of Christ) He might for (ὑπὲρ, 'on behalf of,' 'for the benefit of:' where this ordinary meaning of ὑπὲρ suffices, that of vicariousness must not be introduced. Sometimes, as e. g. 2 Cor. v. 15, it is necessary. But here clearly not, the whole argument proceeding not on the vicariousness of Christ's sacrifice, but on the benefits which we derive from His personal suffering for us in humanity; not on His substitution for us, but on His community with us) every man (is παντὸς neuter or masculine? and if the latter, to what to be referred? Origen (apparently, see above), Thdrt., Ec., Thl. (above), take it as neuter, and apply it either to all nature, or to all reasonable beings. The latter see discussed below. The former can hardly be here meant; for of such a doctrine, however true, there is no hint (see above on the reading χωρὶς θεοῦ, β. 1). Then taking παντὸς masculine, are we to understand it "for every one, angels included?" So Ebrard: but where do we find any such usage of πᾶς, absolutely put as here? And where in this chapter again is any room for the position, that Christ suffered death for angels? In the logical course of the argument, we have done with them, and are

γὰρ αὐτῷ *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ *δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, e Rom. xi. 26.
1 Cor. viii. 6.
Col. i. 16.
f ch. i. 3 reff.

now treating of man, and of Him who was made man to be our High Priest and advocate. And therefore of none other than man can this word παντός be here meant, in accordance indeed with its universal usage elsewhere. If it be asked, why παντός rather than πάντων, we may safely say, that the singular brings out, far more strongly than the plural would, the applicability of Christ's death to *each individual man*: and we may say that this again testifies to the sense 'every man,' as there would be no such reason for individualizing other rational beings, as there is for shewing that the whole nature of man, to which this promise of sovereignty is given, is penetrated by the efficacy of Christ's death) taste of death (reff. and so γεύσθαι frequently in the classics with other substantives, e.g. μόχθων Soph. Trach. 1103, πόνον Pind. Nem. v. 596, πένθους Eurip. Alcest. 1069, τῶν κακῶν Hecub. 379, δίστοῦ, ἀκακῆς δούρος Homer, τῆς ἀρχῆς, τῆς ἐλευθερίας Herod. iv. 147; vi. 5,—but never with θανάτου. So that Bleek infers it has come into the N. T. diction from the Heb. phrase, which is not uncommonly found in the Rabbinical writings. Some have seen in the phrase an allusion to the shortness and transitoriness of the Lord's death: so Chrys., καὶ κυρίως εἶπεν, ὑπὲρ παντός γεύσθαι θανάτου, καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀποθάνειν. ὥσπερ γὰρ ὅπως γευσάμενος, οὕτω μικρὸν ἐν αὐτῷ ποιήσας διάστημα, εὐθέως ἀνέστη: then, comparing Christ to a physician who first tastes his medicines to encourage the sick man to take them, adds, οὕτω καὶ ὁ χριστός, ἐπειδὴ πάντες ἄνθρωποι τὸν θάνατον ἔδεδοίκεσαν, πείθων αὐτοὺς κατατολμᾶν τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεγέυσαστο αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἔχων ἀνάγκην. And so Thl. and Ec., καλῶς δὲ τὸ γεύσθαι: οὐ γὰρ ἐνέμεινε τῷ θανάτῳ, ἀλλὰ μόνον αὐτὸν τρόπον τινὰ ἀπεγέυσαστο. And so many other Commentators, among whom Beza and Bengel find also the *verity* of His Death indicated in the words. But it is well answered (not by Calvin, as Bleek; for he says, "Quod Chrysostomus *gustare mortem* exponit, quasi summis labris delibare, eo quod Christus victor e morte emergerit, non refello neque improbo, quanquam nescio an adeo subtiliter loqui voluerit apostolus"), that in none of the places where the phrase appears, either in the N. T. or in the Rabbinical writings, does any such meaning appear to be conveyed. Nor again can we, as Bleek himself, understand the implication to be that

Christ underwent all the *bitterness* of death. But, as θανάτου has been just before mentioned, I cannot help regarding its position here behind the verb as throwing that verb into some little prominence, as θανάτου itself is this second time in a place of insignificance. Thus viewed, the phrase falls into exact accord with the general argument of the passage, that it became Christ, in order to be the great and merciful High Priest of humanity, to be perfected through human sufferings: and it forms in fact the first mention of this idea, and prepares the way for γάρ which follows. I would say then, that γεύσθαι must be regarded as slightly emphatic, and as implying the personal undergoing of death and entering into its suffering. And I doubt much, whether it will not be found that in the other passages where the phrase occurs, this personal suffering of death, though not boldly prominent, is yet within view, and agreeable to the context. And now, having considered the three points, χάριτι θεοῦ—ὑπὲρ παντός—and γεύσθαι θανάτου,—we return again to the question of the connexion of the ὅπως, with which this clause begins. We before stated that, avoiding all tortuous and artificial arrangements, we find it dependent on the former clause διὰ ἐστεφανωμένον. This exaltation, being the τελείωσις (see ver. 10) of Christ, was arrived at διὰ παθημάτων, and διὰ τὸ πάθημα τοῦ θανάτου—both by means of and on account of, His suffering of death. And this exaltation has made Him the divine Head of our humanity—the channel of grace, and the ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν. Without His exaltation, his death would not have been effectual. Unless he had been crowned with glory and honour, received to the right hand of the Father, and set in expectation of all things being put under his feet, His death could not have been, for every man, the expiation to him of his own individual sin. On the *triumphant issue* of His sufferings, their efficacy depends. And this I believe is what the sacred Writer meant to express. His glory was the consequence of His suffering of death;—arrived at through His suffering: but the applicability of His death to every man is the consequence of His constitution in Heaven as the great High Priest, in virtue of his blood carried into the holy place,—and the triumphant Head of our common humanity: which common humanity of Him and ourselves now becomes the subject

g Matt. xx. 28. § πολλοὺς ^h υἱοὺς εἰς ⁱ δόξαν ^k ἀγαγόντα, τὸν ^l ἀρχηγὸν
 Rom. viii. 29.
 ch. ix. 28.
 h = Rom. viii. 14 al. absol., Gal. iv. 6, 7. i = Rom. viii. 18. 1 Thess. ii. 12. 2 Thess. ii. 14.
 k = Rom. viii. 14. l Acts iii. 15. v. 31. ch. xii. 2 only. Isa. xxx. 4.

of further elucidation). 10.] For (the connexion with the foregoing, see above. The γάρ renders a reason why the result just introduced by the ὅπως should have been one which the χάρις θεοῦ contemplated) it became (as matter not only of decorum, but of sequence from the data,—‘was suitable to,’ ‘decebat:’ not as matter of absolute necessity, which was not the question here. “The expression here glances at those who found in a suffering and crucified Messiah something unsuitable to the Godhead; and expresses not merely a negative, that it was not unsuitable, not unworthy of God,—but at the same time the positive, that it was altogether correspondent to and worthy of His Being and His Wisdom and His Love, to take this course: that it is so shaped, that he who knows the being and attributes of God, might have expected it. And thus it is indirectly implied, that it was also the most suitable, and that any other way would have been less correspondent to the being and purpose of God. In this sense we have πρέπει τῷ θεῷ and similar formulæ often in Philo: e.g. Leg. Allegor. i. 15, vol. i. p. 53, τί οὖν λεκτέον; ὅτι πρέπει τῷ θεῷ φυτεῖν κ. οἰκοδομεῖν ἐν ψυχῇ τὰς ἀρετάς: De Incorrump. Mundi, § 13, vol. ii. p. 500, ἐμπρεπὲς δὲ θεῷ τὰ ἄμορφα μορφοῦν κ. τοῖς αἰσχίστοις περιτιθέναι θαυμαστά κάλλη. And so elsewhere also ἀρμόττει τ. θεῷ, πρεπῶδές ἐστιν, cf. Carpzov here.” Bleek; who has some excellent remarks on the lingering of the offence of the cross among these Jewish Christians, who, although their ideas of the glory and kingly triumph of the Messiah had been in a measure satisfied by the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, and their hopes awakened by the promise of future glory at His second coming,—yet, in the procrastination of this great event, felt their souls languishing, and the old stumbling-block of Christ’s sufferings recurring to their minds. To set forth then the way of suffering and the cross as one worthy of God’s high purpose, would be a natural course for the argument of the Writer to take) Him, for whom (cf. εἰς αὐτὸν in reff.) are all things (not only, “all those things which contribute to man’s salvation,” as Grot., al., but ‘the sum total of things,’ ‘the universe,’ as in the parallel passages. All created things are for God (see below), for His purpose and for His glory) and by whom (by whose will, and fiat, and agency, cf. ἐξ οὗ in ref. Rom.,

which perhaps would have been the expression here, had not the Writer preferred using the διὰ in its two senses: see below) are all things (who is intended? From the sequel of the sentence there can be no doubt that it is God the Father. For the subject of this clause is there said τελειῶσαι Christ; and this could be predicated of none but the Father Himself. That these expressions are found frequently used of the Son, need be no objection: whatever is thus said of Him as the End, and the Worker, in creation, may à fortiori be said of the Father who sent Him and of whose will He is the expression. As to the reason of this periphrasis here, Calvin well says: “Poterat uno verbo Deum appellare; sed admonere voluit pro optimo id habendum, quod statuit ipse ejus et voluntas et gloria rectus est omnium finis.” And not only this: in introducing the πρέπον of Christ’s sufferings by such a description of God, he reminds his readers that those sufferings also were δι’ αὐτόν—contributing to His end and His glory—and δι’ αὐτοῦ, brought about and carried through by His agency and superintendence. The words are referred to Christ by Theodoret (reading ἔπρεπε γὰρ αὐτόν), Primasius, al., taking τελειῶσαι neuter: Cramer refers this clause to Christ, and πολλὰ. v. εἰς δόξ. ἀγ. to the Father: Chr. Fr. Schmid refers αὐτῷ to the Father, and δι’ οὗ &c. to Christ: Paulus refers αὐτῷ δι’ ὃν τὰ π. to the Father, and then begins the reference to Christ with δι’ οὗ τ. π. None of these require a serious answer), bringing (a grave question arises: does this clause, πολ. v. εἰς δ. ἀγ., belong to the subject of the preceding, αὐτῷ, δι’ ὃν τ. π. κ. δι’ οὗ τ. π., or to the object of the following, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τ. σωτ. αὐτῶν? The latter is held by the Commentators mentioned above, who refer the former clause to Christ, and by Erasm. (paraphr.), Estius, Justiniani, Schöttg., Bengel, Pyle, and several others; recently also by Ebrard. It is argued that as τὸν δὲ βραχὺ τι παρ’ ἀγγέλους ἡλαττωμένον, above, ver. 9, was in apposition with Ἰησοῦν following, so is πολλοὺς υἱοὺς εἰς σωτηρίαν ἀγαγόντα with τὸν ἀρχηγὸν κ.τ.λ. here. At first sight, it forms an objection to this view, that the art. is expressed with ἡλαττωμένον, and not with ἀγαγόντα. And this objection is urged by Bleek. But as Lünemann has pointed out, it is not a valid one. Had the art. been expressed, then τὸν πολλὰ. v. εἰς δ. ἀγαγόντα and τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτ.

τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν διὰ ^m παθημάτων ⁿ τελειῶσαι. 11 ὁ ^m 2 Cor. i. 5, 7. Phil. iii.
 10. 1 Pet iv. 13. v 1+. n ch. v. 9. vii. 19, 28. ix. 9. x. 1, 14. xi. 40. xii. 23, 32. Luke xiii. 32. (see note.)

αὐτῶν would be co-ordinate clauses in apposition, the latter being slightly emphasized. Whereas with the art. omitted, the former clause is subordinate to the latter — 'the Captain of their salvation, while bringing many sons to glory.' The arrangement would indeed be exceedingly harsh, but not grammatically inadmissible. There are, however, serious objections to it. It would be contrary to all Scripture analogy, to represent us as *sons*, in relation to Christ. Nay, in the very next verses, the argument goes on to substantiate the community of our nature with Him by the fact of our being His *brethren*. And besides, on this hypothesis the sentence would contain little more than a tautology: πολλὰ υἱ. εἰς δόξ. ἀγ., and τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τ. σωτηρίας αὐτῶν, being in fact mere assertions of the same thing. So that there can hardly be a doubt that the true application of the clause is to God the Father, the subject of the preceding. And so Chrys., Thl., Ec., Erasm. (annot.), Luth., Calv., Schlichting, Grot., Limb., and many others, and recently Bleek, Lünemann, and Delitzsch. The accusative ἀγαγόντα, after αὐτῶν, will not surprise any Greek scholar: cf. Herod. i. 37, τὰ κάλλιστα . . . ἡμῖν ἦν, ἔς τε πολέμους κ. ἐς ἄγρας φοιτέοντας εὐδοκίμειν: vi. 109, ἐν σοι . . . ἔστι ἡ καταδουλώσαι Ἀθήνας, ἡ ἐλευθέραι ποιήσαντα μνημόσυνα λιπέσθαι . . . Thuc. ii. 39, περιγίγνεται ἡμῖν τοῖς τε μέλλουσιν ἀλγενοῖς μὴ προκαμπτεῖν, καὶ ἐς αὐτὰ ἐλθεῖναι μὴ ἀπολαμοτέρους τῶν ἀελ μοχθούτων φαίνεσθαι. See many other examples in Matthiæ, § 536, obs. The most frequent in the N. T. are found in St. Luke, whose style approximates the closest to that of this Epistle: e. g. Luke i. 74: Acts (xi. 12 v. r.) xv. 22; xxv. 27. The aor. part. ἀγαγόντα is by many taken as an absolute past: so D-lat., "*multis filiis in gloriam adductis*:" the vulg., "*qui multos filios in gloriam adduxerat*," and similarly Luther, Estius, al., and recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 39, referring the expression chiefly, or entirely, to the O. T. saints. These however can hardly be meant; for they cannot be said in any adequate sense to have been led to glory, or to have had Christ for the ἀρχηγός of their salvation. And surely it would be most unnatural to refer the part. to those saints only who had entered into glory since the completion of Christ's work, but before this Epistle was written. Bleek maintains that the aor. part., with an infinitive, may have sometimes a future

sense, and would render, "intending to bring," &c., da er viele ὁδῆς zur Herrlichkeit führen wollte: and he cites for this Bernhardt, p. 383 f.: who however only notices the use of the aor. with verbs of waiting, hoping, expecting, and says that in such cases it has eine entschiedene Richtung zum Futurum. The fact seems to be that it has in all such cases reference to the *completion* of the action (being a *futurus exactus*): τὸ καθανέιν is to *have died*,—Anglicè, idiomatically, *to die*, but the act of death is regarded in both phrases as completed. And similar is the use of the aor. here. In Christ's being τετελειωμένος, the bringing many sons to glory is *completed*. Had it been ἄγοντα, we must have rendered, as indeed the E. V. has erroneously rendered now, "*in bringing*:" so that the Father's τελειῶσαι of Christ was *only a step in the process* of leading many sons to glory. But now it is *the whole process*. We cannot give in idiomatic English this delicate shade of meaning correctly: the nearest representation of it would perhaps be,—"it became Him . . . , bringing, as He did, many sons to glory, to' &c. Various other renderings are "adducere decreverat," so Grot., al., and Kuinoel: that it signifies only the manner, without any temporal reference; so, after a long discussion, Tholuck (last edn.): that it is simply present; so Beza, "*Ipsa sententia ostendit actum præsentem, non præteritum*." But we need not have recourse to any elaborate and refined interpretations, where the simple force of the tense will serve) *many* (see reff. Not identical with πάντας, but as there, an indefinite expression, indicating great number, but no more. "*πολλούς*," says Delitzsch, "not in contrast to *all*, but in contrast to *few*, and in relation to *One*") *sons* (probably in the closer sense; not merely sons by creation, but sons by adoption. This seems necessitated by the next verse) to *glory* (the expression is not common in this meaning in our Epistle: and is perhaps chosen on account of δόξ in ver. 9. It is, that supreme bliss and majesty which rightly belongs to God only—of which His divine Son is (ch. i. 3) the ἀπαύγασμα, and of which believers in Christ are here in their degree partakers, and shall be fully so hereafter. It is the crowning positive result of the negative σωτηρία), to *make perfect* (τελειοῦσθαι is used often in our Epistle (reff.), and in various references. It is said of the Redeemer Himself, here, and in ch. v. 9; vii. 28,—of His people,

ο = John xvii. 19, ch. ix. 13, x. 10, 14, 29. **τε γὰρ** ο ἀγιάζων καὶ οἱ ο ἀγιαζόμενοι ᾠξ ἑνὸς πάντες.
 xiii. 12. Exod. xxix. 37. p = Rom. xi. 36. 1 Cor. viii. 6 al. q Rom. iii. 12 (from Pa.
 xiii. 2. v. 15, 16. ix. 10. Gal. iii. 16, 20, ch. xi. 12. always masculine.

who *τελειούνται* through Him, ix. 9; xi. 14, 40; xii. 23; and indeed xii. 2;—with a general reference, vii. 11, 19: see also *τέλειος*, ch. v. 14; ix. 11,—and *τελειότης*, ch. vi. 1. From all this it is evident, that some meaning must be looked for wide enough to include all these senses of the word itself and its cognates. And such a sense is found in the ordinary rendering of the word,—to ‘*accomplish*,’ or ‘*make complete*,’ or ‘*perfect*.’ This accomplishment, completion, or perfecting of Christ was, the bringing Him to that glory which was His proposed and destined end: so Thl., *τελειώσιν ἐνταῦθα νοεὶ τὴν δόξαν ἣν ἐδοξάσθη*. Estius, “*Consummaret, i. e. ad consummatam gloriam perduceret*.” and it answers to the *δόξη καὶ τιμῇ ἐστεφανωμένοι* of ver. 9: and to the *δοξασθῆναι* of St. John: and fits exactly the requirements of the other passages in our Epistle where our Lord is spoken of. Nor is such meaning at all misplaced in those passages where *we* are spoken of: seeing that it is a relative term, and our *τελειωθῆναι* is the being brought, each one of us, to the full height of our measure of perfection, in union with and participation of Christ’s glory. Some Commentators, from the LXX usage of *τελειοῦν τὰς χεῖρας* for ἱερωσύνη, in Exod. xxix. 9, 33: Levit. viii. 33; xvi. 32 (xxi. 10 Grabe on the authority of Codd. Ambros.-marg., Coisl.): Num. iii. 3, spoken of the consecration of a priest, and of *τελειώσις* for ἱερωσύνη in reference to the same, and especially for the offering offered on the occasion, in Exod. xxix. 22 ff.: Levit. vii. 27; viii. 21 ff., 33 (*ἕως ἡμέρα πληρωθῇ, ἡμέρα τελειώσεως ὑμῶν ἐπτα γὰρ ἡμέρας τελειώσει τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν*),—have imagined that the meaning here and elsewhere in our Epistle is ‘*to consecrate*’ and understand the word of the setting apart or consecration of Christ to the high-priestly office. So Calvin (the first, as Bleek thinks, who propounded the view), Beza (in his earlier edd.), a-Lapide, Le Clerc, Schöttg., Peirce, Whitby, al. But Bleek replies well, that such a meaning will not suit the other passages in our Epistle, e.g. ch. vii. 11, 19; and that in the LXX itself *τελειοῦν τινα* is never simply used for consecrating any one (but see Levit. xxi. 10, AB Ald. &c.). He also notices the idea of Michaelis, al., that the word in this sense came from the Greek mysteries, and pronounces it to be without proof. Certainly, no such mean-

ing is noticed in the best Lexicons. The word occurs in the sense of ‘*ad scopum perducere*’ in Herod. iii. 86, *ἐπιγεγόμενα δὲ ταῦτα τῷ Δαρείῳ ἐτελέωσέ μιν, ὥσπερ ἐκ συνθέτου τευ γεγόμενα*) the Leader [Author] (*ἀρχηγός*) is illustrated very copiously by Bleek. In its literal sense it is often found in the LXX (see Trommius). Then we have the sense of the *progenitor of a race*: *Τεῦκρος μὲν ὁ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἀρχηγός*, Isocr., Nicocl.: see other examples in Bleek. Then that of one who *precedes others by his example*, they following him. So Herodian vii. 1. 23, *ἀρχηγός τῆς ἀποστάσεως*: 1 Macc. x. 47, *ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐγένετο αὐτοῖς ἀρχηγός λόγων εἰρηνικῶν*: Polyb. ii. 40. 2, *ἀρχηγὸν . . . τῆς ὁλῆς ἐπιβολῆς*. So ch. xiii. 2, *τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγὸν κ. τελειωτήν*, [where the idea of *Author* and *Completer* is so closely allied to that in our verse, that the word *Author* should have been kept here also.] Hence comes easily the idea of *origination*; and so it frequently occurs in Greek writers, especially later ones, of the person from whom any thing, whether good or bad, first proceeds, in which others have a share: and sometimes so that it very nearly = *αἴτιος*. So Xen. Hell. iii. 3. 5, *τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τοῦ πράγματος*; Isocr. Panegy. 16, *ἀρχηγὸς ἀγαθῶν*: and more examples in Bleek. Hence the usage here, and in Acts iii. 15, where Christ is called *ὁ ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς*, is easily explained: on Him our salvation depends; He was its originator: as Chrys., *ταυτέστι τὸν αἰτίον τῆς σωτηρίας ὁρᾷς ὅσον τὸ μέσον καὶ οὗτος νόος, καὶ ἡμεῖς νοιοῖ ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν σώζει, ἡμεῖς δὲ σωζόμεθα. εἶδες πῶς ἡμᾶς καὶ συνάγει καὶ διδάσκει: πολλοὺς φησιν νοιοῦς εἰς δόξαν ἀγαγόντα ἐνταῦθα συνήγαγε τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν καὶ πάλιν διέστησε*. Principally from Bleek’s note) of their salvation, through sufferings (i. e. His sufferings were the appointed access to and the appointed elements of, His glory: see more particularly below, on ch. v. 8, 9. Chrys., al., give a beautiful general application: *δεικνύς ὅτι ὁ παθὼν ὑπὲρ τινος, οὐκ ἐκείνον ὠφελεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς λαμπρότερος γίνεται καὶ τελειότερος*). 11—13.] The connexion with the foregoing cannot be made plain, till we have discussed the meaning of *ἐξ ἑνός* below. It may suffice to say, that the assertion, and the quotations, are subordinate to the *πολλοὺς νοιοῦς* in ver. 10.

For both the Sanctifier and (notice the *τε*—καί, which bind closely together in one

H δε ην
ΑΒCΔΗ
ΚΛΜΠΝ
α β γ δ ε
ζ η θ κ λ
μ ν ο
17. 47

ῥ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἔπαισχύνεται ἰ ἀδελφούς αὐτοὺς καλεῖν, ῥ Luke viii. 47.

28 2 Tim. i. 6, 12. Tit. i. 13 only. L P.H. Philo de op. mund. § 33, vol. i. p. 23 end. Acts x. 21. xxiii. 24. xxiii. s = and

constr., ch. xi. 16. absol., 2 Tim. i. 12. w ἐπί, Isa. i. 29 AN¹ 3b. usually w. acc., as Mark viii. 38 bis

h. L. at. Job xxxiv. 19 BN only.

t Matt. xii. 49 j. xxv. 40 al.

category) the sanctified (both the participles are in their official substantival sense, as *ὁ πειράζων*, and the like. The imperfection of our passive in English prevents our accurately expressing a present passive participle: 'they that are being sanctified' is perhaps, though we are obliged sometimes to use it, hardly allowable English. The word *ἀγιάζω* (see reff.) signifies in LXX and N. T. usage the selecting out and adopting for God's service. It is not here, as Bleek infers, = *σώζω*, but as every where, when used in allusion to Christ's work on His people, involves that transforming and consecrating process, of which His Spirit is the actual agent. Hence, believers are ordinarily not *ἡγιασμένοι*, but *ἁγιαζόμενοι*, as here: the difference being, as may be traced in reff., that where their present state is spoken of, the participle is present: where God's purpose respecting them, and Christ's finished work, the perfect. Sanctification is glory working in embryo: glory is sanctification come to the birth and manifested.

It is disputed whether the reference of these words is to be considered as general, applying to every case of sanctifier and sanctified, as, e.g., the priest and the people under the old law (so Schlichting, Schöttgen, al.), the firstfruits and the remaining harvest (so Cappellus): or is to be restricted to Christ and His people alone. Certainly the latter seems to be required by the context, and most of all by the assumption of the subject in the next clause tacitly as contained in *ὁ ἀγιάζων*. The ground on which Christ is our Sanctifier has also been variously alleged. Grotius leaves the connexion very loose, when he says, "Christus nos sanctos facit doctrina sua et exemplo. Ille ex Spiritu sancto conceptus est, et nos per Spiritum sanctum novam adipiscimur naturam; ita communem habemus originem." But this obviously does not reach the depth of the following argument, see especially ver. 17: and we must believe that there is a reference to the expiatory death of Christ: see also ch. x. 10, 14, and more in the note there) (are) of one (*ἑνός*, as will be seen by the usage in reff., must be taken as *masculine*; not with Carpzov, Abresch, al., supplied by *σπέρματος* or *αἵματος*, nor understood "ex communi massa," with Cappellus, al.,—"ex una natura," Calv.,—nor "puritatem conditionis spiritalis," as Cameron, similarly Corn.-a-lapide. And if masculine,

what are we to supply? Erasmus (par.), Beza, Estius (as an altern.), Hofmann, al. say, *Adam*: Bengel (whose note is well worth consulting), Peirce, al., *Abraham*. But it seems far better and simpler here, on account of the πολλοὺς υἱούς above, and as satisfying fully the force of *ἐκ*, to understand *God* to be meant. So all the patristic Commentators, and almost all the recent ones, including Delitzsch: most of them however giving it the very wide sense of ref. 1 Cor. *ἡμῖν εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα*, which is referred to here by Chrys.,—(and so Thdrt., *καὶ τοῦτο κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον λέγεται, κτιστὴ γὰρ ἡ ληφθεῖσα φύσις εἰς δὲ γε καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ αὐτῆς ποιητῆς*). But this can hardly be. For the argument in this particular place is not to shew *by what means*, viz. by becoming man, Christ made men into sons,—but, that sonship of Himself and them towards the Father having been predicated, to justify the use of the common term. And thus we are driven to a sense of *υἱοί* commensurate with *ἁγιαζόμενοι*, by which word the Writer takes it up again. So that it is not here the mere physical unity of all men with Christ which is treated, but the further and higher spiritual unity of the *ἀγιάζων* and the *ἁγιαζόμενοι*, as evinced by his speaking of it. The same is plain from ver. 14 below: see there. So that it is the higher Sonship of God, common to the Lord and those whom the Father by Him is leading to glory, which must be understood. See John viii. 47: 1 John iii. 10; iv. 6; v. 19: 3 John 11. Note, that the point brought out here is not that the holiness of our Lord's human nature, and our holiness, are both of one, viz. the Father (John x. 36): which, however true, would be introducing a matter not belonging to the argument *here*, all (of them) (after the *τε*—*καί*, *πάντες* forms a sort of pleonastic repetition; but comes with considerable force. On account of the *τε*—*καί*, it is quite impossible, with Bengel, al., to confine the *πάντες* to the *ἁγιαζόμενοι* only: and his argument,—"utrosque, dicitur, si sanctificantem τῷ πάντες, omnes, includeret,"—goes for nothing: the *ἁγιαζόμενοι* being not set over against the *ἀγιάζων* as a second class, but thought of in their multitudinous distinctness as individuals. The connexion with ver. 10 will now be plain: 'πολλοὺς υἱούς was the right expression to use of those who are

u Matt. xii. 18. 12 λέγων u' Απαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου,
 1 John i. 2, 3. Gossr. & Acts passim. Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 25. 1 Thess. i. 9 only. Ps. lxx. 17, 18. (Psa. xxi. 22) Acts xxi. 25 (Matt. xxv. 30 | Mk.) only. Isa. xli. 4, 5. w ch 1. 5 reff. 2 Cor. i. 9 1-A viii 17. 2 Kings xxii. 3. y Mark x. 24. Luke xi. 32. xviii 9. 2 Cor. i. 9 only. Ps. ii. 12. z Isa. viii. 18.

brought to glory, for they are of the same divine stock—have the same heavenly Father as their ἀρχηγός, the one proper Son of God.' And this will be now illustrated by His own words: on which account (reff. especially 2 Tim., Tit.: viz. because they are all of one) He (Christ: see above) is not ashamed (see ref. δρᾶς πῶς πάλιν δεικνύσι τὴν ὑπεροχὴν: τῷ γὰρ εἰπεῖν οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται, δεικνύσιν οὐ τῆς τοῦ πράγματος φύσεως, ἀλλὰ τῆς φιλοστοργίας τοῦ μὴ ἐπαισχυνομένου τὸ πᾶν ὄν, καὶ τῆς ταπεινοροσύνης τῆς πολλῆς, Chrys.) to call them (τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους) brethren (the Commentators quote from Philo de Septenario, § 8, vol. ii. p. 284, τοὺς μὲν (scil. τοὺς δμοεβνέας) καλέσας εὐθυβόλως ἀδελφούς, ἵνα μηδεὶς φθονῇ τῶν ἰδίων ὡς ἂν ἐκ φύσεως συγκληρονόμοις ἀδελφοῖς), saying, I will declare (LXX, δηγήσομαι) thy name to my brethren, in the midst of the assembly will I sing of thee (it will be sufficient to refer, respecting the general sense and prophetic import of Ps. xxii., to what has been before said, on Ps. viii. (above, ver. 6), and on similar citations elsewhere. The Psalm was originally the expression of a suffering saint, in all probability David, communing with his God: laying forth to Him his anguish, and finally triumphing in confidence of His gracious help and deliverance. But by the mouth of such servants of God did the prophetic Spirit speak forth His intimations respecting the Redeemer to come. No word prompted by the Holy Ghost had reference to the utterer only. All Israel was a type: all spiritual Israel set forth the second Man, the quickening spirit: all the groanings of God's suffering people prefigured, and found their fullest meaning in, His groans, who was the chief in suffering. The maxim cannot be too firmly held, nor too widely applied, that all the O. T. utterances of the Spirit anticipate Christ, just as all His N. T. utterances set forth and expand Christ: that Christ is every where involved in the O. T., as He is every where evolved in the N. T. And this Psalm holds an illustrious place among those which thus point onward to Christ. Its opening cry, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" was uttered by the Lord Himself in His last agony. The most minute particulars detailed in it are by the

Evangelists adduced as exemplified in the history of His Passion: see e. g. (Matt. xxvii. 35 rec.) John xix. 24. And, as Bleek well observes, the particulars chosen out of that history by St. Matthew seem to have been selected with an especial view to the illustration and fulfilment of this Psalm. Ebrard, in his note here, insists on the authorship of the Psalm by David, and on its date, as belonging to the time of his persecution by Saul. Then he maintains the exact parallelism of the circumstances with those of the second and greater David, and refers the ἀδελφούς here to the countrymen of David, who were hereafter to be his subjects. I have no positive objection to this view. Subordinately to the deeper and wider one, it might be applicable in individual instances: but that other seems to me both safer and nearer the truth. See especially on the Psalm, Delitzsch, h. l.

The particular verse here chosen, the 22nd, forms the transition-point from the suffering to the triumphant portion of the Psalm: and consequently the resolution expressed in it by the Messiah has reference to His triumphant state, in which he is still not ashamed to call his people brethren. It is characteristic of the object of this Epistle with reference to its intended readers, that whereas the Writer might have cited two instances as matters of fact, in which our Lord did call His disciples brethren after His resurrection (see John xx. 17: Matt. xxviii. 10), yet he has not done so, but has preferred to establish his point by O. T. citations).

13.] And again, I will put my trust in Him (there is considerable dispute as to the original place from which this citation comes. Most Commentators, and recently Bleek and Delitzsch, have believed it to be taken from Isa. viii. 17, where the words occur in the LXX, immediately preceding the next citation. The only objection to this view is, that it would be hardly likely in this case that the words καὶ πάλιν would have occurred, but the two citations would have proceeded as one. And hence the words have been sought in other places: e. g. in Ps. xviii. 3 (xvii. 2, LXX), where however the LXX have ἐλπῶ ἐπ' αὐτόν: so Calv., Beza, Limborch, al. — Isa. xlii. 1, — so Schöttgen; where however, besides the LXX being different (ἀντλήσωμαι αὐτοῦ), the words

καὶ τὰ παῖδιά ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός. ¹⁴ ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ παῖδιά

are spoken in a totally different reference. The *same* words are found in the LXX in 2 Sam. (2 Kings) xxii. 3 (πεποιθώς ἔσομαι ἐπ' αὐτῷ); and Isa. xii. 2, where however the Alexandrine recension, with which our Writer mostly agrees, has ἐν αὐτῷ. There is no objection to the first of these passages being the *origin* of our citation; and the alleged non-Messianic character of the Psalm will weigh very light with those who view the Psalms as above set forth.

Still, regarding the above-stated objection as of no weight,—owing to the diversity of the two cited clauses, the one expressive of personal trust in God, the other declaratory respecting a relation to others (cf. also ch. x. 30, which is a nearly though not exactly similar case),—I prefer, as the more natural, the opinion which derives both texts from the same place of Isaiah. On the sense then see below): and again, Behold I and the children which God gave me (Isa. viii. 18. Considerable difficulty has been made by the Commentators in applying these citations to Christ. I own that the question seems to me to be admirably stated by Theodoret on Ps. xxii., μάλλον γὰρ πιστευτέον τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἀποστόλοις κ. αὐτῷ τῷ σωτῇρι χρωμένῳ σαφῶς τῷ τοῦ ψαλμοῦ προοιμίῳ ἢ τοῖς παρερμηνεύειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν. But this does not preclude our entering on an attempt in each case to give a distinct account of the rationale of the application. In the passage of Isaiah (vv. 11—18), the Prophet is especially blaming the people of Judah under Ahaz, for having called in the help of the Assyrian king against Pekah king of Israel, and Rezin king of Syria. And in these verses (17 f.) the Prophet expresses his own determination, in spite of the reliance of the people on the confederacy, to wait for the Lord, and to remain, he and the children whom God had given him, for signs and wonders in Israel from the Lord of Hosts, which dwelleth in Zion. Then, from Isa. viii. 18 to ix. 7, is set forth the prospect of future deliverance to Judah coming from their God, ending with the glorious anticipation of the great future Deliverer. This confident speech of the Prophet our Writer adopts at once as the words of the greatest of all Prophets—thereby *assuming* the prophetic office of Christ. Thus the matter illustrated (for there is no demonstration here; this verse is a *consequence* of the last, of δι' ἣν αἰτίαν) is, that as the Prophet Isaiah withstood the human dependence of his age, and stood forth, he and the children whom God had given him,

and who were begotten in pursuance of the divine command, as a sign to Israel,—so the *great Prophet* himself fulfilled the same office and had the same hopes, and bore the same relation to those among whom He prophesied, praising God with them, leading them in confidence on God, and speaking of them as one family and stock with Himself. So that our passage forms a notable instance of the prophetic office of Christ being taken as the anti-type of the official words and acts of all the Prophets, just as His kingly office fulfils and takes up all that is said and done by the theocratic Kings, and His priestly office accomplishes all the types and ordinances of the O. T. Priesthood. There is one difference between Christ and the Prophet, which Ebrard, fully as he enters into the general argument, has missed, owing to his applying πολλοὺς υἱοὺς . . . ἀγαγόντα, above, to Christ. The *παῖδια* are not the children of Christ (Chrys., Thdrt., vulg.: “*pueri mei*,” al.), as they were of Isaiah, but the children of God. John xvii. 6, σοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ἐμοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας, seems decisive for this. They are God's children, and God has given them to Him. So also Schlichting, Grot., Kuin., Bleek, De W., Lünem., al. See on next verse: and Delitzsch's note here. He agrees in the main with the above, but would restrict the reference to Christ of prophetic words and acts, to those occasions when the Prophets were put eminently forward as signs, as Isaiah in this case. But is not the very fact of being commissioned as a prophet, such a putting forward? Cf. Hofmann's remarks in the Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. p. 110).

^{14.} The connexion and line of argument is this: in ver. 5 it was shewn, that *not to angels, but to MAN*, is the new order of things subjected: in vv. 6—8, that this domination was predicated of man in the O. T.: in ver. 9, that the only case of its fulfilment has been that of Jesus, who has been crowned with glory and honour on account of His suffering death. Then, vv. 10, 11 a, it is shewn that the becoming way for the Redeemer to this crown of glory, the purpose of winning which was to bring many sons of God to it, was, being perfected through sufferings, seeing that He must share with those whom He is to sanctify, in dependence on a common Father. Then vv. 11 b, 12, 13 have furnished illustrations confirmatory of this, from His own sayings in the Scripture. And *now* we are come to the proof, that He who was thus to be the Leader of the salvation of

a w. gen. here only. Prov. 1. 11. dat. Rom. xii. 13. xv. 27. Gal. vi. 16. Phil. iv. 15. 1 Tim. v. 22. 1 Pet. iv. 13. 2 John 11 only. 18. Eph. vi. 12 only. Sir xiv. 18 xvii. 31. 10. x. 17, 21, 30. ch. v. 13. vii. 13 only. Prov. i. 18. Esdr. v. 40 al. b Matt xvi. 17. 1 Cor. xv. 50. Gal. i. 17. 47 c here only t. (-ov, Phil. ii. 27.) d 1 Cor. ix. 17. 47

14. rec transp αματος and σαρκος (corrtn to more usual order), with KL rel vulg F-lat D-lat Syr [æth] Thdr̄t, [Euthalms Damase Orig-int, Ambr,] Jer, Aug, : txt ABC D-gr M[P]N m 17 [47] am(with fult) syr copt arm Orig[-int,] Eus, Athl, Cyr- jer, Chrī, Cyr[-p Thdr̄t,]. aft των αυτων ins παθηματων D¹ Eus, Thdr̄t, Jer, eorundem passionē D-lat. aft 1st θανατου ins θανατον D¹.

these many sons, by trusting like them, and suffering like them, must Himself become MAN like them, in order for that His death to have any efficacy towards his purpose. Since then (by *ἐπει*, an inference is drawn from the words immediately preceding: by *οὖν*, the thought is cast back to the argument of which the citations had been an interruption: q. d. and by this very expression in our last citation, τὰ παῖδια, we may substantiate that which our argument is seeking to prove) the children (before mentioned: "Articulus est αναφορικός: illi pueri, de quibus versu præcedente dictum." Gerhard, in Bleek:—not τὰ generic, and τὰ παῖδια, little children, as Valcknaer and Heinrichs, and recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 40, which introduces a thought quite irrelevant: cf. Hofmann: Er von der Menschwerdung Christi sagen wollte, daß er in derselben ein Kind wie andere Kinder, mit Fleisch und Blut, geworden ist) are partakers of (lit. "have been constituted partakers of,"—in the order established in nature, and enduring still. The κοινωνία is not with their elders, as Valcknaer (see above), but with one another. This absolute use of κοινωνεῖν is not often found: we have it in Xen. Mem. ii. 6. 22, 23, δύνανται πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες ἀλλήλους σίτου κ. ποτοῦ κοινωνεῖν . . . δύνανται δὲ καὶ χρημάτων οὐ μόνον τοῦ πλεονεκτεῖν ἀπεχόμενοι νομίμως κοινωνεῖν . . . and Econ. vi. 3, ἥδ' ὅ γ' οὖν ἐστίν . . . ὥσπερ καὶ χρημάτων κοινωνήσαντας ἀναμφιλόγως διελεβείν, οὕτω καὶ λόγους κοινωνοῦντας περὶ ὧν ἂν διαλεγόμεθα συνομολογοῦντας διεξίεναι. The verb itself is generally found in the N. T. with a dative of the thing shared: in the classics, as here, with a genitive. See many examples in Bleek) blood and flesh (this order, instead of the more usual one, σαρκ. κ. αἷμ., occurs in ref. Eph., and Polyænus, Stratagem. iii. 11. 1: ἐπειδὴν μέλλωμεν μάχεσθαι, μήτοι νομίζωμεν ὡς πολεμίοις συμβάλλοντες, ἀλλὰ ἀνθρώποις αἷμα κ. σάρκα ἔχουσι, κ. τῆς αὐτῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν κεκοινωνηκόσιν. Bleek however suspects that this expression itself, belonging as it does to the time of the

Antonines, may be derived from biblical or Jewish usage. It is found frequently in the later Jewish writers. "It betokens," says Bleek, "the whole sensuous corporeal nature of man, which he has in common with the brutes, and whereby he is the object of sensuous perception and corporeal impressions: whereby also he is subjected to the laws of the infirmity, decay, and transitoriness of material things, in contrast to purely spiritual and incorporeal beings." Delitzsch remarks on the order, that it differs from *σὰρξ κ. αἷμα* in setting forth first the inner and more important element, the blood, as the more immediate and principal vehicle of the soul, . . . before the more visible and palpable element, the flesh: doubtless with reference to the shedding of Blood, with a view to which the Saviour entered into community with our corporeal life), He himself also in like manner (similarly: the original idea of παραπλήσιος being that of lying close together all along: not exactly = ἴσος, for the two are not unfrequently found in conjunction, as ὁρῶντες στρατὸν ἴσον καὶ (where we should say, 'or') παραπλήσιον τῷ προτέρῳ ἐπεληλυθότα: Thuc. vii. 42, nor = ὁμοῖος: cf. Herod. iii. 101, χρώμα φορέουσι ὁμοῖον πάντες καὶ παραπλήσιον Αἰθιοπῆ: cf. also Thuc. i. 143, τὰ μὲν Πελοποννησίων ἔμοιγε τοιαῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια δοκεῖ εἶναι: but expressing a general similitude, a likeness in the main; and so not to be pressed here, to extend to entire identity, nor on the other hand to imply, of purpose, partial diversity; but to be taken in its wide and open sense—that He Himself also partook in the main, in like manner with us, of our nature. The ancient expositors dwell justly on the word as against the Docetæ, who held that our Lord's was only an apparent body. So Chrys., and more explicitly Thl.: οὐκ εἶπε γὰρ μόνον ὅτι μετέσχε σαρκὸς κ. αἵματος ὥσπερ τὰ παῖδια, τούτῃ οἱ λοιποὶ ἄνθρωποι καίτοι εἰ καὶ τοῦτο εἶπεν, ἰκανὸν ἦν παραστήσαι ὅτι ἀληθῶς ἐσαρκώθη: ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ παραπλήσιως προσέθηκε, ἵνα τὴν ἀπαράλλακτον πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀληθινὴν σάρκαωσιν πᾶραστήσῃ. And Thdr̄t.: σφόδρα δὲ ἀναγκαῖος καὶ τὸ

^ε καταργήσῃ τὸν τὸ ^ι κράτος ^ι ἔχοντα τοῦ θανάτου, ^ε τουτ- ^ε = 1 Cor. xv. 24. 2 Thes. ii 8. 2 Tim. i. 10.
^εστιν τὸν ^h διάβολον, ¹⁵ καὶ ⁱ ἀπαλλάξῃ τούτους ὅσοι
 f here only. Herod. iii. 117. w. gen., iii. 69. g Acts xix. 4. Philom. 12. ch. vii. 5. ix. 11. x. 20. xi. 16. xiii. 15. 1 Pet iii. 20. h Heb. here only. Matt. iv. 1, &c. 1 Tim. iii. 6, 7. 1 John iii. 8 al. Job i. 6, &c. i Luke xii. 58. Acts xix. 12. ordin. with gen., as Wisd. xii. 2, but see Job ix. 34.

15. ἀποκατάλλαξῃ Α.

παρὰ πλῆσιώς τέθεικεν, ἵνα τὴν τῆς φαντασίας διελέγῃ συκοφαντίαν) participated in (the E. V., "took part," is good, but it should be followed by 'in,' not 'of,' which makes it ambiguous. Bleek remarks that *κοινωνέω* and *μετέχω* are almost convertible; and instances Lycurg. cont. Leocrat. p. 187 (154, Bekker), *ἐξ Ἰσου τῶν κινδύνων μετασχόντες, οὐχ ὁμοίως τῆς τύχης ἐκινώνησαν*: see also Xen. Anab. vii. 6. 28. So that minute distinction of meaning is hardly to be sought for. Notice the aorist, referring to the one act of the Incarnation) the same things (viz. *blood and flesh*: not τῶν παιδίων, nor as Bengel, "the same things which happen to his brethren, not even death excepted"), that by means of his death (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ὃν ἀνεδέξατο, ὡς σαρκεὺς κ. αἵματος δηλαδὴ μετασχόν: Thl. "Paradoxon: Jesus mortem passus vicit: diabolus mortem vibrans succubuit." Bengel. "Death itself, as Death, is that which Jesus used as the instrument of annihilating the prince of Death:" Hofm. Schriftb. ii. 1. 274, whose further remarks there see, and Delitzsch's comments on them, Hebr.-brf. p. 85. The latter quotes from Primasius, "Arma quæ fuerunt illi quondam fortia adversum mundum, hoc est, mors, per eam Christus illum percussit, sicut David, abstracto gladio Goliath, in eo caput illius amputavit, in quo quondam victor ille solebat fieri." "Dominus itaque noster"—so Gregory the Great on Job xl. 19, "ad humani generis redemptionem veniens velut quemdam de se in necem diaboli hamum fecit . . . Ibi quippe inerat humanitas, quæ ad se devorantem adduceret, ibi divinitas quæ perforaret: ibi aperta infirmitas, quæ provocaret, ibi occulta virtus, quæ raptoris famem transigeret." Cf. the remarkable reading in D: and the old Latin epigram, "Mors mortis morti mortem nisi morte tulisset, Æternæ vitæ janua clausa foret") He might destroy (bring to nought: see reff. The word is found, besides here, once in Luke (xiii. 7), and twenty-five times in Paul) him that hath the power of death (the pres. part. is better taken of the office, q. d. 'the holder of the power,'—than of past time, "him that had the power," as E. V. The phrase τὸ κράτος ἔχειν has been abundantly illustrated by Bleek. Among his examples followed by a geni-

tive, as here, are Herod. iii. 142, τῆς δὲ Σάμου Μαϊανδῆριος . . . εἶχε τὸ κράτος: Aristoph. Thesmoph. 871, δωμάτων ἔχει κράτος: Jos. Antt. i. 19. 1, οἷς ἐγὼ τὸ ταύτης κράτος τῆς γῆς δίδωμι. It is evident that the gen. τοῦ θανάτου must be similarly taken here, and not, as Schlichting, al., as = "mortiferum" merely. The reason why this clause comes first, and not τὸν διάβολον, is probably, as Chrys. suggests, to exhibit the paradox mentioned above: τὸ θαυμαστὸν δεικνυσιν, ὅτι δι' οὗ ἐκράτησεν ὁ διάβολος, διὰ τούτου ἡττήθη, καὶ ὅπερ ἰσχυρὸν ἦν αὐτῷ ὅλον κατὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης, ὁ θάνατος, τούτῳ αὐτὸν ἐπληξεν ὁ χριστός. Thl. mentions some who thought that by τὸ κράτος τοῦ θανάτου was meant *sin*: and Ec. gives this interpretation. But it is hardly worthy of serious consideration), that is, the devil (cf. Wisd. ii. 24, φθόνῳ δὲ διαβόλου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον: and see Rev. xii. 9; xx. 2. So in the Rabbinical writings, Samael, the chief of the evil spirits, was called the angel of death: and it is said (Debarim Rabb. fin.), "Samael causa fuit mortis toti mundo:" and (Sohar, fol. xxvii. 3), "Fili serpentis antiqui qui occidit Adamum et omnes ab eo descendentes." τὸν διάβολον ὃς ἐκράτει τοῦ θανάτου πῶς; διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἁμαρτάνειν ἐποιεῖ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τῆς πρώτης ἐκείνης παρακοῆς, αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ τὸν θάνατον δημιουργήσας, ὥσπερ τινὲ στρατιώτῃ αὐτῷ κ. ὅπλῳ ἰσχυρῷ χρῶμενος κατὰ τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης φύσεως. Thl.: cf. Rom. v. 12: John viii. 44. Ebrard would make τὸν θάνατον the subjective genitive,—"the power, which death has over us," and ἔχοντα to signify "wielding." But this seems far-fetched and unnecessary. The Death of Christ brought to nought the agency of the devil in death, because, that Death of His being not the penalty of His own sin, but the atoning sacrifice for the sin of the world, all those who by faith are united to Him can now look on death no longer as the penalty of sin, but only as the passage for them, as it was for Him, to a new and glorious life of triumph and blessedness. But for those who are not united to Him, death, retaining its character of a punishment for sin, retains also therewith all its manifold terrors. Delitzsch, in treating of 'Him that has the power of death,' quotes an important

1 gen. obj., Matt. xxviii.
 4. John vii.
 13. Rev. xviii 10, 15 al. Ezek. xxxviii. 21 A. Sir xl. 5.
 Jos. Antt. viii. 13. 7, end 1 constr. Matt. xxvi. 66. Mark iii. 29, xiv. 64. 1 Cor. xi. 27 James i. 10. Isa.
 lv. 17. dat., Matt v. 21, &c. only. Deut. xix. 10. Job xv. 5 al. m Rom. viii. 15, 21. Gal. iv. 24. v.
 1 only. Exod. xx. 2 al

φόβῳ ἰ θανάτου διὰ κ παντὸς κ τοῦ ζῆν ἰ ἐνοχοὶ ἦσαν ἢ δου-

remark of Gregory the Great, on Job i. 11, "Satanæ voluntas semper iniqua est, sed nunquam potestas injusta, quia a semet ipso voluntatem habet, sed a Domino potestatem"), and might deliver (the construction is somewhat doubtful. The more obvious way of taking the sentence would be, to join δουλείας with ἀπαλλάξῃ — 'might free from bondage,' ἀπαλλάττω usually governing a genitive of the thing from which the deliverance is effected: see many examples in Bleek, from which the following may be selected as containing δουλείας: Jos. Antt. xiii. 13. 3, τῆς ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτοῖς δουλείας . . . ἀπαλλάττειν: Isocr. Plataic. 9, δουλείας ἀπηλλάγησαν. And this would also suit the ordinary construction of ἐνοχος with a dative: see reff., and examples from the classics in Bleek. Still, it is hardly natural to suppose that δουλείας, standing so far as it would thus from its verb, in a position of so little emphasis, and without any designating article or pronoun, can belong to ἀπαλλάξῃ. We are thus brought to the ordinary construction, viz. the taking δουλλάξῃ absolute, and joining δουλείας with ἐνοχοί. And this latter is by no means an unusual construction, as the reff. will shew. Bleek divides the imports of a gen. after ἐνοχος into three: 1. *the punishment incurred*: so reff. Matt., Mark, Demosth. p. 1229. 11, ἐνοχοὶ δεσμοῦ γεγόνασι: 2. *the guilt incurred*: so 2 Macc. xiii. 6, τὸν ἱεροσουλίας ἐνοχον ὄντα: Lysias in Alcib. p. 140, ὡς οὐδεὶς ἐνοχος ἔσται λειποταξίου οὐδὲ δειλίας: &c.: 3. *the person or thing wherein the guilt is incurred*: so reff. 1 Cor., James, Isa. So that the construction with the genitive seems to embrace a wider range of meaning than that with the dative, and to put ἐνοχος rather in the place of a substantive, 'the subject of,' to be interpreted by the context: whereas with a dative it rather stands in a participial connexion, = ἐνεχόμενος (cf. Gal. v. 1, μὴ πάλιν συγῶ δουλείας ἐνέχεσθε): 'entangled in,' 'liable to.' Thus we shall here have ἐνοχοὶ δουλείας = those in a state of slavery; as (Bl.) in Sir. prol., οἱ φιλομαθεῖς καὶ τούτων ἐνοχοὶ γενόμενοι, those who are occupied with such things) those (τούτους is not, as Bengel, Kuinoel, al., to be referred to the preceding, whether υἱούς, ver. 10, or παδία, ver. 14, but to the ὅσοι, which it designates and brings out. See below) **who all** (this use of ὅσος after a demon-

strative pronoun is not very common. It does not in such a case imply the existence of *others who do not* fulfil the thing predicated, but rather takes, so to speak, the full measure of those indicated, being almost = 'who, every one of them' . . . Thus we have it after πᾶς in Æsch. Prom. 975 f., ἀπῶ λόγῳ τοὺς πάντας ἐχθαίρω θεούς, ὅσοι παθόντες εὐ κακοῦσιν μ' ἐκδίκας. In fact it answers, as a relative of quantity, to ὅστις as a relative of quality. These persons whom Christ died to free, were all subject to this bondage induced by the fear of death. And these in fact were, all mankind; to whom the potential benefit of Christ's death extends) by fear of death (so Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, § 17, vol. ii. p. 462, οἰόμεθα τοὺς μὲν ἀσκητάς τῆς ἐν σώμασιν εὐτοῦσας ἐπιβεβηκέναι φόβῳ θανάτου: see also reff. Sir. The obj. gen. after φόβος, as θεοῦ, ἀνδρῶν, &c. is common enough) were through all their lifetime (= διὰ πάσης τῆς ζωῆς. This substantival use of τὸ ζῆν is found in Æschin. dial. iii. 4, ὥσπερ εἰς ἕτερον ζῆν ἐπιθανούμενος: Ignat. ad Trall. 9, οὐ χωρὶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν ζῆν οὐκ ἔχομεν: id. ad Eph. 3, καὶ γὰρ Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς τὸ ἀδιάκριτον ἡμῶν ζῆν. Bl. But the use with an adjective seems to want other examples. We have something approaching to it in the "Scire tuum nihil est, nisi te scire hoc sciat alter" of Persius) subjects of (on the construction of ἐνοχος with a genitive, see above. It is here not merely 'subject to,' so that they might or might not be involved in it, but their actual implication is inferred) bondage (Wetst. &c. quote Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber, § 3, vol. ii. p. 448, ἐπαινεῖται παρὰ τινῶν ὁ τριμετρον ἐκεῖνο ποιήσας — τίς ἐστὶ δούλος; τοῦ θανεῖν ἄφροντις ὢν; (the line is from Euripides, and is cited also by Plutarch. Bl.) ὡς μάλα συνιδὼν τὸ ἀκούσθαι ὑπέλαβε γὰρ, ὅτι οὐδὲν οὕτω δουλοῦσθαι πέφυκε διάνοιαν, ὡς τὸ ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δέος ἕνεκα τοῦ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἡμέρου. See also many passages to the same effect in Raphael and Wetstein. Calvin's note is well worth transcribing: "Hic locus optime exprimit quam misera sit eorum vita qui mortem horrent; ut necesse est omnibus sentiri horribilem, qui eam extra Christum considerant: nam tum in ea nihil apparet nisi maledictio. Unde enim mors, nisi ex ira Dei adversus peccatum? Hinc ista servitus per totam vitam, hoc est, perpetua anxietas qua constringuntur in-

λείας. ¹⁶ οὐ γὰρ ⁿ δήπου ἀγγέλων ^o ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἀλλὰ ⁿ here only +
^p σπέρματος ^p Ἀβραάμ ^o ἐπιλαμβάνεται. ¹⁷ ὅθεν ὥφει-

..αβρααμ
 H.
 ABCDK
 LMPN
 a b c d e
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

o here bis. ch. viii 9, from Jer. xxxviii (xxxix.) 32. Matt. xiv. 31. 1 Tim. vi. 12 al. = Sir. ii. 11. Ant. x. 5. 3.
 1. 55. John viii 33, 37. Acts iii 25 (from Gen xxii. 18). vi. 5, 6. Rom. i. 13 ix 7 xi. 1. 2 Cor xi 22.
 q = Matt. xiv 7. Acts xxv. 1. 19 (Paul), ch. iii. i. vii. 26. viii 3. ix. 18. xi. 19. Judith viii 20. r = ch. v.
 3, 12. 1 Cor. vii. 36 f.

felices animæ. Nam semper ex peccati conscientia Dei iudicium observatur. Ab hoc metu nos Christus liberavit, qui maledictionem nostram subeundo sustulit, quod in morte formidabile erat. Tametsi enim nunc quoque modo defungimur: vivendo tamen et moriendo tranquillius et securi, ubi Christum habemus nobis præuentem. Quod si quis animum pacare non potest mortis contemptu, is sciat parum se adhuc profecisse in Christi fide. Nam ut nimia trepidatio ex ignorantia gratiæ Christi nascitur, ita certum est infidelitatis signum. *Mors* hic non separationem modo animæ a corpore significat, sed pœnam quæ ab irato Deo nobis infligitur, ut æternum exitum comprehendat. Ubi enim coram Deo reatus, protinus etiam inferi se ostendunt."

[16.] Epexegetic of ver. 15, by pointing out a fact well known to us all (see on δήπου below), that it was to help a race subject to death, that Christ came). For, as we well know (δήπου is a word of pure classical usage, see Xen., Plut., al. in Bleek: not found except here in the N. T. nor in the LXX. Its force will be reached by combining that of the two simple particles. δῆ, with an assertion, gives decision and confidence: που universalizes this decision and confidence: implies the success of an universal appeal for the truth of what is said. See Hartung, ii. 235: Klotz, Devar. p. 427 ff., where the various uses are fully gone into. Bengel compares πρόδηλον γάρ, ch. vii. 14), it is not angels that He helpeth, but it is the seed of Abraham that He helpeth (I have rendered thus, to preserve the emphasis on the two contrasted words, ἀγγέλων and σπέρματος Ἀβρ. ἐπιλαμβάνω, to receive in addition, 'insuper accipere,' also to take hold of or upon,—is found in the N. T. and the LXX, in the middle form ἐπιλαβάνομαι only; and thus signifies, with the dynamic force of personal agency, to lay hold upon, to seize. It usually, after the analogy of λαμβάνομαι itself, has a gen. case: occasionally, e. g. Acts ix. 27; xvi. 19; xviii. 17, an accusative. When a person is the object, it may be used in a bad sense, to seize hold of, in order to overpower or lead away, e. g. ἐπειδὴ σου ἐπιλαβόμενος ἄγῃ (ὁ δικαστής), Plato, Gorg. p. 527 A: Luke xxiii. 26 al.: as (more usually) in a good sense, to take by the hand, in order to help or lead, e. g.

ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς χειρός, Xen. Rep. Ath. i. 18: Matt. xiv. 31: Mark viii. 23: Luke xiv. 4: see also Jer. xxxi. 32 in our ch. viii. 9. From this latter meaning is easily derived that of *helping*, adopting for protection: e. g. ref. Sir., ἡ σοφία υἱοῦς ἑαυτῇ ἀνύψωσε κ. ἐπιλαμβάνεται τῶν ζητούντων αὐτήν: the Schol. on Æsch. Per. 742 (ἀλλ' ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις, αὐτὸς χῶ θεὸς ξυνάπτεται),—ὅταν σπεύδῃ τις εἰς καλὰ ἢ εἰς κακὰ, ὁ θεὸς αὐτοῦ ἐπιλαμβάνεται. And this is the best explained here: as referring back to the ἀπαλλάξαι just spoken of, and exactly answering to the βοηθήσαι below in ver. 18. This help is not by Him rendered to angels: He is not the Captain of their salvation. And herein there is no contradiction to Col. i. 20: for the reconciliation which Christ has effected even for the things in the heavens, is not delivering them from fear of death, or bringing them through sufferings to glory, whatever mystery it may involve beyond our power of conception. σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ next comes under consideration. And we must here, as ever, render, and understand, according to the simple sense of the words used, regarding the circumstances under which they were used. Accordingly, we must not here understand *mankind*, as some have done: nor again with others, can we suppose the *spiritual* seed of Abraham to be meant (Gal. iii. 7, 29: Rom. iv. 11 f., 16),—because, as Bleek well remarks, because of that of which He has helped them. The seed of Abraham then means, the Jewish race, among whom Christ was born in the flesh, and whom He did come primarily to help: and the peculiarity of the expression must be explained with Estius, "Gentium vocationem tota hac epistola prudenter dissimulat, sive quod illius mentio Hebræis parum grata esset, sive quod instituto suo non necessaria:!" and with Grotius, "Hebræis scribens satis habet de iis loqui: de gentibus aliter loquendi locus." I must not omit to mention, that the above manner of interpreting this verse, now generally acquiesced in, was not that of the ancient expositors. By them it was generally supposed that ἐπιλαμβάνεται referred to our Lord's taking upon Him of our nature: and they for the most part

Acts xvii. 22. **ΛΕΥ** ² *κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς* ¹ *ὁμοιωθῆναι*, *ἵνα* ² *ἐλεήμων*
Gal. iii. 20, 22.
ch. iv. 15 al.
παῖδα αὐτῷ γεννήσασθαι ὅμοιον κατὰ πάντα. Art. midcor. i 14. t = Acts xiv. 11. Rom. ix. 29, from
Isa. i. 9. elsw. Mt. Mk. L. only. u Matt. v. 7 only. Exod. xxii. 17.

make it into a past tense, and render as E. V.,—"He took not upon him the nature of angels, but He took upon him the seed of Abraham," so Chrys. (οὐκ ἀγγέλων φύσιν ἀνεδέξατο, ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπων), Thl. (οὐ τῆς τῶν ἀγγέλων φύσεως ἐδράξατο οὐδὲ ταύτην ἐφόρεσεν), Thdrt. (εἰ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἀνείληφε φύσιν, κρείττων ἂν ἐγγόνει θανάτου. ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνθρώπειον ἦν δ' ἀνέλαβε κ.τ.λ.), Ambros. (de Fide iii. 11, vol. ii. (iii. Migne) p. 512, al.), Primasius, the Syr. ("Non ex angelis sumsit sed ex semine Abrahami sumsit"): and so also Erasm., Luth., Calvin., Beza, Owen, Calov., Wolf, and many others. On this I will give the substance of Bleek's remarks: "This interpretation has been favoured both by the preceding and following context, and also by the circumstance that in the Greek Church the words λαμβάνειν and ἀναλαμβάνειν are in use as representing the union of the two natures in Christ, the divine being the λαβοῦσα or ἀναλαβοῦσα, and the human the ληφθεῖσα or ἀναληφθεῖσα. But supposing that ἐπιλαμβάνειν might be similarly used, certainly the middle ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι with a genitive cannot; and even independently of this, the formula 'to take on him the seed of Abraham, or the angels,' would be a most unnatural way of expressing 'to take the nature of either of these.' And the ancients themselves seem to have felt, that this formula of itself could not bear such a meaning. They assume accordingly that the Writer represents man and his nature, through sinfulness, alienated and flying from God and the divine nature, and the Son of God pursuing, overtaking, and drawing it into union with Himself. So Chrys., Ec., Thl.; so the Schol. in Matth.: οὐκ εἶπεν ἀνέλαβεν, ἀλλ' ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ἵνα δείξῃ ὅτι φεύγουσαν τὴν φύσιν ἡμῶν κ. μακρυνθεῖσαν ἐδίωξε καὶ φθάσας ἐπελάβετο αὐτῆς κ. περιεπλάκη ἐνώσας ἑαυτῷ κ. στήσας αὐτὴν τῆς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ φύσεως: so also Primasius, Erasmus, Justiniani, a-Lapide, and Hammond." It needs little to shew how far-fetched and forced this interpretation of the words is, if it is intended to give the sense of *assuming the nature of man*. Nor would the present of the verb suit this sense: which present some explain as if it represented the *testimony of Scripture*, i. e. the prophetic or official present, as δ' ἐρχόμενος, 'No where do we find it in Scripture that Christ has taken, or is to take,' &c. So Erasm., Calvin., Seb. Schmidt, Hammond,

Wolf. But such sense altogether would be irrelevant in the context. Seeing that it has been in the preceding period maintained, that Christ was flesh and blood like those whom He is to sanctify,—we should not surely have γὰρ introducing the same thought again, but this verse must somehow express *why* that other happened. Again, had that former thought been here expressed a second time, the following one could not have been joined to it by an ὅθεν: for the sense would be this: He was to take on Him human nature: therefore must He in all things be made like His brethren, = as they take on them human nature. And even were we, with Ec. and Thl., to lay an emphasis on κατὰ πάντα, thus—seeing that He was to take human nature on Him at all, He must also in *every thing* become like other men,—we might admit such a sense, if succeeded by, 'and therefore must He die,' or the like: but that which here follows, *ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται κ.τ.λ.*, would be wholly out of place. The first who detected the error of this rendering was Castellio († 1563), who translates the word "*opitulatur*," which Beza calls "*excranda audacia*." Then the R.-Cath. expositors Ribera and Estius took up the true rendering, which was defended more at length and thoroughly by Camero (whose note see in the Critici Sacri) and Schlichting; and so adopted without further remark by Grotius. The conflict against this latter expositor and the Socinians (who all thus explain the word), induced many other Commentators, especially Lutherans, to hold fast obstinately to the old interpretations: see above. But this pertinacity, from the palpable untenableness of the sense, could not prevail widely nor long. The right view is taken by Witlich, Braun, Akersloot, Limborch, Calmet, Bengel, Peirce, Cramer, Michaelis, Ernesti (who however is wrong in saying it was the interpretation of the Greek Fathers), Storr, and the moderns almost without exception. Of these latter, Schulz has ventured to doubt the correctness of it, and to propose a new view—viz. that Death, or the Angel of Death, is the subject of the sentence; "for on angels truly he taketh not hold, but on the seed of Abraham he taketh hold." And this sense is doubtless both allowable and admissible in the context; but it is most improbable that the subject in this verse should be a different one from that in the foregoing,

γένηται καὶ ^v πιστὸς ^w ἀρχιερεὺς ^x τὰ ^x πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ^y εἰς ^{v=1 Tim. i. 15. 2 Tim. ii. 2. 1 Mac. xiv. 41.} ^{w of Christ, Heb. only, ch. iii. 1. iv. 14 al. (vii. 27, 28 al.) elsw. Gosp. and Acts only. (Lev. iv. 3 only Esdr. v. 40. ix. 40. 1 Mac. x. 20 al. 2. elsw. ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ μέγας.) x Rom. xi. 17. ch. v. l. see 2 Pet. i. 3 al. y constr., Acts iii. 19. Rom. i. 11, 20. Gal. iii. 17. ch. vi. 28. viii. 3. xii. 10. xiii. 21.}

seeing that the same person, the Son of God, is also the subject, without fresh mention, in ver. 17, which is so intimately connected with this). 17.] Because then He had this work to do for the seed of Abraham (sons of men, in the wider reference),—viz. to deliver them from *fear* of death, He must be made like them in all things, that He may be a merciful and faithful High Priest. Then ver. 18 gives the reason of this necessity. Whence (ὅθεν is a favourite inferential particle with our Writer. It never occurs in the Epistles of Paul. On ref. Acts, see Prolegg. to Acts, § ii. 17 δ. It is = δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, ver. 11) it behoved Him (not = ἔδει, used of the eternal purpose of God (Luke xxiv. 26):—but implying a moral necessity in the carrying out of His mediatorial work. Compare ch. v. 3, and especially ib. ver. 12, *οφείλοντες εἶναι διδασκαλοὶ διὰ τὸν χρόνον*) in all things (i. e. all things wherewith the present argument is concerned: all things which constitute real humanity, and introduce to its sufferings and temptations and sympathies. The exception, *χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας*, brought out in ch. iv. 15, is not in view here. τί ἐστὶ κατὰ πάντα; ἐτεχθῆ φησὶν, ἐτράφη, ὑψήθη, ἐπαθε πάντα ἅπεν ἔχρον, τέλος ἀπέβη. Chrys.) to be like (not, 'made like': see reff., and compare Matt. vi. 8; vii. 26 al. The aor. expresses that this resemblance was brought about by a definite act, other than His former state: an important distinction, which however we must rather lose in the English than introduce an irrelevant idea by the word 'made') to his brethren (the children of Israel, as above: but obviously also, his brethren in the flesh—all mankind), that He might become (γένηται, not simply γέ, because the High Priesthood of Christ in all its fulness, and especially in its work of mercy and compassion and succour, was not inaugurated, till He entered into the heavenly place: see ch. v. 9; vi. 19, 20; vii. 26; viii. 1, 4. His being in all things like his brethren, sufferings and death included, was *necessary* for Him, in order to his becoming, through those sufferings and death, our High Priest. It was not the death (though that was of previous necessity, and therefore is often spoken of as involving the whole), but the bringing the blood into the holy place, in which the work of sacerdotal expiation consisted: see Levit. iv. 13—20, and passim: and

below, on εἰς τὸ ἰδᾶσκ. κ.τ.λ.) a merciful (Luther, Grot., Böhme, Bleek, De W., Tholuck, take ἐλεήμων (formed as *τλήμων, αἰδήμων, νοήμων*) alone, and not as an epithet to ἀρχιερεὺς, and Bl. maintains that grammar requires such a rendering, on account of the order of the words and the interposition of the verb γένηται. On the other hand, Bengel, Cramer, Storr, Ebrard, Hofmann, Delitzsch, take ἐλεήμων with ἀρχ., and Ebrard asserts that, had it been otherwise, πιστὸς would have followed ἀρχιερεὺς. There does not seem to me to be much weight in either argument: and the words might be rendered either way, were it not for the scope and object of our epistle, which is rather to bring out the facts and accessories of Christ's High Priesthood, and all His attributes as subordinate to it, than to place them, abstractedly, by the side of it, as would be the case if ἐλεήμων were to be taken independently here. Cf. ch. vii. 26, where many attributes of the Lord's High Priesthood are accumulated. And especially here, where the first mention of ἀρχιερεὺς occurs, would it be unnatural to find a mere attribute contemplated abstractedly and made co-ordinate with the office on which the Writer has so much to say hereafter. I therefore adopt the latter view, joining ἐλεήμων with ἀρχιερεὺς. Bengel, with his usual fine tact, accounts for the inversion of the words thus: "De tribus momentis unum, ἐλεήμων, *miseri-cors*, ante γένηται, *fletet*, ponitur, quia ex ante dictis deducitur. Reliqua duo commode innectuntur, quia cum primo illo postmodum tractanda veniunt." Calvin has a beautiful note here: "In sacerdote, cuius partes sunt iram Dei placare, opitulari miseriis, erigere lapsos, sublevare laborantes, misericordia inprimis requiritur, quam in nobis generat communis sensus. Rarum enim est ut tangantur aliorum ærumnis qui perpetuo beati fuerunt. Certe hoc Virgilianum ex quotidiana hominum consuetudine sumptum est: 'Non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco.' Non quod experimentis necesse habuerit Filius Dei formari ad misericordiæ affectum, sed quia non aliter persuaderi nobis posset, ipsum esse clementem et propensum ad nos juvandos, nisi exercitatus fuisset in nostris miseriis; hoc enim ut alia nobis datum est. Itaque quoties nos urgent quævis malorum genera, mox succurrat nihil nobis accidere quod non in se expertus sit Filius

* constr., here (Luke xviii. 13) only. Ps. lxxv 3 B³¹. (A def) (ἐξῆλ, Sir. xxviii. 5) a = Matt. i. 21. Luke i. 68, 77. n. 10. b (see note) attr. ABCDK LMPN a b c d e f g h k l m n o 17. 47

17. ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις A 17 (so in some mss of Ath Chr).

Dei ut nobis condolescat: nec dubitemus ipsum nobis perinde adesse ac si nobiscum angeretur") and faithful (true to His office, not only (Delitzsch) as regards God (ch. iii. 5, 6), but as regards men also; to be trusted without fail: see ref., and cf. *μαντεία πιστά*, Soph. Trach. 77: also Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hæres, § 18, vol. i. p. 486, ἀπιστήσαι γενέσει τῇ πάντα ἐξ ἐαυτῆς ἀπίστω, μόνω δὲ πιστεύσαι θεῷ τῷ καὶ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν μόνω πιστῷ, μεγάλης κ. ὀλυμπίου διανοίας ἔργον ἐστίν: and De Sacr. Abel et Cain, § 28, vol. i. p. 181, τοῦ . . . πιστευθῆναι χάριν ἀπιστοῦμενοι καταφεύγομεν ἐφ' ὅρκον ἄνθρωποι· ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ λέγων πιστὸς ἐστιν) **High Priest** (this is the first mention of the sacerdotal office of Christ, of which so much is afterwards said in the Epistle, and which recurs again so soon, ch. iii. 1: see note on γένηται above, and that on εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκ. below) in matters relating to God (so in ref., and in many other examples in Bleek, Elsner, and Kypke: e. g. Xen. Rep. Lac. xiii. 11, βασιλεῖ οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἐργον καταλείπεται . . . ἢ ἱερεῖ μὲν τὰ πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εἶναι, στρατηγῷ δὲ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους: Soph. Philoct. 1441, εὐσεβεῖν τὰ πρὸς θεοὺς: &c. The words must not be referred to πιστός, but to ἀρχιερεὺς, as in the example from Xenophon; or rather to the whole idea, ἐλεήμων καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς), to expiate the sins (from ἵλαος, propitiations, comes ἱλάσκεισθαι, properly used passively of the person to be rendered propitious, see ref. Luke: and 2 (4) Kings v. 18. The expression here and in ref. Ps. is not a strict one: but is thus to be accounted for: God ἱλάσκειται (pass.), is rendered propitious to the sinner, who has forfeited His favour and incurred His wrath. But (see Delitzsch's long and able note here) we never find in Scripture, O. T. or N. T., any such expression as ἱλάσθη ὁ πατήρ περὶ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν διὰ τὸν θάνατον τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, or as χριστὸς ἱλάσατο (or ἐξῆλάσατο) τὸν θεόν (or τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θεοῦ) διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ: never κατηλλάγη (or ἀποκατηλλάγη) ὁ θεός. "As the O. T. no where says, that sacrifice propitiated God's wrath, lest it should be thought that sacrifice was an act, by which, as such, man influenced God to shew him grace,—so also the N. T. never says that the sacrifice of Christ propitiated God's wrath, lest it may be thought that it was an act anticipatory of God's gra-

cious purpose,—which obtained, and so to speak, forced from God previously reluctant, without His own concurrence, grace instead of wrath." Del. To understand this rightly, is all-important to any right holding of the doctrine of the Atonement. This then is not said: but the sinner is (improperly, as far as the use of the word is concerned) said on his part, ἱλάσκεισθαι, to be brought into God's favour; and if the sinner, then that on account of which he is a sinner, viz. his sin. The word here is middle, used of Him who, by His *propitiation*, brings the sinner into God's favour, = makes propitiation for, expiates, the sin. The Death of Christ being the necessary opening and condition of this propitiation,—the propitiation being once for all consummated by the sacrifice of His death, and all sin by that sacrifice expiated, we must of necessity determine (against the Socinian view of Christ's High Priesthood, which will again and again come before us in this commentary) that His High Priesthood was, strictly speaking, begun, as its one chief work in substance was accomplished, here below, during his time of suffering. That it is still continued in heaven, and indeed finds its highest and noblest employ there, is no reason against this view. The high priest had accomplished his sacrifice, before he went within the veil to sprinkle the blood: though it was that sprinkling of the blood (see on γένηται above) by which the atonement was actually made, as it is by the Spirit's application of Christ's atoning blood to the heart of each individual sinner that he is brought into reconciliation with God) of the people (again, the Jewish people, cf. ref. Matt. διὰ τί δὲ οὐκ εἶπε, τὰς ἀμαρτίας τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἀλλὰ, τοῦ λαοῦ; ὅτι τέως περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦν ὁ λόγος τῷ κυρίῳ, καὶ διὰ τοιούτους ἤλαε προηγουμένως, ἵνα τοῦτον σωθῶντων καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σωθῶσιν, εἰ καὶ τοῦναντίον γέγονε. Theophyl.). 18.] Explanation, how the κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι has answered the end, ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται κ.τ.λ. **For He Himself** having been tempted in that which He hath suffered, He is able to succour them that are (now) tempted (the construction is much doubted. The ordinary rendering is to take ἐν ᾧ as equivalent to 'forasmuch as,' "in that," E. V., and to justify it by the Hebrew *כִּי*. But it is doubt-

ἡ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς ἡ πειρασθεῖς, δύναται τοῖς ἡ πειραζομένοις
ἡ βοηθῆσαι.

III. 1 ἡ Ὁθεν, ἡ ἀδελφοὶ ἡ ἄγιοι, ἡ κλήσεως ἡ ἐπουρανίου
24. Acts xvi. 9. xxi. 28. 2 Cor vi. 2 (from Isa. xlii. 8). Rev. xii. 16 only. Josh. x. 6. c see ch. ix. 26
17 reff. g here (1 Thess. v. 27 rec.) only. see Col. i. 2, note. d Matt. iv. 1 al.
i John iii. 12. Phil. ii. 10. ch. xi. 4. vii. 5. ix. 23. xi. 16. xii. 23. Dan iv. 23 Theod.-A (συρ. B F.). (Eph. i. 1
20. Ps. lxxvii. 14. 2 Macc. iii. 39 only.) fr Gen. xxii. 1. xxi. 1. Mark xv. 25. fcb ii. Mark ix. 22.

18. αὐτος bef πέπονθεν D.

om πειρασθεῖς N¹ (ius N³).

ful whether ἐν ᾧ has ever this meaning absolutely. It seems only to approach to it through *'quatenus,' 'in as far as,'* which is an extension of its strict meaning, *'in that particular in which,' 'wherein.'* And this slightly extended meaning is preferable in all the places usually cited to justify that other: e. g. Rom. viii. 3: ch. vi. 17: Plato, Rep. v. p. 455 (ἐλεγεσθαι τὸν μὲν εὐφυῆ πρὸς τι εἶναι, τὸν δὲ ἄφυῆ, ἐν ᾧ ὁ μὲν βράδιος τι μανθάνει, ὁ δὲ χαλεπῶς). And in places where there is no need even to strain the expression so far as this, it is far better to retain its literal rendering, *'in the thing in which,' 'wherein.'* See Bernhardy, Syntax, p. 211: Fritzsche on Rom. viii. 3, who though he protests against *quoniam* in this place, seems too lenient to it in other passages.

But the difficulty by no means ends with taking *'wherein'* for ἐν ᾧ. The first clause or protasis is open to several logical arrangements and consequent renderings. 1. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πειρασθεὶς αὐτὸς πέπονθεν, δύναται τοῖς (ἐν αὐτῷ) πειρ. βοηθ., *'for He is able to help those who are tried by the same temptations in which His own sufferings consisted.'* 2. ἐν ᾧ γὰρ πέπονθεν αὐτὸς πειρασθεὶς δυν. &c. as before, *'for having been Himself tempted in that which He suffered,'* &c.: 3. with the same arrangement of the Greek words, *'for in that which He suffered when He himself was tempted, He is able to succour those who are tempted (in the same).'* 4. resolving the participial construction, *'for in that in which He himself was tempted and hath suffered He is able,'* &c. Of these I much prefer (2); because, a. it keeps together the prominent members of the logical comparison, πειρασθεὶς and πειραζομένους, giving ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν as a qualification of πειρασθεὶς, and thus explaining wherein His temptation consisted. Nor, B. is it at all open to Lünemann's objection, that it limits the power of Christ to help, to those things merely in which He himself has suffered and been tempted: stating as it does generally the fact πειρασθεὶς, and then specifying in what, viz. ἐν ᾧ πέπονθεν. It also, γ. corresponds exactly in construction with the similar sentence ch. v. 8, ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν, in supplying

an object after πέπονθεν. And, δ. it seems more natural that an object should be required after the perfect, than that it should be used absolutely. After *'He hath suffered,'* we enquire, *'What?'* after *'He suffered,'*—*'When?'* Of recent Commentators, Bleek takes nearly as above, after Chr. F. Schmid; and so Delitzsch in loc. (only maintaining that ἐν ᾧ is ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι, *'in that He hath suffered,'* not ἐν τούτῳ ᾧ, *'in that which He hath suffered.'*) so Hofmann also: Ebrard prefers (4): Luther, Casaubon, Valcknaer, Fritzsche, al., take (3): (1) is mentioned by Bleek, but I am not aware that it has met with any fautor. It may be necessary to guard readers against the citation, in Dr. Bloomfield's note, of Ebrard as if he rendered ἐν ᾧ *'forasmuch as'* or *'in that.'* His rendering is, *'Quibus in rebus tentatus ipse (est etc) passus est, iis tentatos potest adjuvare.'* On the sense, see Calvin's note above. Christ's whole sufferings were a πειρασμός in the sense here intended: see ch. iv. 15: James i. 2.

The δύναται βοηθῆσαι here is not to be understood of the power to which the Lord has been exalted through death and suffering to be a Prince and a Saviour,—which is not here in question: but of the power of sympathy which He has acquired by personal experience of our sufferings. As God, He knows what is in us: but as man, He feels it also. And by this, wonderful as it may seem, He has acquired a fresh power, that of sympathy with us, and, in consequence, of helping us. See my sermon on this text, in Quebec Chapel Sermons, vol. iii. p. 84. And this is the general view of expositors, both ancient and modern. Chrys. says, ὁ δὲ λέγει τοῦτό ἐστι δι' αὐτῆς τῆς πείρας ὧν ἐπάθμεν ἦλθε· νῦν οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ τὰ πάθη τὰ ἡμέτερα· οὐ γὰρ ὡς θεὸς μόνον ὦδεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἔγνω διὰ τῆς πείρας ἧς ἐπειράσθη· ἔπαθε πολλά, οἷδε συμπαύσχειν. And the Schol. in ms. 113, cited in Bleek, τοῦτό ἐστι, προθυμότερον ὁρᾷ χεῖρα τοῖς πειραζομένοις (so far Ec. also): συγκαταβάσεως δὲ ὁ λόγος πρὸς τὸ νηπιῶδες τῶν ἀκούοντων).

CHAP. III. 1—IV. 16.] THE SON OF GOD GREATER AND THAN MOSES: AND INFERENCES THEREFROM. The Writer

^k ch. i. 9 reff. ^k μέτοχοι, ^l κατανοήσατε τὸν ^m ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα
 Clem. rom. 1 ad Cor. 34.
 1 = Luke xii. 24, 27. Rom. iv. 19. ch. x. 24. Isa. v. 12.

m of Christ, here only.

ABCDK
 LMPN
 a b c d e
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

CHAΡ. III. 1. κατανοήσατε D¹[-gr].

has arrived through the reasonings of ch. i. ii., at the mention of the High Priesthood of Jesus. He might at once have passed thence to the superiority of His High Priesthood to that of the imperfect priests on earth. But one point yet remains, without which the gospel would not have its entire comparison with the law. The law was given by angels in the hand of a mediator, Moses was that mediator. Moses was above all others the Prophet by whom God had spoken to the Fathers in times past. Christ therefore must be compared with Moses, and shewn to be greater than he. This being done, he returns again to his central idea, the High Priesthood of Christ (ch. iv. 14); and from thenceforward treats of and unfolds it. Ebrard gives the detailed connexion well: "The angel of the covenant came in the name of God before the people of Israel; Moses in the name of Israel before God; the High Priest came in the name of God before Israel (with the name $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho$ on his forehead), and in the name of Israel (with the names of the twelve tribes on his breast) before God (Exod. xxviii. 9—29 and 36—68). Now the N. T. Messiah is above the angels, according to ch. i. ii.: α . because in Himself as Son of God He is higher than they, and β . because in Him all humanity is exalted above the angels to lordship in the $\sigma\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$ μέλλουσα, and that by this means, because the Messiah is not only $\gamma\eta\upsilon\sigma\iota$, but also ἀρχιερεύς,—not only messenger of God to men, but also the propitiatory sacerdotal representative of men before God. Now exactly parallel with this runs our second part. The fundamental thesis, ch. iii. 3, $\pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ γὰρ οὗτος δόξης παρὰ Μωυσὴν ἤξιώται, is plainly analogous in form with the fundamental thesis of the first part, i. 4, $\tau\omicron\varsigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega$ κρείττων γινόμενος τῶν ἀγγέλων. The N. T. Messiah is above Moses, because He, α . of Himself, as Son of the house (iii. 6), is above him who was only the *servant* of the house (cf. with iii. 5, $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\nu$,—i. 14, $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ πνεύματα), and, β . because the work, of bringing Israel into rest, which was not finished by Moses, is now finished by Him (iv. 1 ff.). And this work Christ has finished, by being not, as Moses, a mere leader and lawgiver, but at the same time a propitiatory representative, an ἀρχιερεύς (ch. v. 11 ff.). So far does the parallelism of the two portions reach even into details, that as the two

divisions of the former part are separated by a hortatory passage, so are those of this part also:—

"I. The Son and the angels.

α . The Son of God of Himself higher than the $\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau\upsilon\rho\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\alpha}$ πνεύματα of God, i. 5—14.

(Hortatory passage, ii. 1—4.)

β . In Him manhood is exalted above the angels, ii. 5—16.

For He was also High Priest, ii. 17, 18.

II. The Son and Moses.

α . The Son of the house of Israel higher than the $\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega\nu$ of the house, iii. 1—6.

(Hortatory passage, iii. 7—19.)

β . In Him Israel has entered into rest, iv. 1—13.

Thus He is also our High Priest, iv. 14—16." Comm. pp. 123 f.

Ebrard has perhaps not enough noticed the prevalence of the hortatory mood not only in the interposed passage, iii. 7—19, but all through the section: cf. iv. 1, 11, 14, 16.

1.] Whence (i.e. seeing that we have such a helper: it is connected with the result of ch. ii.: not, surely, with ch. i. 1, as De W. The fact just announced in ii. 18, is a reason for $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$: see below), *holy brethren* (Michaelis proposed to put a comma at $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\iota$, and treat the two as separate,—*brethren* (and) *saints*. But, as Bleek observes, the rhythm seems against this, $\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\upsilon\rho$. μέτοχοι following. And a graver objection may be found in the choice of the words themselves: for there can hardly be a doubt that both are used in reference to the $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\alpha\zeta\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\iota$ of ch. ii. 11, 12. Not that the $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\iota$ here are *Christ's* brethren: but that the use of the word reminds them of that brotherhood in and because of Christ, of which he has before spoken. Whether the idea of common nationality is here to be introduced, is at least doubtful. I should rather regard it as swallowed up in the great brotherhood in Christ: and Bleek has well remarked, that, had the Writer been addressing believing Jews and Gentiles, or even believing Gentiles only, he would have used the same term of address and without any conscious difference of meaning), *partakers* (see on $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$, ch. ii. 14: and reff. here) of a heavenly calling ($\kappa\lambda\acute{\eta}\sigma\iota\varsigma$, as usual, of the invitation, or summons, of God, calling men to His glory in Christ—and hence of the state

τῆς ἡ δόμολογίας ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν, 2^ο πιστὸν ὄντα τῷ ποιῇ-ⁿ = (see note)
ch. iv. 14. x.
23. 2 Cor.
p = (see note)

ix. 13. 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13 only L.P.H ‡ (Lev. xxii. 18 al.)
1 Kings xii. 6.

o Num. xii. 7.

rec ins *χριστον* bef *ιησ.*; ins aft *ιησ.* C² or ³D³KL rel syrr arm Orig, Chr, Thdr^t₁ [Damasc¹] Ec Thl Hil.; om ABC¹D¹M¹P¹N 17 [47] latt coptt aeth Ath⁶ Cyr¹-p₂] Thdr^t₁ [Euthal-ms Damasc¹] Ambr¹, Jer Fulg Vig-taps.

which is entered by them in pursuance of that calling: cf. especially Phil. iii. 14, τῆς ζωῆς κλήσεως τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Then also ἐπουρανίου (see reff.)—a calling made from heaven, see ch. xii. 25: “vocatio quæ de cælo,” Syr. Or it may mean, the calling which proposes a heavenly reward,—whose inheritance is in heaven. By far the best way is, to join the two meanings together: so Bengel, “per Dominum e cælo factæ, et eo, unde facta est, perducentis.” In fact the calling being ἐπουράνιος and proceeding from heaven, must of necessity be heavenly in its purport and heavenly in its result; eine vom Himmel aus ergangene und gen Himmel rufende: ihr Ausgangsort, ihr Inhalt, ihr Ziel—das Alles ist himmlisch. Delitzsch, contemplate (survey, with a view to more closely considering. The word is used of the survey of the spies at Jericho (λαθόντες γὰρ τὸ πρῶτον ἅπαναν ἐπ’ ἀδείας τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν κατενόησαν, τῶν τε τειχῶν ὅσα καρτερὰ κ.τ.λ. Jos. Antt. v. 1. 2: cf. also Gen. xlii. 9, κατὰσκοποῖ ἔστω, κατανοῆσαι τὰ ἔχνη τῆς χώρας ἡκατε, and Num. xxxii. 8, 9); and of fixing the thoughts on any object, see reff. Luke, with whom it is a favourite word. The meaning then of the exhortation here is not, ‘pay attention to’ (“ut sedule attendant ad Christum,” Calvin.), ‘be obedient to,’ but as above) the **Apostle and High Priest** (notice that but one art. covers both ἀπόστ. and ἀρχ., thereby making it certain that both words belong to τῆς δόμολογίας) of our profession, **Jesus** (ἀπόστολον, as superior to the ἄγγελοι, being Himself the angel of the covenant, God’s greatest messenger: the word ἄγγελον being, as Ebrard, avoided, on account of its technical use before, to prevent Christ being confused with the angels in nature. He is ὁ ἀπεσταλμένος παρὰ πατρός: see John xx. 21. (I may remark, that the circumstance of the Writer using ἀπόστολος without scruple, as designating our Lord, may shew that the ἀπόστολοι as a class were not so distinctly marked as they have since been: a view supported also by some expressions of St. Paul: e. g. 2 Cor. viii. 23.) Ebrard well remarks, that all the difficulties which Commentators have found in this term vanish, on bearing well in mind the comparison between Christ and the angels in

ch. i. ii. See an instance of this in the elaborate discussion of its meaning on Hebraistic grounds in the last edition of Tholuck; who, by rendering ἀπόστ., “mediator,” has lost the joint testimony of the two, ἀπόστ. and ἀρχ., to Christ’s mediatorship. Bengel says well on the two,—“τὸν ἀπόστ., eum qui Dei causam apud nos agit: τὸν ἀρχ., qui causam nostram apud Deum agit. Hic Apostolatus et Pontificatus uno mediatoris vocabulo continentur.” τῆς δόμολογίας ἡμ., of our Christian confession,—i. e. of our faith: so Thl., ταυτέστι τῆς πίστεως: οὐ γὰρ τῆς κατὰ νόμον λατρείας ἀρχιερέως ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας πίστεως. And so Thdr^t₁, Ec., and Erasm., Calv., Beza, Grot., al. Tholuck objects, that thus we get no good sense for ἀπόστολος: but he does not seem to have taken into account the parallel with ch. i. 14. Thos. Aquinas, Luther, Camero, Calov., Owen (as an altern.), Wolf, al., and De Wette, and Tholuck, take the words as merely importing “whom we confess.” But although De W. defends this from ch. iv. 14, it does not seem to agree with the usage there, κρατῶμεν τῆς δόμολογίας,—nor with ch. x. 23,—nor 1 Tim. vi. 12, 13. To render δόμολογία by “covenant,” as Camerar., Tittmann, al., is not according to N. T. usage, which always has διαθήκη for this idea. There is a remarkable passage quoted by Wetst., out of Philo de Somn. i. § 38, vol. i. p. 654, containing the expression ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τῆς δόμολογίας: a parallel hardly to be accounted accidental, especially as the ἀρχιερεὺς here spoken of is the λόγος (see above, § 37, p. 653, δύο ἱερά θεοῦ, ἐν μὲν ὅδε ὁ κόσμος, ἐν δὲ καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς, ὁ πρωτόγονος αὐτοῦ θεῖος λόγος). But Bleek has argued that, there being nothing in the context, or in the usage of Philo elsewhere, which can justify τῆς δόμολογίας there, the only inference open to us is, that it has been inserted in Philo’s text from this passage.

2.] First, a point of likeness between our Lord and Moses is brought out, and that by a reference to an O. T. declaration respecting the latter (μέλλει προῖδεν τὸν κατὰ σάρκα χριστὸν προτιθέναι Μωυσέως. ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ, εἰ καὶ πιστοὶ ἦσαν οὗτοι πρὸς οὐδὲν λόγος, μεγάλας ἔτι δόξας εἶχον περὶ Μωυσέως, ἵνα μὴ εὐθέως ἀποφράξωσιν αὐτῶν τὰ ὦτα, οὐκ εὐθέως προτιθῆται Μωυσέως τὸν

σαντι αὐτόν, ὡς καὶ Μωυσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ ° οἶκῳ αὐτοῦ. ABCDK

2. om ολω B coptt [Cyr.] Ambr₁.

LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

χριστόν, ἀλλὰ τέως ἐξίσου· εἶτα προῖδον προτίθησιν. (Ec.), who is (not, 'was.' The present participle may always be contemporary with a previously expressed verb, of any tense, provided that verb be absolutely in construction with the participle, as ἀνέβλεψε τυφλὸς ὢν, "he, being blind, received sight" = he was blind and received sight. But a present participle standing absolutely, or with a present verb, must retain its present force; as τυφλὸς ὢν ἔρτι βλέπω, "I, being a blind man, now see," = "whereas I am (by infirmity, as every one knows, not, "whereas I was," as in E. V. in loco, John ix. 25) blind, now I see." And so the present sense must be retained here. Then a question arises: are we to understand it strictly of present time, of Christ now in heaven,—or as in the case cited, of general designation? Clearly, I think, of the latter: Jesus, whose character it is, that He is πιστός. For the strict present would, to say nothing of other objections, not apply to the ἀπόστολον portion of the Lord's office, but only to the ἀρχιερέα. It, as Lünemann has well expressed it, charakterisirt das Streben als inhärentende (Eigenschaft) faithful (it is questioned, whether or not this word refers back to the πιστός ἀρχιερέας of ch. ii. 18. The sense is certainly not the same: the faithfulness there being the fidelity wherewith He being like His brethren would, so to speak, reproduce their wants before God,—that here spoken of being His faithfulness to God, over whose house He is set, ver. 6. Still I cannot help thinking that the word *itself* is led to by, and takes up that other. That regarded more the *sacerdotal*, this regards the *apostolic* office of Christ) to him that made him (so we must render ποιήσαντι, not, "that appointed him." And so D-lat., "fidelem esse creatori suo," Ambrose, de Fide iii. 11, vol. ii. (iii. Migne) p. 512 (quoting as above, he adds, "Videtis in quo creatum dicit; in quo assumisit, inquit, semen Abraham, corporalem utique generationem asserit"), Vigil-taps. (contra Varinadum, i. 4, Migne, Patr. Lat. vol. lxii. p. 366, "fidelem existentem ei qui creavit eum"), Primasius ("qui fidelis est eidem Deo Patri qui fecit eum (so vulg.), juxta quod alibi dicitur: qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem (Rom. i. 3)." *ibid*), Schulz, Bleek, Lünemann. The ordinary rendering, "who appointed Him" (viz. ἀπόστολον κ. ἀρχιερέα) does not seem to me to be suffi-

ciently substantiated by any of the passages brought in its defence. That ποιῶν with two accusatives signifies to *appoint*, to *make into*, of course no one doubts: cf. Gen. xxvii. 37: Exod. xviii. 25: John vi. 15: Acts ii. 36. But our question is not of such constructions: we want to know whether ποιῶν τινα can ever be filled up with a second accusative out of the context. Two passages are most frequently alleged to prove the affirmative. One is ref. 1 Kings, μάρτυς κύριος ὁ ποιήσας τὸν Μωυσῆν καὶ τὸν Ἀαρὼν ("מֹשֶׁה וְאַהֲרֹן), καὶ ὁ ἀναγαγὼν τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου. But here Bleek, against Gesenius and De Wette, holds fast, and I think rightly, to the original sense of נָסַךְ, and renders "who made Moses and Aaron." The other place, Mark iii. 14, ἐποίησε δώδεκα ἵνα ὄσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, is less still to the point, because there the ἵνα ὄσιν κ.τ.λ. qualifies the verb, and gives the second accusative, q. d. ἐποίησε δώδεκα τοὺς ἐσομένους κ.τ.λ. And the phrase ὁ ποιήσας αὐτόν, for God the Creator, is so common in the LXX, that had our Writer had that other meaning in his view, his readers would have been sure to misunderstand him. Bleek accumulates instances: cf. Isa. xvii. 7; xliii. 1; li. 13; liv. 5: Hosea viii. 14: Job xxxv. 10: Ps. xciv. 6 (xcv. 7); cxlix. 2: Sir. vii. 30; x. 12; xxxix. 5, and many other places. He also presses the fact that ὁ ποιῶν in the Hellenistic Greek of Philo is the constant designation of God as the Creator. The word thus taken, is of course to be understood of that constitution of our Lord as our Apostle and High Priest in which He, being human, was made by the Father: not of Him as the eternal Word (as even Bleek and Lünemann, explaining it of His generation before the worlds), which would be irrelevant here, besides being against all Scripture precedent. Even Athanasius himself, though arguing against this unwarranted inference of the Arians from the phrases, seems to have understood it as we have done above: for he says, Contra Arianos ii. (iii.) 8, vol. i. (ii. Migne), p. 376, οὐχ ὅτι ὁ λόγος, ᾧ λόγος ἐστί, πεποιήται, νοεῖν θέμις· ἀλλ' ὅτι λόγος ὢν δημιουργὸς ὑστερον πεποιήται ἀρχιερέως ἐνδυσάμενος σῶμα τὸ γεννητὸν καὶ ποιητόν. And so also the orthodox Latins, Ambrose, Vigil-taps., Primasius, explaining "creatio" by "corporalis generatio." The Greek Fathers, generally, repudiate

3^a πλείονος γὰρ ὅτος δόξης ἑπαρὰ Μωυσῆν ἡξίωται, q ch. xi. 4 reff.
 1^a καθ' ὅσον ἁπλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατα- r so ch. vii.
 2 Thess i. 11. 1 Tim. v. 17. ch. x. 29 only. 1 Macc. xi. 66. see Luke vii. 7 (Acts xv. 38. xxviii. 22). L.P.H.
 ch. vii. 20. ix. 27 only constr., ch. vii. 6. v here See. ch. ix. 2, 6. xi. 7. Mark i. 2. Luke i. 17. vii.
 27 || Mt. 1 Pet. iii. 20 only. Num. xxi. 27. t = & constr.
 s ch. i. 4 reff.

3. rec δοξης bef ουτος, with KLM rel vulg [Euthal-m Thdrt Damasc₂]: txt ABC D[P]N m [47] Chr₁. μωνσεως D¹.

strongly this view, as was natural, living as they did in the midst of the strife. Chrys. says, τί ποιήσαντι; ἀπόστολον κ. ἀρχιερέα· οὐδὲν ἐνταῦθα περὶ οὐσίας φησίν, οὐδὲ περὶ τῆς θεότητος, ἀλλὰ τέως περὶ ἀξιώματων ἀνθρωπίνων. And so (C_c. and Thl. Thdrt. even more plainly, ποιήσιν δὲ οὐ τὴν δημιουργίαν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χειροτονίαν κέκληκεν. And Epiphani. Hær. lxi. 38, 39, vol. ii. (Migne), p. 761, distinctly denies any reference even to the humanity of Christ as created,—οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν πλάσιν ἐνταῦθα δηγεῖται τοῦ σπματος, οὐδὲ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἐνανθρωπήσεως, οὐ περὶ κτίσεως ὅλως φάσκει, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὴν ἐνδύμειαν τοῦ ἀξιώματος τὸ χάρισμα. See other testimonies from the Fathers in Suicer, ii. p. 783), as also (καί, to take another instance of faithfulness: thus, with every circumstance of honour, is Moses introduced, before any disparagement of him is entered upon) (was) Moses in all His house (from ref. Num., οὐχ οὕτως ὁ θεράπων μου Μωσῆς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ μου πιστός ἐστι. 1. It may be well to remark, that the substitution of αὐτοῦ for μου at once indicates to whom αὐτοῦ is to be referred: viz. to God, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν: see also below on ver. 6. And so most ancient and modern Commentators. Ebrard would make it both times reflexive—"his house," i.e. the house to which he belongs: Bleek, both times to refer to Christ, whose house, as a Son, it is: Thl. gives the alternative, οἶκον τὸν λαὸν λέγει, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰώθαμεν λέγειν, ὁ δὲνα τῆςδε τῆς οἰκίας ἐστίν· αὐτοῦ δέ, ἦτοι τοῦ θεοῦ, ἢ τοῦ Μωυσέως· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦ Μ. ἐλέγετο ὁ λαός, ὡς τὸ δὲ λαός σου ἤμαρτεν. But this last expression had a special reference, and did not represent a general truth. 2. The circumstance of the quotation makes it far more natural to refer ἐν ὅλῳ τ. οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ to Moses directly, and not to Christ, as Ebrard, al., putting a comma at Μωσῆς. 3. The ellipsis is to be filled up by πιστός ἦν after τῷ οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ, as in the place cited. 4. The signification of ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ is well illustrated by 1 Tim. iii. 15, πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζώντος. It imports the Church of God: and is one and the same here and in ver. 6; not two different houses, but the same, in the case of Moses taken at one

time only,—in that of Christ, in its whole existence and development). 3.] For (the γὰρ is best connected, as commonly, with the κατανόηστε above: as containing the reason why our attention should be thus fixed on Jesus: for, though He has the quality of faithfulness in God's house in common with Moses, yet is He far more exalted and glorious than he. Bleek, understanding αὐτοῦ above of Christ, inclines to connect γὰρ immediately with it: "it is His house, inasmuch as," &c. But surely a ratiocination so taken up from a pronoun of at least ambiguous reference, would, without something to emphasize αὐτοῦ as = αὐτοῦ, be exceedingly obscure to the reader. Others, as De Wette, would join it to the immediately preceding and render it explicatively: but this seems harsh and incoherent) this person (the transposition in the later MSS. to δόξης οὗτος has probably been made to bring οὗτος παρὰ Μωυσῆν together and πλείονος δόξης. But it is characteristic of our Writer to separate words constructed together by an emphatic word) hath been held worthy (the word includes, with the idea of 'accounting worthy,' that also of the actual bestowal of the dignity. So Philo, of Moses when a child, De Vit. Mos. i. 5, vol. ii. p. 83, τροφῆς οὗν ἦδη βασιλικῆς κ. θαρραλείας ἀξιούμενος. And De Decal. § 21, p. 198, τὴν μέντοι προνομίαν ἧς ἐν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐβδόμας ἡξίωται: Diod. Sic. xix. 11, τὴν δ' Εὐρυδικὴν . . . ἐκρίνε μέγιστον ἀξιώσαι τιμωρίας: Arrian, Var. Hist. xii. 10, τὸν ἀνδραγαθὸν ἡξιώθησαν. See more examples in Bleek. The word refers to the honour and glory wherewith God hath crowned Christ, in His exaltation to His right Hand; which is taken for granted without further explanation, as a fact well known to the readers) of more glory (not, "of so much the more:" the construction is as in ch. viii. 6, διαφορετέρας τέτυχεν λειτουργίας, ὅσας καὶ κρείττονός ἐστιν διαθήκης μεσότης) than (on παρὰ after a comparative, see note, ch. i. 4), Moses, inasmuch as (this seems to give καθ' ὅσον very happily, with just the same blending of analogy and inference) he hath more honour than the house (so is this gen. to be rendered, and not 'in,' or 'from the house,' as D-lat., "quanto majorem honorem habet domus is qui præpa-

w ch. ii. 9 reff. σκευάσας αὐτόν· ⁴ w πᾶς γὰρ οἶκος ^v κατασκευάζεται ὑπὸ ABCDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

ravit eam:" and so vulg., Luther, but combining with it the other rendering also (nachdem der eine größere Ehre am Hause hat der es bereitet denn das Haus), Wolf, Peirce, al. This, that the Founder of the house had more glory from, or in the house, than Moses, was not true in fact of Christ: for they of the house had rejected Him. Cf. a very similar comparison in Philo, de Plant. Noë, § 16, vol. i. p. 340, ὅσα γὰρ ὁ κτησάμενος τὸ κτήμα τοῦ κτήματος ἀμείνων, κ. τὸ πεποιηκὸς τοῦ γεγονότος, τοσοῦτ' βασιλικώτεροι ἐκείνοι. The majority of Commentators take it as above: e.g. Chrys., πλείονα τιμὴν ἔχει τῶν ἔργων ὁ τεχνίτης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου ὁ κατασκευάζων αὐτόν: and Thdrt., ὅση φησὶ ποιήματος πρὸς ποιητὴν διαφορὰ, τοσαύτη Μωυσέως πρὸς τὸν χριστόν. For the argument, see below) who established it ("κατασκευάζειν οἶκον," says Bleek, "is not to 'found a household,' so that ὁ κατασκευάσας τὸν οἶκον should designate the paterfamilias,—a meaning which can hardly be defended:—but the formula refers beyond doubt primarily to the erection of an actual house. The word is so used, of the preparation of a building,—a house, or temple, or ship, or town, &c.,—and especially in later Greek. So in our Epistle (in St. Paul it never occurs), besides here and ver. 4,—as in reff. also. 1 Macc. xv. 3, κατεσκεύασα πλοῖα πολεμικά: Jos. Vit. § 12, καθαιρεθῆναι τὸν οἶκον ὑπὸ Ἡρώδου . . . κατασκευασθέντα: Herodian, v. 6. 13, κατεσκεύασε δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ προαστείῳ νεῶν μέγιστον τε καὶ πολυτελέστατον: ib. § 22, πύργους τε μεγίστους καὶ ὑψηλοτάτους κατασκευάσας: Plut. Numæ, p. 67 A, ἐνταῦθα κατασκευάζεται κατὰ γείους οἶκος οὐ μέγας: Diod. Sic. xi. 62, ἄλλας τριήρεις πολλὰς κατεσκεύασαν, &c. In almost all these places, the verb may be so taken as to include not only the erection of the building, ship, &c., but also the fitting up, providing with proper furniture (κατασκευή, σκευή), as indeed it is found more expressly used in Attic writers: e.g. Xen. Hiero ii. 2, μεγαλοπρεπεστάτας οἰκίας καὶ ταύτας κατεσκευασμένας τοῖς πλείστοις ἀξίους: id. Anab. iv. 1. 8, ἥσαν δὲ καὶ χαλκώμασι παμπόλλοις κατασκευασμένοι αἱ οἰκίαι, and al.; Demosth. p. 1208, ἔτι δὲ σκεύεσιν ἰδίους τὴν ναὺν κατεσκεύασα: p. 689, οἷς κατεσκευασμένην δρᾶτε τὴν πόλιν: ib., ὥστε τινὲς μὲν αὐτῶν πολλῶν δημοσίαν οἰκοδομημάτων σμενοντάς τὰς ἰδίας κατεσκευάσασιν οἰκίας. And here also we may say, that κατασκευάζειν means more than οἰκοδομεῖν οἶκον, and includes, be-

sides the building of the house, the fitting it up, and providing it with all requisites. So that to this κατασκευή of the house belong servants, male and female; and so here we may say that the οἰκέται, the servants of the house, are included. The sense then is this: just as he who has built and furnished a house,—for himself namely, as master of the house,—stands higher in honour than the house itself and the individual οἰκέται, so does Christ higher than Moses: and Christ is thus represented as he who has prepared the house of God (and therefore as its lord), to whom Moses also belongs, as an individual οἰκέτης. And so Chrys., &c., &c." Wetstein and Böhme have proposed a way of taking this verse which is at least specious: viz. to understand ὁ κατασκευάσας not of the Son, but of the Father, and the sentiment to be, inasmuch as he who established the house has more honour than the house, *which honour Christ, as His Son, shares.* But however suitable this idea may be in the next verse (see below), it is well answered by Bleek, al., that the insertion of it here would be quite alien from the object of the Writer, who is clearly comparing, directly, Moses and Christ: and that besides, a reference to a sentiment lying out of the immediate path of the argument would be introduced not by καθ' ὅσον, but by πλὴν, or ἀλλὰ (or δέ, as in ver. 4). I am surprised to find Hofmann and Delitzsch upholding this last-mentioned interpretation as the only right one. Surely the ellipsis of the proposition 'the honour of the Father belongs to the Son also' is not for a moment to be assumed. And besides, to suppose οὗτος in this verse, and ὁ κατασκευάσας, not to refer to the same person, would involve a harshness and carelessness of style neither of which belongs to our Writer. See more on next verse). 4.] For (expansion and justification of ὁ κατασκευάσας) every house is established by some one (i. e. it belongs to the idea of a house that some one should have built and fitted it up: arrangement implies an arranger, design a designer): but (contrast as passing from the individual to the general) He which established all things is, God (= God is he which established all things; θεός being the subject, and ὁ τὰ πάντα κατασκ., the predicate. Before treating of the misunderstanding of this verse by the Fathers, and by many of the moderns, let us endeavour to grasp its true meaning. The last verse brings before us Christ as the κατασκευαστής of

τινός, ὁ δὲ πάντα [†] κατασκευάσας θεός. ⁵ καὶ Μωυσῆς ^{x ver. 2.}
^{y here only.}
 μὲν ^x πιστὸς ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ ^x οἴκῳ αὐτοῦ ὡς ^y θεράπων,
² εἰς ^z μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων. ⁶ χριστὸς δὲ ὡς
 8. Deut. iii. 24. Josh. i. 2 (τῶν). (πειρά, Luke xii. 42.) ^z Matt. viii. 4 || x. 18 || xxiv.
 14 ||. James v. 3. Gen. xxi. 30.

4. rec ins τα bef πάντα with C² or ³D³L[P] rel [arm Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc₂]:
 om ABC¹D¹KMN 17 Chr.-ms.

the house of God. And this He is, in whatever sense οἶκος be taken: whether in the narrower sense which best suits this present comparison, or in the wider sense implied by the faithful centurion in Matt. viii. 9, in which all natural powers are His οἰκέται. But He is this not by independent will or agency. δι' οὗ καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς αἰῶνας, is our Writer's own language of the creation by Christ: and it is in accord with that of St. John, where he says πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. He, as the Son, is ὁ κατασκευάσας the house of God—the Church, or the world, or the universe; but, apparently (cf. ver. 6), the former of these: but it is as one with,—by virtue of his Sonship,—Him who is ὁ πάντα κατασκευάσας, viz. God. And thus the αὐτοῦ, twice repeated in vv. 5, 6, falls into its own place as belonging both times to God: Moses is His servant, part and portion of His household: Christ is His Son, over His household. And by this reference to God as the πρωτοκατασκευαστής, is the expression above, τῷ ποιήσαντι αὐτόν, illustrated and justified. So that this verse is not quasi-parenthetic, as almost all the recent expositors make it—e. g. Tholuck, Bleek, Ebrard, Lünemann,—but distinctly part of the argument. The ancient expositors, almost without exception, take θεός as predicate, and ὁ (τὰ) πάντα κατασκευάσας as a designation of Christ—"now He that founded all things, is (must be) God:" thus making the passage a proof of the deity of Christ. The short-hand writer has apparently here blundered over Chrysostom's exposition, for it is meagre and confused to the last degree; but Thdrt., Ec., and Thl., so explain it, regarding ver. 2 as an assertion of Christ's superiority to Moses regard His human nature, and this verse as regards His divinity. ὅρα πῶς ἤρξατο μὲν τῆς συγκρίσεως ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκός, ἀνέβη δὲ εἰς τὴν θεότητα, καὶ ἀσυγκρίτως ὑπερέχειν τὸν ποιητὴν τοῦ ποιήματος ἔδειξε. And so also Beza, Estius, Cappellus, a-Lapide, Cameron, Seb. Schmidt, Calmet, Bengel (who however as well as Cappellus, takes ὁ as the personal pronoun referring to Christ, and (τὰ) πάντα κατασκευάσας as in apposition; but He, who &c., is God), al. But, apart from the extreme harshness and

forcing of the construction to bring out this meaning, the sentiment itself is entirely irrelevant here. If the Writer was proving Christ to be greater than Moses inasmuch as He is God, the founder of all things, then clearly the mere assertion of this fact would have sufficed for the proof, without entering on another consideration: nay, after such an assertion, all minor considerations would have been not only superfluous, but preposterous. He does however, after this, distinctly go into the consideration of Christ being faithful not as a servant but as a son: so that he cannot be here speaking of His Deity as a ground of superiority). 5.] The argument proceeds, resuming the common ground of ver. 2: and Moses indeed (inasmuch as δὲ following has the effect of bringing out, and thus emphasizing, χριστός, this μὲν may almost be treated as a particle of disparagement: cf. Isocr. Panegy. p. 178, ἡ καλουμένη μὲν ἀρχή, οὐσα δὲ συμφορά—"which is called indeed . . . but really is . . .") (was) faithful in all His (God's, cf. above the words of the citation, on ver. 2) house, as a servant (cf. as above; the word θεράπων (see reff.) is often applied by the LXX to Moses. So also Wisd. x. 16: Barnabas, Ep. c. 14, Μωυσῆς θεράπων ὦν ἔλαβεν (τὰς πλάκας), αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν ἔδωκεν. θεράπων differs from δούλος, in embracing all who are, whether by occasion or by office, subservient to another: thus the Etym. Mag.: θεράπωντας οὐχ, ὥσπερ οἱ νεώτεροι, δούλους, ἀλλὰ πάντας τοὺς θεραπευτικῶς ἔχοντας, ὡς "Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἀρηος" καὶ, τὸν ἐν δευτέρᾳ τάξει φίλον, ὡς "Πάτροκλος Ἀχιλλέως θεράπων." Wetst., who also cites Apollonius, Ammonius, and Eustathius, to the same effect. This of course would allow the same person to be called by both names, as Moses is in Josh. i. 1 and 2 F. (not A), and al. Bleek well remarks here, that δούλος, had it been used of Moses in the place cited, would have served the Writer's purpose here just as well for the argument, but not for the words εἰς μαρτ. τῶν λαληθησομένων, which here follow, indicating the nature of his θεραπεία, for testimony of the things which were to be (afterwards) spoken (these words are not to be joined with θεράπων, as Bleek, Lün.,

■ Matt. xxv.
21, 23, (see
ch. x. 21.)

υἱὸς ^a ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ· οὐ ^b οἶκός ἐσμεν ἡμεῖς, ἐὰν τὴν

b 1 Tim. iii 15. 1 Pet iv. 17.

ABCDK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

6. for ου, os D¹M latt Lucif, Ambr₁ (not Did Chr Jer): ου o 2. 122. rec εανπερ, with ACD³KL³ rel [Chr₁ Euthal-mas Thdr̄t Damasc Lucif₁]: txt BD¹M[P](N¹) 17.

(N¹ has καν, with the ε written above κ a l. m.) (*As εανπερ is found, with no var in*

al., nor, as Estius, al., with πιστός; but with the whole preceding sentence: the purpose of the faithful service of Moses in God's house was, εἰς μαρτ. κ.τ.λ. In considering the meaning of the words, surely we must look further than the commonly received shallow interpretation which refers them to the things which Moses himself was to speak to the people by God's command. For how could his fidelity ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ οἴκῳ θεοῦ, comprehending as it does the whole of his official life, be said to be εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν λαληθησομένων by him to the people? It seems to me that neither εἰς μαρτύριον (ἐν τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ) nor τῶν λαληθησομένων (τῶν λαληθέντων) will bear such an interpretation. And yet it is acquiesced in by Syr. ("in testimonium eorum quæ loquenda erant in ejus manu"), Chrys. (not perhaps exactly: τί ἐστίν, εἰς μαρτύριον; ἵνα ᾧσι, φησί, μάρτυρες, ὅταν ἀναισχυντῶσιν οὗτοι: but this surely will not suit the gen. τῶν λαληθ.). Thdr̄t. (ἐκεῖνος μὲν πιστὸς ἐκλήθη, ἵνα δεῖχθῇ ἀξιοχρεως νομοθέτης. τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν, εἰς μαρτ. τῶν λαλ.), Thl. (ἵνα λαλῇ τὰ τοῦ δεσπότου τοῖς λοιποῖς οἰκέταις, κ. μάρτυς ἢ τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῇ κρίσει τῶν λαληθέντων), Ec., Primas., Est., Corn.-a-Lap., Grot., Hamm., &c., Stuart, De W., Bleek, Lünem. But, 1. the εἰς with μαρτύριον seems best to express an ulterior purpose of the whole of that which is spoken of in the preceding clause: cf. the same combination in reff. Gosp. — 2. the neut. gen. after μαρτύριον is best understood of that to which the testimony referred, as in Acts iv. 33: 1 Cor. i. 6; ii. 1: 2 Tim. i. 8: — and 3. the future participle requires that the λαληθησόμενα should be referred to a time wholly subsequent to the ministry of Moses. This has been felt by some of the expositors, and curiously evaded: e. g. by Jac. Cappelus, "Rationi consentaneum erat ut statim initio fidelissimus comperiretur Moses, quo fide dignius esset testimonium quod postea perhibiturus erat in monte Sinai." But unfortunately for this view, the incident from which this divine testimony to Moses is quoted, was long subsequent to the delivery of the law from Sinai. If then we are pointed onward to future time for τὰ λαληθησόμενα, what are they? What, but the matter of the divine ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν νῆφ of our ch. i. 1? The whole ministry of Moses was, εἰς μαρτύριον of

these λαληθησόμενα. And when Bleek says that the participle would not be put thus absolutely with such a signification, but would be qualified by ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν, or διὰ τοῦ νῆφ, or the like, or expressed τῶν μελλόντων λαληθῆναι, we may well answer that the Writer, having in ch. i. 1 laid down λαλεῖσθαι as a common term for the revelations of the two dispensations, and again taken it up ch. ii. 2, 3, had no need again to qualify it further than by the future participle. I interpret it then to mean the Gospel, with Calvin ("Moses, dum est ejus doctrinæ præco, quæ pro temporis ratione veteri populo erat prædicanda, simul testimonium Evangelio, ejus nondum matura prædicatio erat, reddidit. Nam certe constat, finem et complementum legis esse hanc perfectionem sapientiæ quæ evangelio continetur. Atque hanc expositionem exigere viætur futurum participii tempus"), Owen ("λαληθ. represents things future unto what he did in his whole ministry. This our translation rightly observes, rendering it, 'the things that should be spoken after.' And this as well the order of the words as the import of them doth require. In his ministry he was a testimony, or, by what he did in the service of the house he gave testimony: whereunto? to the things that were afterwards to be spoken, viz. in the fulness of time, the appointed season, by the Messiah: i. e. the things of the gospel. And this indeed was the proper end of all that Moses did or ordered in the house of God"), Cameron, Calov., Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Wolf, Peirce, Wetstein, Cramer, Baumg., al., Ebrard, and, as I have found since writing the above note, Hofmann and Delitzsch): but Christ (scil. πιστός (ἐστιν), to correspond with the πιστὸν ἦντα, ὡς καὶ κ.τ.λ. above, ver. 2. Some would supply ἐστιν only, as Erasmus. (paraphr.), "At Christus, ut conditor ac filius, administravit suam ipsius domum:" but thus the parallelism would be broken. Then, supplying πιστός, are we to join it with ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκ. αὐτοῦ, as in Matt. xxv. 21, 23, ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡς πιστός, or to insert it before ὡς υἱός, and take it absolutely? Certainly the latter, as shewn by the order of the words in the previous sentence; the ellipsis here being, to judge by that order, between δέ and ὡς, not between υἱός and ἐπὶ) as a Son over his house (αὐτοῦ here again of

ο παρρησίαν καὶ τὸ α καύχημα τῆς ε ἐλπίδος f κατάσχωμεν. c = Eph. iii. 12
 1 Tim. iii.
 13. ch. iv.
 d lsw., P. only. = 2 Cor.
 f = Luke

16. x. 19, 35. 1 John ii. 28. iii. 21. iv. 17. v. 14. Job xxvii 10.
 v 12 ix. 3. (Rom. iv 2 alv.) Deut. x. 21. e = ch. vi. 11, 18. vii. 19. x. 23
 viii. 15 1 Cor. xi. 2. x. 2. 1 Thess. v. 21. ver. 14. ch. x. 23.

the MSS, in ver 14 and ch vi. 3, it is prob here that the other readg is the true one.)

rec aft ἐλπίδος ins (as in ver 14) μέχρι τελους βεβαιαν, with ACCKLM[P]N rel [vss];
 u. τ. (only) Syr; in æternum æth-pl; μ. τ. κατασχ. βεβ. 4: om B æth-rom Lucif, Ambr.,

God,—not primarily, though of course by inference, of Christ. The house is God's throughout: but Christ is of primary authority and glory in it, inasmuch as He is the Son in the house, and actually established the house. This, which I am persuaded is required by the context, is shewn decisively by ch. x. 21, *ἔχοντες . . . ἱερέα μέγαν ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ*. So Chrys. (*ἐκείνος μὲν εἰς τὰ πατρῶα ὡς δεσπότης εἰσέρχεται, οὗτος δὲ ὡς δούλος*), Thdrt. (on the following words: *οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ κέκληκε τοὺς πιστεύοντας κατὰ τὴν προφητείαν τὴν λέγουσαν, ἐνοικήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς κ.τ.λ.*), D-lat. (but with "*in*,"—"Christus autem tanquam filius in domo ejus:" vulg. has "in domo sua"), Jerome (Ep. 18, ad Damas. § 5, vol. i. p. 49, "Christus autem ut filius super domum ejus"), Corn.-a-Lap., Schlichting, Peirce, Bengel, Storr, Morus, Abresch, Dindorf, al.: and recently, Stuart (but only as a question between *ἐαυτοῦ* and *αὐτοῦ*, and apparently without being aware that *αὐτοῦ* may have both meanings), and Lünemann. The greater number of Commentators refer it to Christ: many of them writing it *αὐτοῦ*, to which Bleek well replies, that had the Writer intended the emphatic reflexive pronoun to be understood, writing as he did without accents, he would certainly have used *ἐαυτοῦ*, in a matter so easily confused. Of the rest, some, e.g. Ebrard, take *αὐτοῦ* as referring to Christ: and others, as simply the reflexive pronoun after the generic *υἱός*: "as a son over his (own) house:" thus Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, al. But thus the parallelism is destroyed, and in fact the identity of the house in the two cases, on which depends the strictness of the comparison between Moses and Christ. Most of the expositors have not felt this: but Ebrard has distinctly maintained that two houses are intended: "In the one house serves Moses for a testimony of the future revelations of God, the *οἶκος* itself being part of the *μαρτύριον*: the other *οἶκος*, the *οἶκος* of Christ, are *we*: it is a living house, built of living stones." But this introduces a complicated comparison, and to my mind infinitely weakens the argument. There is but one house throughout, and that one, the Church of God, in which both are faithful; one as

a servant, the other as a son: this house was Israel, this house are we, if we are found faithful in the covenant. So also I am glad to see Delitzsch takes the sentence. Dec. 31, 1858), whose (not (except by inference) *Christ's*, as Ec., Jac. Cappellus, Estius, Owen, Bleek, De Wette, Ebrard, al., but, *God's*,—as Chrys. (*οἶκος γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐσόμεθα τοῦ θεοῦ . . . ἐάντερ κ.τ.λ.*), Thdrt. (see above on *αὐτοῦ*), Thl. (as Chrys., recognizing, however, Christ also, as the possessor of the house, *οἶκον ἔχει καὶ ὁ χριστός, ἡμᾶς*), Calvin ("Additur hæc admonitio, tunc eos in Dei familia locum habituros, si Christum parent"), al., and Delitzsch. Besides the considerations urged above as affecting the question, we have the strong argument from Scripture analogy, cf. besides reff., 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17: 2 Cor. vi. 16: Eph. ii. 22: ch. x. 21; xii. 22: Rev. iii. 12: which alone, especially ch. x. 21, would go very far with me to decide the question) house (some, e.g. Bengel who would read *ὁς οἶκος*, urge the omission of the article here as against *τὸ οἶκος*: adducing such expressions as *ὁ τὸ πνύον, ἧς ὁ ἀδελφός, ὃν τὸ στόμα, ὃν τὰ ὀνόματα, ὃ ἡ πληγὴ, ὃν τὰ κῶλα, ὃ ἡ φωνή, ὃ ἡ οἰκία*. But in every one of these the subject is distributed: whereas here *οἶκος* and *ἡμεῖς* are not commensurate, the proposition merely expressing categorical inclusion, and God's house being far wider than *ἡμεῖς*. Compare the precisely similar passage, 1 Pet. iii. 6, *ἧς (Σάρρας) ἐγενήθητε τέκνα ἀγαθοποιούσαι κ.τ.λ.*) are *we* (the Writer and his Hebrew readers: = of whose house we are, even as Moses was), if we hold fast (reff. Bleek objects to the shorter text here, that the Writer has twice besides used this verb, and both times with a tertiary adjectival predicate: see reff. But such a consideration can hardly override critical evidence) the confidence (reff.: not, "*free and open confession*," as Grot. ("professio Christianismi aperta"), Hamm., Limborch, al., which would not suit *κατάσχωμεν*, a purely subjective word) and the (notice the article, which shews that this second noun is not merely explicative of the first, nor to be ranked in the same category with it) matter of boasting (the concrete: not here to be confounded (although the con-

g ch. ix. 8. x. 16. Acts i. 16. 2 Pet. i. 21. h Psal. xciv. 7-11. i constr., ver. 15 & ch. iv. 7, from i. c. ch. xii. 19. 1 John iv. 5, 6 al. fr. j see note. vv. 13, 15. ch. iv. 7. Acts xix. 9. Rom. ix. 18 only. Jer. xix. 15.

ABC DK
LMPN
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

fusion certainly did take place sometimes) with *καύχησις*, the abstract, as is done by Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, &c. As *παρρησία* was subjective, *our confidence*, so is this objective, *the object whereon that confidence is founded*: see notes on reff. 2 Cor., where the same mistake has been made. And *κατάσχωμεν* is no objection to this: we may 'hold fast' an object of faith, though (see above) we could not 'hold fast,' except in a very far-off sense, an outward practice, such as a bold profession) of our hope (*καλῶς εἶπε τῆς ἐλπίδος, ἐπειδὴ πάντα ἦν ἐν ἐλπίσι τὰ ἀγαθὰ: οὕτω δὲ αὐτὴν δεῖ κατέχειν, ὡς ἡδὴ καυχᾶσθαι ὡς ἐπὶ γεγενημένοις*: Chrys. See reff. and Rom. v. 2). 7-19.] See the summary at the beginning of the chapter. *Exhortation*, founded on the warning given by the Spirit in Ps. xciv., *not to allow an evil heart of unbelief to separate them from this their participation in the house of God.* 7.]

Wherefore (i. e. seeing that they are the house of Christ if they hold fast their confidence and boast of hope. It has been disputed, what verb is to be connected with *διό*. Some (as Schlichting, J. Cappellus, Heinrichs, Cramer, Kuinoel, Ebrard, al.) join it immediately with *μὴ σκληρύνετε*, and regard the Writer as making the Spirit's words his own: but this labours under the great difficulty that in ver. 9 the speaker is God Himself, and so an unnatural break is made at the end of ver. 8 (Delitzsch acknowledges this difficulty, but does not find it insuperable, and adopts the view). Others, as De W. and Tholuck, believe that the construction begun with *διό* is dropped, and never finished, as in Rom. xv. 3, 21: 1 Cor. i. 31; ii. 9: supplying after *διό, μὴ σκληρύνετε τὰς καρδ. ὑμ.,*—or understanding *διό* more freely, "wherefore let it be so with you, as" &c. But by far the best way is, with Erasmus. (annot.), Calvin, Est., Pisc., Grot., Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Wetst., Abrsch, Böhme, Bleek, Lünem., al. to take the whole citation, including the formula of citation, as a parenthesis, and join *διό* with *βλέπετε* ver. 12. The length of such parenthesis is no objection to this view: see ch. vii. 20-22; xii. 18-24, where the Writer, after similar parentheses, returns back into the previous construction. Nor again is it any objection, that in the midst of the citation, another *διό* occurs, ver. 10: for that *διό*

belongs strictly to the citation, and finds both its preparation and its apodosis within its limits. Nor again, that the sentence beginning with *βλέπετε*, ver. 12, is more an analysis of the citation than an application of it: had this been so, we should more naturally have expected to find *βλέπετε οὖν*,—ch. xii. 25 supporting, instead of impugning (as Tholuck) this last reply to the objection),—even as the Holy Spirit saith (in Ps. xciv., Heb. and Eng. This Psalm in the Heb. has no writer's name: in the LXX it is headed, *αἶνος φῶδης τῷ Δαυεὶδ*. And it is ascribed to David in ch. iv. 7 below. The passage is cited as the direct testimony of the Holy Spirit, speaking through David: cf. reff.), *To-day, if ye hear his voice* ("In the Psalm, according to the Hebrew, the words corresponding to these, *ἡρῶν ἡγῶμαι οἶν*, the second hemistich of the 7th verse, form an independent sentence, to be taken as a powerful exhortation expressed in the form of a wish, *οἶ, si, utinam*, as often. The sense from ver. 6 is,—'Come let us fall down and bow ourselves, kneel before Jehovah our Creator. For He is our God and we the people of his pasture and the flock of his hand.' Then this sentence follows: 'O that ye might this day hearken to His voice!' *οἶν* stands first with strong emphasis, in contrast to the whole past time, during which they had shewn themselves disobedient and rebellious against the divine voice, as e.g. during the journey through the wilderness, alluded to in the following verses: 'to-day' therefore means 'now,' 'nunc tandem.' Then in the following verses, to the end of the Psalm, is introduced, in the oratio directa, that which the divine voice, which they are to hear, addresses to them. And it is probable that the LXX took the words in the sense of the Hebrew: at least their rendering of *οἶν* by *ἐάν* elsewhere gives no sure ground for supposing the contrary, seeing that they often give *ἐάν* for *οἶν* as *utinam*, and that, in places where they would not well have understood it otherwise: e.g. Ps. cxxxviii. 19. Yet it would be obvious, with such a translation, to take this period not as an independent sentence, but either in close connexion with the preceding period of the 7th ver., as a declaration of the condition of their being His people,—or in reference to the following, as a protasis to which ver. 8, *μὴ σκληρύνετε κ. τ. λ.*,

ἰμῶν ὡς ἐν τῷ ^k παραπικρασμῷ ¹ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ^k here and ver. 15 from l. c. only.
^m πειρασμοῦ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, ⁹ οὐ ^o ἐπέειραν οἱ πατέρες (κραίνειν, ver. 16. Ps. lxxv. 7. lxxvii. 6.)
 ἰμῶν ἐν ^p δοκιμασίᾳ, καὶ εἰδὼν τὰ ἔργα μου τεσσεράκοντα
 1 of time, Acts xvi. 25, xxvii. 27. Winer, § 49 d. b. m Matt. vi. 13. Luke iv. 13 al. Deut. vi. 16.
 n = (see note) Deut. viii. 15. o = Acts v. 12. 1 Cor. x. 13. Ps. lxxvii. 46.
 only t. Sir. vi. 21 only. Xen. Mem. ii. 2. 13 al. in Bleek. p here

8. for παραπικρασμῷ, πικρασμῷ N.

9. for οὐ, ὅπου D¹. rec aft εἰπειραν ins με (as LXX-Ed-vat N^{3a}), with D³KLM [P]^N rel vulg [syrr arm] copt-wilk Chr Thdrt [Euthal-ms Damasc] Ambr₁: om (as LXX-A[B]^N) ABCD¹N¹ 17 copt(Wetst) Lucif₁. rec (for ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ) ἐδοκιμασαν με (corr'n to LXX), with D³KLN³ rel vulg syrr [æth arm Chr, Cyr₁, Thdrt Damasc Ambr₁]: txt ABCD¹M[P]^N 17 copt (Clem) [Euthal-ms]. ἰδὼν AC[P] 17 Did₁. rec τεσσαράκοντα, with B² (H in ver 17) KLM[P]: μ' D: txt AB¹CN. (So also in ver 17.)

forms the apodosis. In this last way the Writer of our Epistle appears to have taken the words, from his beginning his citation with them: and yet more clearly from ver. 15, and ch. iv. 7." Bleek: and so De Wette, on the Psalm: and Tholuck and Lünemann: and Calv. as an alternative. **στήμερον** will thus refer to the day in which the Psalm was used in public worship, whenever that might be. See below), **harden not your hearts** (Heb. heart. Bleek remarks, that this is the only place (in Heb. and LXX: βαρύνειν τ. κ. of the act of man is found Exod. viii. 15, 32: 1 Kings vi. 6) where this expression 'to harden the heart' is used of *man's* own act: elsewhere it is always of *God's* act, cf. Exod. iv. 21; vii. 3 (vii. 22; viii. 19); ix. 12 (35); x. 20, 27; xi. 10; xiv. 4, 17: Isa. lxviii. 17, and τὸ πνεῦμά τινος, Deut. ii. 30; whereas when the hardening is described as the work of man, the formula σκληρύνειν τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ is used, Deut. x. 16: Neh. ix. 17, 29: 2 Chron. xxx. 8 (where however B reads τὰς καρδίας); xxxvi. 13: Jer. vii. 26 al., or τὸν νῶτον αὐτοῦ, 4 Kings xvii. 14. For N. T. usage see reff.), as in the provocation (Heb. מְרִיבָה, "as (at) Meribah." In Exod. xvii. 1—7 we read that the place where the children of Israel murmured against the Lord for want of water was called Massah and Meribah,—καὶ ἐπονθήμασε τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκεῖνου Πειρασμός καὶ Λοιδόρησις, LXX. But the subsequent account of Num. xx. 1—13, makes it plain that the two names refer to two different events and places: and this is further confirmed by Deut. xxxiii. 8, "Thy holy One whom thou didst prove at Massah, and with whom thou didst strive at the waters of Meribah." In the Psalm these two are mentioned together, and the LXX as usual *translate* the names, using here however the uncommon word **παραπικρασμός**, for λοιδόρησις, which is their word in Exod. xvii. 7, λοιδόρια Num. xx. 24 (so AB), and ἀντιλογία in Num. xx. 13 (24 Ald.); xxvii. 14: Deut. xxxii. 51;

xxxiii. 8: Ps. lxxx. 7; cv. 32; the only places where they have preserved the proper name, being in Ezek. xlvii. 19 (μαριμῶθ), xlviii. 28 (βαριμῶθ). In giving, for the proper names, their meaning and occasion, they have in fact cast light upon the sacred text; though it is rather exegesis than strict translation. The word itself, **παραπικρασμός**, is supposed by Owen to have found its way into the LXX from this citation: but there is no ground whatever for such a supposition. Though the subst. does not again occur, the verb **παραπικραίνω** occurs 35 times, and generally of men provoking God to anger. It has also been conjectured by Michaelis, that the LXX may, as they have never rendered Meribah by this word elsewhere, have read מַרְיָה, Marah, in their Hebrew text here, which they render πικρία in Exod. xv. 23: Num. xxxiii. 8, 9. This may have been so, but is pure conjecture), in the time of (the κατὰ, as the Writer takes it, seems, by ver. 16 below, where only the verb **παρεπικράναν** introduces the question, not **παρεπ. καὶ ἐπέειραν**,—to be subordinate to the **παραπικρασμός**, and as so often, to signify 'during,' at the time of: so οἱ καθ' ἡμᾶς, our contemporaries,—κατὰ Ἀμασιν βασιλεύοντα,—κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον: see Bernhardy, p. 241: Blomf. Glossary on Agam. 342. In the Heb. this second clause is distinct from the first, and introduces a fresh instance: see below) the day of the temptation in the wilderness (Heb., מִדְבָּרָה מִדְבָּרָה, as in the day of Massah in the wilderness: viz. that of the second murmuring against Moses and Aaron for want of water: see Num. xx. 1—13. The place was in the wilderness of Sin, near Kadesh: ib. ver. 1), where (we have the same construction of οὐ after τῆς ἐρήμου in ref. ὅπου, τουτέστιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἢ, οὐ ἐπέειραν πειρασμοῦ, ἵνα ἢ τὸ οὐ ἄρθρον, ἀλλὰ μὴ τόπου δηλωτικόν. Ec. And in this latter way it is taken by Erasmus, Schmid, Francke, Bengel, and Peirce. But the

q (and constr.) ἔτη. 10 διό q προσώχθισα τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ καὶ εἶπον Ἄελ

Gen. xxv. 46 Ps. xxi. 24. Sir. vi. 25 al. w. ἐν, Num. xxi. 5 w. ἀπὸ προσώπου, xxi. 3. absol., Deut. vii. 26.

10. rec (for ταυτη) ἐκεινη (corr. to LXX, where there is no var), with CD³KL[P] rel Chr Thdrt: ista D-lat: txt ABD¹MN 17 vulg Clem Did [from the Psalm]. εἶπα (as LXX-BN) A D²(appy) a c k 17 Chr-ms-corr [Euthal-ms Cyr.]: εἶπαν D¹: txt BCD³KLM[P]N rel Clem Did [Chr Thdrt].

ABCDK
LMPN
abcde
fghkl
mno
17, 47

former way seems the more likely, on account of the arrangement of the words: if the latter had been intended, the order would more probably have been τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, οὗ ἐπέρασαν . . . ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. And the usage of οὗ for ὅπου, though not found elsewhere in this Epistle, is not uncommon in the LXX,—cf. Ps. lxxxiii. 3: Ezek. xxi. 16: Esth. iv. 3: Sir. xxiii. 21,—and is found 24 times in the N. T.) **your fathers tempted by way of trial** ('tempted (me) in trying,' or 'proving (me).') It will be seen that the more difficult reading is sustained by the consent of the most ancient MSS., and expressly supported by Clem. alex.; who cites the whole passage, and, as is evident by his insertion of διό before προσώχθισα, from our Epistle: and continues, ἡ δὲ δοκιμασία τίς ἐστὶν εἰ θεέις μαθεῖν, τὸ ἀγνῶν σοὶ πνεῦμα ἐξηγήσεται: καὶ εἶδον κ.τ.λ. The idea of such a reading being "an alteration to remove a seeming roughness of style" (Dr. Bloomfield) is simply absurd, the roughness existing not in the received text and LXX, but in the expression ἐπέρασαν ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ. It is very difficult to account for such a reading: and Bleek supposes that it may have existed in the Writer's copy of the LXX; ἐν δοκιμασίᾳ, i. e. ἘΔΟΚΙΜΑ- CΙΑ, being written for ΕΔΟΚΙΜΑCΑ; and instances ch. x. 5, σῶμα, and ch. xii. 15, ἐνοχλή, as similar cases. For the usage of the word δοκιμασία, see reff.), and **saw my works** (Heb., ^{וַיֵּרְאוּ} ^{וַיֵּרְאוּ} ^{וַיֵּרְאוּ}, "moreover they saw my work"—i. e. my penal judgments; so Ewald, and Bleek: and so the word ^{וַיֵּרְאוּ} is used in Ps. lxiv. 10: Isa. v. 12: Hab. i. 5; iii. 2: for these penal judgments lasted during the forty years, and it is they which are described in the next sentence. The meaning given by most expositors, "although they saw my works (miracles of deliverance, &c.) for forty years," is not so likely, seeing that these provocations happened at the beginning of the forty years. But see below) **forty years** (these words in the Heb. most probably belong, as rendered in our E. V., to what follows: an arrangement rendered impossible here, on account of διό following. But that such arrangement was not unknown to our Writer is plain, from his presently saying, ver. 17, τίςιν δὲ προσώχθισεν τσοσπεδκοντα ἔτη; It is therefore likely that

he did not choose this arrangement without reason. And if we ask what that reason was, we find an answer in the probability that the forty years' space is taken as representing to the Hebrews their space for repentance; their σήμερον, between the opening of the preaching of the gospel (cf. ch. ii. 2), and their impending destruction. This idea was recognized by the Jews themselves in their books: e. g. Sanhedr. fol. 99. 1, "R. Eliezer dixit: dies Messiae sunt 40 anni, sicut dicitur, Quadraginta annos &c, Ps. xcv. 10;" and then follows a proof of it from this passage in the Psalm: Tanchuma, fol. 79. 4, "Quamdiu durant anni Messiae? R. Akiba dixit, Quadraginta annos, quemadmodum Israelitae per tot annos in deserto fuerunt." "And if," continues Bleek, "this idea of the days of the Messiah was prevalent, that they were the immediate precursors of the מָלְךְ דְּבָרָה (the age to come) as the time of the great Sabbath-rest, and the completed glory of the people of God,—this is something very analogous to the acceptance of the period of the forty years which seems to underlie what is said of them in our Epistle." If so, it is possible that the meaning of καὶ εἶδον τὰ ἔργα μου above may be, that they saw My wonderful works and took no heed to them, and thereby increased their guilt).

10.] Wherefore (see above: διό is inserted, to mark more strongly the reference of τσοσ. ἔτη to the preceding. It is impossible, with διό, to join those words to this sentence and understand διό as = διὰ ταῦτα, as Estius, Piscator, Grot., &c. Instead of being so anxious, at the expense of the meaning of words, to put our citations straight to the letter, it is far better to recognize at once the truth, for such it is, which Calvin here so boldly states: "Scimus autem apostolos in citandis testimoniis magis attendere ad summam rei, quam de verbis esse sollicitos") I was offended (προσοχθίζω and οχθίζω are Alexandrine forms peculiar to the LXX. The classical word is οχθέω, frequently found in Homer; προσοχθέω is cited in Palm and Rost's Lexicon from Psid. fragm. (?). The root seems to be ἔχω, from which also we have the cognate word ἄχθος, -ομαι, which, says Passow, differs from οχθέω in being always used of a literal and material burden, whereas this is always of a metaphorical and mental one. ἔχθος

[†] πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ, αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδοὺς [†] μου ¹¹ ὥς ὥμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου [†] Εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς

10. Rom. xi. 33. Rev. xv. 3. Ps. xvii. 21. [†] = ch. iv. 3, 5, from 1. c. Mark viii. 12. Gen. xiv. 23. Num. xiv. 30. Deut. i. 35. 1 Kings iii. 14. xiv. 45. 2 Kings xi. 11. xx. 20 al

[†] = 1 Cor. vi. 9. 2 Tim. iii. 13. Tit. iii. 3 al. Isa. xxi. 24. Acts xiii. 1. Gen. xiv. 23.

in all probability is another cognate word similarly derived. The substantive *ῥαθ* does not seem to be any further connected with *ῥαθ* and *ῥαθ* than by derivation from a common root. *ῥαθ* is that which stands out or protrudes: *ῥαθ*, to stand out against, to thrust oneself in the way of: "affinis phrasis, *adversum incedere*, Levit. xxvi. 24, 28," Bengel: hence *ῥαθ* ποταμοί, the banks of a river: so Eustathius, *ῥαθ*, παρὰ τὸ ἔχειν (ἐξέχειν) τοπικὸν ἐπανάστημα: but no nautical metaphor, as "*infringing* (impinging?) *upon the shore, running aground*" (Stuart, al., after Suidas, *προσάχθηκε· προσκέρκρουκε, προσκέρκρυνεν* ἀπὸ τοῦ τὰ ἐπινυχόμενα τὰς ῥαθς *προσκρούεσθαι*), is to be thought of. Hesychius interprets *προσ-οχθισμός, πρόσκρουσις, δεινοπάθεια*) with this generation (the LXX has *ἐκείνη*, as the rec. here: there is no demonstrative in the original Hebrew, *וְהָיָה*. I quite think with Böhme and Bleek, that the change is made by our Writer for a set purpose, viz. to extend the saying, by making *γενεά* thus import the whole Jewish people, over the then living race, as well as that which provoked God in the wilderness. Cf. Matt. xxiv. 34, and note), and said, *They do always err in their heart* (Heb., "*They are a people of wanderers in heart.*" Bleek thinks the *ἀέ* of the LXX is owing to the taking *עַם*, people, for *עַיִן*, or *עַיִן*, or *עַיִן*, which last Symmachus has translated *ἀέ* in Ps. xlix. 10; cxxxix. 18), but *they* (in Heb., merely "*and they,*" and so in the LXX-B, *καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἔγν.* Our text agrees with the alex. ms., which marks off the clause more strongly with *δέ* [so also N]. Bengel justifies this: "*עַם* in Hebr. iteratur magna vi. Accentus hic incipiunt hemistichium. Itaque non continetur sub *εἶπον διὰ*, sed sensus hic est: illi me sibi infensum esse sentiebant, αὐτοὶ δέ, *videm* tamen nihilo magis vias meas cognoscere voluerunt. Simile antitheton: *illū, et ego*, cap. viii. 9, coll. ver. 10. Sic, *at illi*, Ps. cvi. 43: cf. etiam Luc. vii. 5: Isa. liii. 7 in Hebr.") *knew not* (aor., as their ignorance preceded their wandering, and is treated as the antecedent fact to it. The *not knowing*, where matters of practical religion are concerned, implies the not following) *my ways* (i. e. the ways which I would have them to walk in, *וְיָצִי*: so Gen. vi. 12: Exod. xviii. 20, *σημανεῖς αὐτοῖς τὰς ὁδοὺς ἐν αἷς πορεύσονται*, and passim.

The meaning given to the clause by Stuart, al., "*They disapproved of (?) God's manner of treating them,*" is quite beside the purpose, and surely not contained in the words: see on Rom. vii. 15: 1 Cor. viii. 3), as (this *ὥς* corresponds to the Heb. *וְכֵן*, which is often used as a conjunction, with various shades of meaning all derivable from its primitive sense, as 'quod' in Latin. In Gen. xi. 7, which De W. on the Psalm adduces to justify *σο δαβ*, it has a telic force: and so the LXX, *ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωσιν ἕκαστος τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ πλησίον*. But it seems hardly to bear the ecclastic, "*so that:*" at least I can find no example. The sense here appears to be '*according as,*' in conformity with the fact, that: such conformity not necessarily implying that the excluding oath was prior to the disobedience, but only that the oath and the disobedience were strict correlatives of one another. As the one, so was the other) I *sware* (see Num. xiv. 21 reff.; xxxii. 10 ff.: Deut. i. 34 ff.) *in my wrath* (not, '*by my wrath,*' though such a rendering would be grammatical (cf. Matt. v. 34; xxiii. 16: Rev. x. 6: Ps. lxii. 11); for such a method of swearing on God's part is never found), *If they shall enter* (this elliptical form of an oath stands for a strong negative: it is sometimes, when *man* is the speaker, filled up by "*The Lord do so to me and more also, if . . .*" Cf. ref. Mark: 2 Sam. iii. 35 al. It is interpreted below, ver. 18: *τίσιν δὲ ὥμοσεν μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι κ.τ.λ.*) *into my rest* (in the Psalm, and in the places referred to above, the *rest* is, primarily, the promised land of Canaan. Ec. says, *εἰς τοσοῦτον φησὶν οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰς ὁδοὺς μου, ὥς εἰς τοῦτό με ἤγαγον, ὥστε ὁμῶσαι μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσίν μου, τοῦτέστι τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐν ᾗ εἰσελθόντες ἐμελλαν ἀπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ἀναπαύεσθαι*. In Deut. xii. 9, 10, the words *κατάπαυσις* and *καταπαύσει ἡμᾶς* are used of the promised inheritance of Canaan. But it has been well noticed, that after Joshua had led the people into the land, they never in reality enjoyed entirely the rest which had been promised;—and in consequence, the meaning of that threat of God opened out before them, and it became plain that more was denounced upon the *γενεά* than one generation merely could exhaust, more also than the mere not entering into

u ver. 18. ch. iv. 1 &c. (6 times.) Acts vii. 49 (from Isa. lxvi. 1) only.
 v = Matt. xxiv.
 4. Acts xiii. 40. 1 Cor. viii. 9. x. 12. Gal. v. 15 f. w indic. fut., Mark xiv 2. Col. ii. 8. Xen. Cyr. iv. 1. 18 al. Winer, § 66. 2. b. α. x = Matt. xiii. 58; Mk. xvii. 20 v. r. Rom. iv. 20. ver. 19 al + Wisd. xiv. 25 only. y ch. ii 8 &c. Matt. xiii. 4. Acts iii. 26. z Luke iv. 13. viii. 13 xiii 27. Acts xii. 10 al. 2 Cor. xii. 8. 1 Tim. iv. 1. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Heb., here only. L P H. 2 Chron. xxx. 7. Wisd. iii. 10. a Acts xiv. 15 2 Cor. iii. 3. vi. 16. 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 10. ch. ix. 14. x. 31. xii. 22 Rev vii 2 xv. 7. Isa. xxxvii 4. 17 al. b Heb., ch. x. 25. xiii. 19, 22 only. = Acts xv. 32 al fr. c = Eph. iv. 32. Col. iii. 13. 1 Thess. v. 13. 1 Pet. iv. 8, 10.

Canaan. Hence the prophetic pregnancy of the oath became evident, and its meaning was carried on in this exhortation by the Psalmist, and is here carried on by the sacred Writer of this Epistle, to a further rest which then remained for Israel, and now still remains for the people of God. Bleek notices the use of *κληρονομεῖν τὴν γῆν* in the Psalms, as a promise of blessings yet future (cf. Ps. xxiv. 13; xxxvi. 9, 11, 22, 29), as pointing the same way : and it is interesting to remember that we have our Lord, in the opening of his ministry, taking up the same strain, and saying, *μακάριοι οἱ πραεῖς, ὅτι αὐτοὶ κληρονομήσουσιν τὴν γῆν*.—12.] take heed (on the connexion of this with διδ above ver. 7, see note there. βλέπετε is only again found in our Epistle at ch. xii. 25. This construction with an indicative future (see reff. on ἔσται) is hardly, as Bleek, to be explained by the interrogative force of μή : but falls under a class of constructions with *ἴνα, ὅπως, ὥς, μή*, in which there is a mingling, in case of *μή*, of the fear lest it should, and the suspicion that it will; and in case of the other particles, of the purpose that it may, and the anticipation that it will. This logical account of the construction is plainer when a past tense is concerned : as in Thuc. iii. 53, *φοβούμεθα μὴ ἀμφοτέρων ἡμα ἡμαρτήκαμεν*, "We fear lest (*that*,—in English idiom) we have missed both at once." See Hartung, Partikellehre, ii. 140, and Bernhardt, p. 402 : and cf. ref. Col. : and the examples in Bleek), brethren, lest (on ποτε not to be pressed as meaning 'at any time,' see above on ch. ii. 1) there shall be (for construction, see above) in any one of you (not the same as ἐν ὑμῖν. Calvin (see also Schlichting in Bleek) remarks well, "Nec tantum in universum præcipit Apostolus ut sibi omnes caveant, sed vult ita de salute cujusque membri esse sollicitos, ne quem omnino ex iis qui semel vocati fuerint, sua negligentia perire sinant. Atque in eo boni pastoris officium facit, qui ita excubare pro totius gregis salute debet, ut nullam ovem negligat") an evil heart of unbelief (the gen. ἀπιστίας is possessive; an evil heart (αὐτὸ πλανῶνται τῇ καρδίᾳ) belonging to, characteristic of, unbelief. This is

plain, from the consideration that ἀπιστία is, throughout, the leading idea,—cf. ver. 19, and ch. iv. 3,—and not the καρδιά πονηρά. Bleek, al. make it a gen. of origin, which in sense comes to the same, but is not so simple in grammar : Calvin ("Significat, conjunctam cum pravitate et malitia fore incredulitatem"), De W., al. a genitive of result (?), "which leads to unbelief;" this latter is logically wrong:—Delitzsch, a qualitative genitive in the widest sense : but this would put ἀπιστίας too much in the background. ἀπιστία must be kept to its simple primary meaning, not rendered, as Schulz, and Bretschneider and Wahl in their Lexicons, *disobedience*; it was not this, but disbelief in the strictest sense, which excluded them, and against which the Hebrews are warned. That it led on to ἀπειθεία, we all know, but this is not before us here), in (the element in which the existence of such an evil heart of unbelief would be shewn) departing (viz. in the sense indicated by the cognate substantive : apostatizing, falling from the faith : see below) from (ἀποστῆναι is commonly constructed with ἀπό in N. T. and LXX : reff. 1 Tim., and Wisd. are exceptions. The classical writers usually construct it with a genitive only, as in these two last passages : see Demosth. p. 78. 21, and numerous other examples in Reiske's index : and Bleek) the living God (by using this solemn title of God, he not only warns them from Whom, and at what risk, they would depart, but also identifies the God whom they would leave, with Him who had so often called Himself by this name as the distinctive God of Israel, and as contrasted with the dumb and impotent idols of other nations. And thus he shews them that Israel, and the privileges and responsibilities of Israel, were now transferred to the Christian Church, from which if they fell away, they would be guilty of apostasy from the God of Israel. Compare the three other places (reff.) where the term occurs in our Epistle, and the notes there),—13.] but (ἀλλά after a negative sentence loses its stronger force of 'nevertheless,' the contrast already lying in the context : and here the preceding exhortation though really a posi-

Η ἀκρις τοὺς ^d καθ' ^d ἐκάστην ^d ἡμέραν, ^e ἄχρις οὗ τὸ σήμερον καλεῖται, ^d here only.
 οὐ... ἵνα μὴ ^f σκληρυνθῇ ἐξ ὑμῶν τις ^g ἀπάτη τῆς ^h ἁμαρτίας. Exod. v. 8.
 1 Kings xvi. 10 A [not in B]. Esth. ii. 11. iii. 4. Job i. 4. Ps.
 ...γὰρ ⁱ μέτοχοι γὰρ τοῦ χριστοῦ ^j ἡμαρταμεν, ^k εἰάνπερ τὴν
 ye e. vii. 11. cxlii 2. see Acts xvii. 17. e = Luke iv. 13. Acts xiii. 11. xx 6 2 Macc. xiv. 10. Xen.
 ABCDH Cyr. v. 4. 16, ἄχρις οὗ ἀσφαλὲς ὄφρο εἶναι. f ver. 8. g Matt. xii. 22 Mk. Eph. iv.
 KLMPN 22. Col. ii. 8 2 Thess. ii. 10. 2 Pet. ii. 13 only. Judith ix. 10, 13. xvi. 8 only. (-τὰν, James ii. 26.)
 a b c d h = Rom. iii. 9, 20 v. 12 al. i = ch. vi. 4. xii. 8. (i. 9 reff.) j Heb. ch. v. 11, 12. vii. 16,
 f g h k l 20, 22, 23 xii. 8 k (ver. 6 v. r.) ch. vi. 3 only.

13. καλεῖτε AC. rec tis bef εξ υμων (transposn in neglect of emphasis), with ACHM[P]N m 17 [47 Lucif.]: txt BDKL rel syr Thdrt Damasc.

14. rec γενομαεν bef του χριστου, with K L(omg του) e rel (syrr copt) [arm Eus.] Chr Thdrt: txt ABCDHM[P]N m 17 latt Orig, Eus, Cyr, Damasc Lucif, Hil.

tive one, βλέπετε, passes as a negative one from the sense, as if it were, 'Let there not be,' &c.) exhort yourselves (so, in a literal rendering, should the word be given, and not "one another," though English idiom may require this latter in a version intended for use. I have already dealt with this supposed εαυτ. "for ἀλλήλ." on ref. Col.: and Bleek treats of it at some length here. "In the word εαυτοῦς we have merely this: that the action to which the subject is united, refers to the subject itself, i. e. to ὑμᾶς. Since however this is a plural idea, a multitude consisting of many members,—the words do not express whether an influence is meant which the different members are to exert one upon another, or each one on himself, or each on himself and on others as well: as regards the expression, it is just as general and indefinite as if it were said, ἡ ἐκκλησία παρακαλεῖται εαυτήν. Still, in the idea of the verb, or otherwise in the context, it may be made clear which of these meanings is intended: and so we find this reflective third person plural frequently used,—whether it imply actually the third person, or the first or second,—where from the context it can only be taken in the second of the above senses, viz. that of an influence to be exerted, in a body consisting of many members, by one member upon another: where, in other words, ἀλλήλων might stand without change of the sense. So in ref.: and in the best Greek writers, e. g. Xen. Mem. iii. 5. 2, εὐμενεστέρους . . . εαυτοῖς: § 16, ὅγε ἀντὶ μὲν τοῦ συνεργεῖν εαυτοῖς τὰ συμφέροντα, ἐπηρεάζουσιν ἀλλήλους, καὶ φθονοῦσιν εαυτοῖς μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις: ib. ii. 7. 12, and De Venat. vi. 12, &c. As regards our passage, this certainly is especially meant, that in the Church one should exhort another: yet not excluding the implication, that each one should himself be exhorted by his exhortation of the Church. In Col. iii. 16, we have the same relation expressed") day by day (reff.: so Xen.

Mem. iv. 2. 12: De Re Equest. v. 9 al. generally in the classics καθ' ἐκάστην, or καθ' ἡμέραν, elliptically), as long as (ἔχρισ, connected with ἄκρις, as μέχρι with μακρός, properly means 'to the height of,' and hence, 'up to,' of space,—'until,' of time. Hence, by a mixed construction, not unfrequently, as here, 'as long as,' i. e. 'up to the moment of such or such a state enduring in existence': see in reff.) the (word) "To-day" is named (i. e. as long as that period endures, which can be called by the name "to-day" as used in the Psalm. That period would be here, the day of grace; the short time (see ch. x. 25, 37) before the coming of the Lord. And so Chrys.: τὸ γὰρ σήμερον, φησὶν, αἰὲ ἐστιν ἕως ἂν συνεστήκη ὁ κόσμος:—on the other hand, many Commentators understand, the term of their natural life; so Basil (Ep. 42. 5, vol. iv. p. 130), Thdrt., Thl., Primasius, Erasm., Corn. a. Lapide, al. But the words themselves, τὸ σῆμ. καλεῖται, are somewhat ambiguous in meaning. De W. with several others, take σήμερον as indicating the whole passage of which it is the first word, and καλεῖται as = κηρύσσεται: so Bengel, "Dum Psalmus iste auditur et legitur." But this seems neither so simple nor so applicable: seeing that, ch. iv. 7, he again calls attention to this σήμερον not as indicating the whole passages, but as πάλιν τινὰ ὀρίζον ἡμέραν), that from among you (emphatic, as contradistinguished from οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν ver. 9. This not having been seen, the transposition, as in rec., has taken place) no one be hardened (as they, ver. 8) by deceit of (arising out of, belonging to) his sin (cf. Rom. vii. 11, ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία . . . ἐξηπάτησέν με καὶ . . . ἀπέκτεινεν. See also Eph. in reff. ὁρᾷ, says Chrysostom, ὅτι τὴν ἀπιστίαν ἡ ἁμαρτία ποιεῖ. And Ec., ἀπατηθεῖσα διὰ τῆς ἀπιστίας ἦν νῦν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκάλειν. In ch. xi. 25; xii. 4, ἁμαρτία is similarly used for defection from God). 14.] A reason given for βλέπετε κ.τ.λ., enforcing the caution; since it is only by endurance that

1 = 2 Cor. ix. 4. ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως ἕως ἑτέρου ἑββαλάν ὁ κατὰ-
 xi 17, ch. (1. 3), xi 1 only. Ruth 1 12 Ps xxxviii 7 Ezek xix 5. Matt. x 22. xxiv. 13. m here only. ἄχρι τ., ch. vi. 11. Rev. ii 26 ἕως, 1 Cor. i. 8. εἰς τέλος, m n o 17. 47

afft υποστ. ins αυτού A 71. 219 vulg Jer.₁[(om)₁] Lucif.₁] Vig-taps.

we can become partakers of Christ. For we have become (Bleek remarks, "Our Writer loves the use of this word γέγονα, where he designates a state to which any one has attained, even where it would have been sufficient to have expressed by εἶναι simply the being (das fidi befinden) in that state." See reff. But here it is rather perhaps proleptic, looking on to the fulfilment of the condition to be stated) partakers of Christ (some, e.g. Michaelis, Paulus, Bretschn., De Wette, take these words as τοὺς μετόχους σου ch. i. 9, to signify "fellow-partakers with Christ," but as Bleek remarks, in all the places where our Writer himself uses μέτοχος with a gen. (ch. i. 9 being a citation), it ever signifies partaker 'of,' and not 'with,' that genitive noun. So μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, ch. vi. 4; also ch. iii. 1; xii. 8;—and μετέχειν τινός, ch. ii. 14; v. 13; vii. 13. So Chrys. (μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ φησιν κ.τ.λ.), Thl. (μετέχομεν αὐτοῦ ὡς σῶμα κεφαλῆς), Ec., Primas., Luther, Bengel, Bleek, Lünemann, &c.), if, that is (περ is originally the same as περί, and is found as an enclitic in Latin as well as in Greek, in 'paulisper,' 'parumper,' 'semper,'—bearing the sense of 'omnino,' or the German prefixed all, in allba, allwo, also, &c., and in our 'although.' See an interesting chapter in Hartung ii. 327—344, and Donaldson's New Cratylus, p. 231 ff. εἰάνπερ does not occur in St. Paul, nor his usual εἴπερ in this Epistle. We have it in Herod. vi. 57, πατρούχου τε παρθένου περί, ἐς τὸν ἰκνέεται ἔχειν, ἢν μὴ περ ὁ παῖρ αὐτὴν ἐγγύησθ, ἢ, that is . . . 'si omnino' . . .), we hold fast (see on ver. 6) the beginning of our confidence (the earlier Commentators, down to Calvin, do not seem to have been aware that ὑπόστασις has in Hellenistic Greek the signification of 'confidence.' That it has, is now proved beyond a doubt. Thus Polyb. iv. 54. 10, οἱ δὲ Ῥόδιοι, θεωροῦντες τὴν τῶν Βυζαντίων ὑπόστασιν, πραγματικῶς διανοήθησαν πρὸς τὸ καθικέσθαι τῆς προθέσεως: ib. vi. 55. 2, οὐχ οὕτω τὴν δύναμιν, ὥς τὴν ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ τόλμαν καταπεπληγμένων τῶν ἐναντίων: Diodor. Sic. Excerpta de Virt. et Vit. p. 557, ἢ ἐν τοῖς βασάνοις ὑπόστασις τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τὸ καρτερικὸν τῆς τῶν δεινῶν ὑπομονῆς περὶ μόνον ἐγενήθη τὸν Ἀριστογέιτον. See more examples

in Bleek and Lünemann. Diod. Sic. also uses ὑποστατικός of one who is of a confident nature (xx. 78), and Polyb. v. 16. 4, ὑποστατικῶς. See also notes on reff. 2 Cor.: and our ch. xi. 1, and the reff. in the LXX. The Greek Fathers mostly give ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστάσεως the sense of "our faith," and Chrys. and Thl. explain how they came by this meaning: τὴν πίστιν λέγει δι' ἧς ὑπέστημεν. The Latins also, as vulg., "initium substantiæ ejus," or as Primasius, "fidem Christi per quam subsistimus et renati sumus, quia ipse est fundamentum omnium virtutum." And thus, or similarly, many of the moderns, even recently Bisping, "the beginning of the subsistence of Christ in us." Calvin himself gives it "fiduciæ vel subsistentiæ."

It is somewhat doubtful, whether τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς ὑποστ. is to be understood 'the beginning of our confidence,' i. e. our incipient confidence, which has not yet reached its perfection,—or, 'our former confidence,' τὴν ὑπόστασιν τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, as 1 Tim. v. 12, τὴν πρώτην πίστιν ἠθέτησαν [cf. also Rev. ii. 4]. This latter is taken by very many, as Grot., Wolf, Tholuck, Delitzsch, al.: but the other is far better, inasmuch as it keeps the contrast between ἀρχή and τέλος; 'if we hold fast this beginning of our confidence firm until the end.' Otherwise, by making ἀρχὴν τῆς = ἀρχαίαν, the contrast vanishes) firm unto the end (see reff. The end thought of is, not the death of each individual, but the coming of the Lord, which is constantly called by this name).— 15.] The whole connexion and construction of this verse is very difficult. I. a. Chrys., Ec., Thl., Erasm. (annot.), Grot., al. suppose a new sentence to begin, and a parenthetical passage to follow from the end of this verse to ch. iv. 1, where the sense is taken up again by φοβηθῶμεν οὖν. Besides the contextual objections to this (which see in the connexion below) there are these: 1. that δὲ or some such connecting particle would thus be wanted here; 2. that thus the οὖν of ch. iv. 1 would be very unnatural. β. Semler, Morus, Storr, De W., Bleek, Tholuck, Lünem., Delitzsch, Winer (§ 63. I. 1, edn. 6), al. still regarding it as the beginning of a new sentence, believe the apodosis to follow at τίνας γάρ, the first question: and justify this use of γάρ at the beginning of a question. But here again the omission of δέ (ἐν

αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ ^q σκληρύνητε τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν ὡς ἐν ^q ver. 8.
 τῷ ^q παραπικρασμῷ. ¹⁶ τίνες ^r γὰρ ἀκούοντες ^s παρεπί-
^r Matt xxiii.
^s 17, 19, Luke
^s xiv 28 al. fr.
^s here only Ps.
 lxxvii. 17, 40. Ezek. ii. 3. (—*παρσμός*, vv. 8, 15.)

15. σκληρυνετε D¹.

16. rec τινές, with LM[P] latt syr copt [Euthal-ms]: txt (see note) o Syr Chr Thdrt.

δὲ τῷ λέγ.) would be unnatural, besides that such a γάρ in a question does not seem predated, when that question is in an apodosis with an ellipsis of λέγω or the like. γ. J. Cappellus, Carpzov, Kuinoel, al. beginning also a sentence at ἐν τῷ λ., believe the apodosis to commence at μὴ σκληρύνητε, from which words they conceive that the Writer adopts the words of the Psalm as *his own*. But thus no good sense is given: "Harden not your hearts, because (or while) it is said "To-day &c." And we should hardly find, in this case, ἐν τῷ παραπικρασμῷ thus standing without further explanation. II. The second class of interpreters are those who join ἐν τῷ λέγ. with the foregoing. And of these, δ. Bengel, Michaelis, al. regard ver. 14 as a parenthesis, and join ἐν τῷ λέγ. with ver. 13; "exhort one another," "as it is said,"—or "while it is said," or even, "by saying." This must be confessed to be very flat and feeble. ε. The Peschito ("scuti dictum est"), Primasius, Erasm. (par.), Luther, Calvin, Beza, Estius, Corn. a-Lap., Calov., Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, Wolf, Paulus, Lachmann (in his punctuation), Ebrard, take ἐν τῷ λέγ. as immediately connected with what preceded. Of these some, as e. g. Thl., Primasius, Luther, Calvin, Estius, al., connect it with ἕως τέλους—"till the end, while or as long as it is said," &c. Others connect it with the whole of the preceding sentence—"if we hold fast the beginning of our confidence, seeing that it is said," or "exhorted by what is said," or "observing what is said." Ebrard takes the words as a proof that we must hold fast &c. in order to be μέτοχοι χριστοῦ. And I own that this seems to me by far the most natural way, and open to none of the objections which beset the others. I would render then 'since it is said,' or in more idiomatic English, for it is said, To-day, if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts, as in the provocation. Thus the context goes on smoothly, and the purpose of the whole is to shew, as is summed up in ver. 12, that it is the καρδιά πονηρὰ ἀπιστίας which they have above all things to avoid. This argument is now carried forward by taking up the word παραπικρασμῷ, and asking, in a double question, who they were that provoked, and with whom it was that He was

offended. But here we are met by a curious phenomenon in Scripture exegesis. It is remarkable that, while all expositors ancient and modern are agreed to take the second τῶν interrogatively, as indeed the form of the sentence renders necessary, the whole stream of interpreters down to Bengel, and many since, have taken τίνες demonstratively, not interrogatively. The sense thus obtained would be as follows: indeed, as in E. V., "*For some, when they had heard, did provoke; howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses*:"—the exceptions being, Caleb and Joshua, and all under twenty years old, and the women and Levites. But if we come to examine, 1. what contextual sense such a sentence can bear, or even, 2. how our Writer would probably have expressed such a meaning, we shall find reason at once to reject the interpretation. For, 1. the purpose here is clearly not to bring out the exceptions to those who were included in this saying, a process which would have quite defeated the purpose of the exhortation, seeing that the rebellious would be designated merely by τίνες, and the exceptions would appear to be by far the greater number: and so every reader might shelter himself under the reflection that he was one of the faithful many, not one of the rebellious τίνες. Nor again, 2. would this, as mere matter of fact, have been thus expressed by the Writer. For it obviously was not so. The τίνες were the faithful few, not the rebellious many: ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν ἠδούκησεν ὁ θεός, 1 Cor. x. 5. As regards the context, the course of thought is in fact just contrary to what this construction would require. The faithful exceptions are overlooked, and the whole of Israel is included in the παραπικρασμός, to make the exhortation fall more forcibly on the readers.

16.] For (on our understanding of the connexion of ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι (see above) this γάρ is not the elliptic γάρ so often accompanying an interrogation, as on Bleek's rendering, but the ordinary γάρ, rendering a reason. 'You need indeed to be careful against unbelief:—for on account of this very unbelief all our fathers were excluded') WHO, when they had heard (in immediate reference to ἐὰν ἀκούσητε above), provoked (scil. God: see reff. and Ezek. xx. 13 A)? nay, was it

t = Luke xvi. 8. Matt. xi. 9 (see note).
u ver. 10 here only.
= LXX, for 72B, cadaver, Lev. xxvi. 30. Num. xiv. 29, 32, 33. 1 Kings xvii 46 but. Isa. lxi. 24 only. u. 30. Tobit ix 3 [not N].

κραναν; ἄλλ' οὐ πάντες οἱ ἐξεληθόντες ἐξ Αἰγύπτου διὰ Μωυσέως; 17 τίσιν δὲ ὁ προσώχθισεν τεσσεράκοντα ἔτη; οὐχὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτήσασιν, ὧν τὰ κῶλα ἔπεσεν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; 18 τίσιν δὲ ὥμοσεν μὴ εἰσελεύσεσθαι εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, εἰ μὴ τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν; 19 καὶ

w = Luke xxi. 24. Num. as above (v) x w. inf. here only. see Acts 17. 47
y ver. 11. z Acts xiv. 2. xix 9. 1 Pet. ii. 7, 8 = Deut. i 26 al. fr. in LXX.

...μη εισε
H. ABCDK
LMPN
a b c d
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

17. aft τισιν δε ins και A D-lat. for αμαρτ., απειθησασιν A 47. επεσαν D Cyr.; επεσον a b f g k l Chr.; txt ABCHKLM[P]N Bas, Maci [Euthal-ms] Damasc. (17 def.)

not (this ἄλλά, in a question which itself answers a question, is elliptical, and may be explained in two ways: 1. 'was it not, not a few but' 2. by regarding the ἄλλά as expressing a negation of the uncertainty implied in the question—a ground why the question should not have been asked at all. And this is by far the better account: cf. ref. Luke: τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν . . . ὅς ἐρεῖ . . . ἄλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ; q. d. 'what need to ask such a question?' Xen. Cyr. ii. 2. 21, καὶ τί δεῖ . . . ἐμβαλεῖν λόγον περὶ τούτου, ἄλλ' οὐχὶ προειπεῖν ὅτι οὕτω ποιήσεις; Aristid. Panath. i. p. 169, ἀρ' ἴσον τὸ κεφάλαιον, ἢ μικρὸν τὸ διδφορον; ἄλλ' οὐ πᾶν τὸνναντίον;) **all who** (Bengel and several others would take πάντες οἱ to signify "*meri*," "*only those who*," a meaning which it cannot by any possibility bear. As above noticed, the exceptions are put out of sight, and that which was true of *almost all*, asserted generally) **came out from Egypt by means of Moses** (the construction is somewhat unusual. We should expect with διὰ a passive participle, like ἐξαχθέντες. Lünemana refers to δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε 1 Cor. iii. 5)? and (we cannot otherwise express in English this δε, which simply brings out the very slight contrast of a second and new particular. It is "*but*" in the E. V.: but that is because they take ver. 16 in the manner above rejected, as an *assertion*) **with whom was He offended forty years** (see on vv. 9, 10 for the verb προσώχθισεν, and the consonance, in the connexion of τεσσ. ἔτη with it, with that in the Psalm, which was there departed from)? **Was it not with those who sinned** (some, as Bengel, Griesbach, Lachmann, Knapp, Vater, set the interrogation here, and take ὧν τὰ κῶλα κ.τ.λ. as an affirmative sentence. But it seems unnatural to insert an affirmative clause in the midst of a series of interrogatories, and therefore better to keep the interrogation for the end of the sentence, including that clause in it), **whose carcasses** (κῶλα any members of the body, but especially the legs: taken also for the legs and arms, i. e. limbs: see

example in Wetst. from Galen. The LXX, see reff., use it for 72B, *corpses*: but probably with the meaning that their bodies should fall and perish limb from limb in the wilderness: so Beza: "Hoc vocabulo significatur, illos non tam sic ferente mortalitate vel quovis morbo, sed tabescentibus sensim corporibus in deserto veluti concidisse") **fell in the wilderness** (cf. 1 Cor. x. 5, κατεστράφησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. The words here are exactly those of Num. xiv. 29. Again, we must remember, in explaining these words, that the Writer is not bearing in mind at this moment the exceptions, but speaking generally. So Calvin: "Quæritur, an Moses et Aaron ac similes in hoc numero comprehendantur. Respondeo, apostolum de universo magis corpore quam de singulis membris loqui")? **And to whom** (not "*concerning whom*," as Syr., al.: the dative after verbs of swearing or asserting is common, as expressing those towards whom the act is directed. So that it is not a dativus incommodi, as Lünemann) **sware He that they should not enter into His rest** (the construction here is somewhat anomalous with regard to the *subject* of the verb εἰσελεύσεσθαι. Ordinarily, the subject of the verb of swearing is identical with that of the verb expressing the act to which he binds himself. So in Xen. Hel. iii. 4. 6, Τισσαφέρνης μὲν ὥμοσε τοῖς πεμφθεῖσι πρὸς αὐτὸν . . . ἡ μὴν πράξειν ἀδόλως τὴν εἰρήνην, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ ἀντάωσαν . . . Τισσαφέρνει, ἡ μὴν, ταῦτα πράττοντος αὐτοῦ, ἐμπεδώσειν τὰς σπονδάς. See other examples in Bleek. But here the persons to whom the oath is directed, are the subject of the future εἰσελεύσεσθαι. We seem to want either a τό before μὴ εἰσελεύσ., or an αὐτοῦς after it. The latter construction is found in ref. Tobit, δώμακε Παγουήλ, μὴ ἐξελεῖν με), **except to those who disobeyed** (not, as vulg., "*incredulū fuerunt*:" E. V., "*believed not*:" and so Luther, Estius, Calov., al.: this was a fact, and was indeed the root of their ἀπίθεια: but ἀπειθήν, ἀπειθεῖν, are most commonly used of *practical* unbelief, i. e. disobedience: even in the passages in the Acts

^a βλέπομεν ὅτι οὐκ ἡδυνήθησαν εἰσελθεῖν δι' ^b ἀπιστίαν. a ch. ii. 9. x. 25. b ver. 12. c = Luke xx. 31. Rom. xi. 4, from 3 Kings xix. 18. Ps. xlviii. 10. see ver. 9. x. 15. d = ch. vi. 12 & c vii. 6 al⁹. Luke xxiii. 49. Acts i. 4. Rom iv. 13 & c. 1 Macc. 2. 15. e constr. inf., Winer, § 44. 1, edn 6. f = (see note) here only. see 1 Cor. x. 12.

CHAP. IV. 1. καταλιπομένης D¹[N] Mac, Thdr̄t.

ins της bef επαγγ. D¹.

(reff.), where the meaning approximates the nearest to unbelief, it is best understood of 'contumacia.' Ref. Deut. seems decisive of the meaning here: see also Deut. ix. 7, 23, 24: Josh. i. 18 al.] **19.] And (thus) we see** (Grot., al. give it, "ex historia cognoscimus:" but Bleek quotes from Seb. Schmidt, and it seems the correcter view, "βλέπομεν non de lectione aut cognitione historiae, sed de convictione animi e disputatione seu doctrina praemissa") **that they were not able to enter in** (however much they desired it: they were incapacitated by not fulfilling the condition of inheriting all God's promises, belief and resulting obedience) **on account of unbelief** (see above on ver. 12. This verse forms a kind of 'quod erat demonstrandum' (as Ebrard), clenching the argument which has been proceeding since ver. 12. The Writer now proceeds to make another use of the example on which he has been so long dwelling).

CHAP. IV. 1—13.] *In the Son, Israel enters into the true rest of God.* On the mingling of the hortatory form with the progress of the argument, see the summary at ch. iii. 1. **1.] Let us fear therefore** (Bleek remarks that the words φοβέσθαι μή, commonly used,—see Acts xxvii. 29: 2 Cor. xi. 3; xii. 20: Gal. iv. 11,—of fear of something happening, here include also the desire to avoid that contingency. It might have been σπουδάσωμεν, as ver. 11, or βλέπομεν μήποτε, as ch. iii. 12, or ἐπισκοπῶμεν, as xii. 15. But the word seems purposely chosen to express the fear and trembling, Phil. ii. 12, with which every servant of God, however free from slavish terror and anxiety, ought to work out his salvation) **lest (on μήποτε as only indefinite, not expressing, 'lest at any time,' see above on ch. iii. 12), a promise being still left us** (notice the *present*—not καταλειφθείσης. On the force of this present, very much of the argument rests. Many Commentators, as Erasm., Luther, Calv., Est., Schlichting, Limborch, al., have mistaken this participle to mean "derelicta seu neglecta per infidelitatem ac diffidentiam pollicitatione divina" (Est.). The term καταλείπειν επαγγελίαν might perhaps bear this meaning, which however

is not substantiated as to the verb by Acts vi. 2, nor as to the *object* of the verb by Baruch iv. 1. But it is decisive against this interpretation, 1. that the participle is *present*, not past, which it certainly in that case must have been: 2. that ἀπολείπεται in vv. 6, 9 takes up again this word: 3. that the article would be wanted before καταλείπειν, or it would stand τῆς επαγγ. τῆς κατ. The meaning given above, 'to leave behind for others,' so that καταλείπεσθαι = 'superesse,' is common enough. Bleek gives many examples: e.g. Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 6, καλὸν . . . κ. αὐτὸν ἐλευθερον εἶναι, κ. παῖσιν ἐλευθερίαν καταλείπειν: and often in Polybius, καταλείπεται ἐλπίς: and οὐ μὴν κακῶν αἰρέσεως καταλειπομένης: see Raphael. Again, as to construction, some, as Cramer and Ernesti, make this genitive governed by the verb ὑστερηκέναι. But against this the want of the article is, if not decisive, a very strong presumption. Our Writer would certainly have expressed this τῆς ἐπ. τῆς κατ. It remains then to take it as a gen. absolute, representing the present matter of fact) **of entering** (compare ἐξουσίαν περιάγειν, 1 Cor. ix. 5: ὁρμὴ ὑβρίσαι, Acts xiv. 5: and such expressions as ὦρα ἀπείναι, καλὸματα μὴ αἰδεσθῆναι. The more usual construction would be επαγγελία τοῦ εἰσελθ. See Winer, in reff.) **into His rest** (it is to be observed, that in the argument in this chapter, the Writer departs from the primary sense of the words κατάπαυσιν μου in the Psalm, and lays stress on αὐτοῦ, making it *God's* rest, the rest into which God has entered: see below on ver. 10. And this is very important as to the nature of the rest in question. So Estius: "Hic per requiem promissam non intelligit terram Chanaan de qua secundum litteram Psalmus locutus est, sed patriam caelestem, quam illa terrena quies mystice significavit." Of course all references of the rest spoken of to the period after the destruction of Jerusalem, as Hammond (see Whitby's note against him), or to the cessation of Levitical ordinances, as Michaelis (on Peirce: he does not however repeat it in his other works), are inadequate and out of the question), **any one of you** (although the communicative form has been used before in φοβηθῶμεν, the second

g = Luke xxii. 35 Rom. iii. 23. 2 Cor. xi 5. ch xii 15. Ps. xxxviii. 4. i w. καὶ, Rom. i. 6. 2 Cor. i. 14. 1 Thess iii. 6, 12. iv. 5 only see ch v. 4. 2. Prov. x. 2. h pass., = ver. 6. Matt. xi. 5 || only (1 Pet. i. 25 al.). 2 Kings xviii. 31 Joel ii. 32. j = 1 Cor. xiv. 6 Gal. v. 17. 47. ABCDEK LMPN a b c d f g h k l m n o

person is here returned to; and of purpose. A similar change is found in ch. x. 24, 25: and in Rom. xiv. 13. The reading ἡμῶν (mss. 5. 56 vulg.-sist. Thdrt.) is too obvious an alteration to what might be expected, to come into the text except on overwhelming authority, which it has not) appear (see below) to have fallen short of it (i. e. be found, when the great trial of all shall take place, to have failed of, = to have no part in,—the promise. So δοκῇ is, as so many both of ancients and moderns have taken it, a mild term, conveying indeed a sterner intimation behind it. The Latin will bear the same idiom—"ne quis videatur non assecutus esse"—expressed without the softening word, "ne quis evadat non assecutus." So, but not exactly, Thl.: ἰλαρότερον δὲ καὶ ἀνεπαχθέστερον τὸν λόγον ποιῶν οὐκ εἶπε· μὴ ὑστερήσῃ, ἀλλὰ· μὴ δοκῇ ὑστερηκέμαι. I say, not exactly; for I should rather say that δοκῇ ὑστερηκέμαι is used, not for ὑστερήσῃ, which would rather require the present, δοκῇ ὑστερεῖν, but for ἐλεγχθῇ, or φανερωθῇ, ὑστερηκώς. We thus fully account for the perfect, which almost all the Commentators who take δοκῇ as pleonastic or as softening, have not attempted, or have failed to do. Another and wholly different interpretation of δοκῇ (and indeed of ὑστερηκέμαι) has been given by Schöttgen, Baumgarten, Schulz, Wahl, Bretschneider (both under ὑστερέω), Paulus, and recently taken up and defended with much spirit, and, as is his wont, with no little confidence, by Ebrard: "*lest any of you think that he has come too late for it*"—i. e. should suppose that, all the promises having been now fulfilled, he has been born too late to have any share in this one. As far as mere usage of individual words is concerned, this interpretation might stand: for δοκεῖν has often, and in our Epistle, this meaning, e. g. ch. x. 29, πόσω δοκεῖτε κ.τ.λ. And ὑστερεῖν has this meaning—*υστερήσαντες τῆς μάχης*, Polyb.; *υστεροῦν τῆς βοηθείας*, Diod. Sic. p. 391 c; *υστερεῖν τῆς πατρίδος*, Xen. Ages. ii. 1. And this view also seems favoured by the perfect ὑστερηκέμαι. As indeed against the general idea of the pleonastic δοκῇ, the perfect would be a strong argument for it. But it is very difficult to persuade oneself that it suits either the mode of expression, or the context. For if this were

the object of the caution, why put so prominent a solemn φοβηθῶμεν? would not the exhortation rather have been expressed in a reassuring form, μὴ οὖν τις ἢ (or ἔστω) φόβος, or μὴ οὖν φοβηθῶμεν, or μὴ δοκῶμεν, or the like? Again, what end would so solemn a caution serve, if merely to explain to the Hebrew converts the fact that the promise had yet a fulfilment waiting for them? This fact indeed the Writer does prove in the subsequent verses; but it is introduced with a καὶ γάρ, and only subserves the purpose already enounced in this verse, that of awakening in them a fear lest their unbelief should be found in the end to have excluded them from the participation of that promise. The meaning here assigned to ὑστερέω, that of *falling short of*, is quite borne out: cf. Thucyd. iii. 31, ὃ δ' οὐδὲ ταῦτα ἐνεδέχετο, ἀλλὰ τὸ πλεῖστον τῆς γνώμης εἶχεν, ἐπειδὴ τῆς Μιτυλήνης ὑστερήκει (since he had failed of Mitylene), ἔτι τάχιστα τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ πάλιν προσμιξαι: Jos. Antt. ii. 2. 1, οὐδενὸς ὅλως ὑστερεῖν. For the usage of δοκέω, the Commentators quote Jos. Antt. ii. 6. 10, οἷδ' ὃν εἰς ἐμὲ δοκεῖτε ἀμαρτάνειν, ἔτι μνημονεύω: which is a fair instance, notwithstanding Ebrard's nur auf eine Stelle des jehūifigen Josephus; and in Latin, Cic. de Off. iii. 2. 6, "ut tute tibi defuisse videare." The usage in Gal. ii. 9, though not identical, is not very dissimilar, carrying the force of softening the verb to which it is attached).

2.] The former half of this verse substantiates the καταλειπομένης of the last verse. The stress is not, *'we*, as well as *they*, which would require ἡμεῖς to be expressed: but lies on εὐαγγελισμένοι, which includes both us and them.

For good tidings have been also announced (καὶ γάρ is often used where the γάρ in fact belongs to the chief word in the sentence, but is transposed back to the καί, because it cannot well stand third: see Hartung, i. 138. This passive use of εὐαγγελίζομαι is found in reff.) to us, as likewise to them (they were not the same good tidings in the two cases: but the Writer treats them as the same. To them indeed it was primarily the inheritance of the land of promise: but even then, as proved below, the κατὰπασις μου had a further meaning, which meaning reaches even down to us): nevertheless the word of their hearing (τῆς ἀκοῆς,

ἐκείνους, μὴ ^m συγκεκρασμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκούσασιν. ^m 1 Cor. xii. 24 only
² Mac. xv. 39 only

2. rec συγκεκραμενος, with vulg(with demid hal harl) Syr Thdrt-ed, *verbum auditus non temperatus fidem auditorum* D-lat Lucif(*fidei*): συγκεκρασμενος N: συγκεκραμενος D³KL[P] rel(-μμ- d k l¹ n) arm Mac, Chr Cyr[-p.] Thdrt Phot [Thl Ecē]: συγκεκρασμενος 17[(appy) Cyr-ms-p₁(-κεκερ-)] : txt ABCD¹M m Thdor-mops [Euthalms], non admixtis fidei am (with fuld tol F-lat), cum non admixti essent fidei qui audierant syr, quia non confusi sunt in fide cum iis qui audiverunt copt. (συνκ. AB¹CD¹[N].) for τοῖς ἀκούσ., των ἀκουσάντων D¹ syr-mg Lucif; ex his [iis vulg] quæ audierunt am (with fuld [demid] F-lat): τους ἀκουσάντας Chr-ms: τοῖς ἀκουθεῖσιν 71 Thdor-mops_{expr} Thdrt(appy).

gen. of apposition; the word and the ἀκοή being commensurate: 'the word of (consisting in) that which they heard.' See note on ref. 1 Thess., where however ἀκοή is connected with παρ' ἡμῶν. Delitzsch says here: "The classical use of ἀκοή (e.g. ἀκοὴν ἔχω λέγειν τῶν προτέρων, i.e. a tradition from the ancients, Plato, Phædr. p. 274 c) does not by itself explain the apostolic; but we must refer to the Heb. קָבַץ, which is received by hearing, the tidings (with the gen. of the thing declared 2 Sam. iv. 4, or of the declarer ref. Isa.). That is so called, which the Prophet hears from Jehovah and announces to the people, Isa. xxviii. 9: Jer. xlix. (xxix., LXX) 14: and thus there could not be a more appropriate word for that which is heard immediately or mediately from the mouth of the ἀκούσαντες (ch. ii. 3), and thus for the N. T. preaching, so that the λόγος ἀκοῆς, considered as one idea (ref. 1 Thess.), betokens the N. T. word preached. The expression of this idea not being of itself a N. T. one, it may, without supposition of any reference to such passages as Exod. xix. 5 (ἐὰν ἀκοῇ ἀκούσῃτε τῆς φωνῆς μου), be used of God's word spoken to Israel in the time of Moses") did not profit *** them, unmingled as they were in faith with its hearers.**

The passage is almost a locus desperatus. The question of reading may be solved by consulting the digest. The nominative, which apparently makes the sense so easy, "the word, not being mingled with faith in them that heard it," rests on no manuscript authority, except that of the Codex Sinaiticus, but mainly on the Peschito and ancient Latin versions. It is notwithstanding retained by Mill, and Tischendorf ed. 7 [and 8], and defended, purely on subjective grounds, by Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, Ebrard, and Delitzsch. I own that the temptation is strong to follow their example: but the evidence on the other side is very strong, and internal grounds seem to me as decisive in its favour as external. No doubt the difficulty is great: but not, I think, so great in reality, as on the other

more tempting and apparently easy construction. I will first discuss this latter, and thus approach the question of the real meaning. The above rendering, "the word, not being mingled with faith in them that heard it," is that of the great majority of modern expositors: who take τοῖς ἀκούσασιν as a dative either, α. commodi, "for," or "with" ("chez") the hearers; β. as = ὑπὸ τῶν ἀκουσάντων, the dative of the subject after a passive; or γ. as = "with," i.e. so that the hearers are they with whom the word was not mingled in, or by, faith. This latter appears to be the sense of the Syr.: "quoniam non commixtus erat per fidem cum iis qui eum audierant:" (Etheridge's rendering however is "because not contempered with faith in them that heard it:") and the general understanding of this has been, that as food profits not, unless assimilated and mingled with the body of the eater, so the word did not profit, there being no assimilation of it by faith with (or, according to (α) and (β), it not being mingled with faith in) the hearers. Ebrard, alone of all Commentators, strikes out confidently and with some assumption a different path, and, taking this reading, understands that not the non-receptivity of the hearers, but the incapacity of the O. T. word itself to carry faith with it, is meant. I need hardly remind the reader that such a sense is directly against the argument, which knows of but one word,—and against the plain assertion of ver. 12, which Ebrard tries, without the least indication in the text itself, to interpret of the N. T. word only. It is indeed lamentable that an able expositor, such as Ebrard on the whole is, should suffer himself to be so often carried away by unworthy crotchets, and when so carried away, to speak so confidently of them. But let us now discuss this whole class of renderings. The first objection to it appears to me to be, that it connects μὴ συγκεκραμένος with λόγος. Bleek felt this, and tried to help the sense by the conjecture τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, originally suggested, from Thdrt's

n particip.
aor. 2 Thess.
ii. 12. Jude 5 al.

³ εἰσερχόμεθα γὰρ εἰς τὴν ὃ κατὰ πᾶσιν οἱ ὃ πιστεύσαντες,

ABCDK
LMPN
a b c d
e f g h i k l
m n o
17. 47

3. εἰσερχόμεθα AC m¹ 17.

for γαρ, ουν ACMN [47] copt.

om 1st την BD¹.

explanation, by Nösselt. It would be surely unnatural that the *word itself*, and not the hearers, should be alleged as in any way the ground of *their rejection*. And if it be replied, that it is not the word itself, but the circumstance of its being not mixed with faith in them, I answer that such may have been the *fact*, but considering what our Writer says of the word of God in ver. 12, it seems to me very unlikely that *he should so have expressed it*. Then again the μή presents a difficulty on this interpretation. The usages of μή with participles are very difficult to limit accurately, amidst all the varieties of subjectivity introduced by personification and hypothesis: but I think we may safely say, that the occurrence of μή συγκεκραμένους applied to λόγος, and indicative of mere historical matter of fact, would not be so likely as that of μή συγκεκρασμένων, where *persons* are treated of. And yet more: it seems hardly probable from the form of the sentence, that ἐκείνους and τοὺς ἀκούσαντας should refer to the same persons, as they must do, in case of the nominative reading being adopted. Why not in this case αὐτοῖς, or ἐν αὐτοῖς, or simply τῇ πίστει? I feel however another, and a still weightier objection, to the art. τῇ, in that case. It *might* doubtless be there, and capable of a good meaning: but when we examine the habit of our Writer, we find that he *never* uses ἡ πίστις for '*faith*,' abstract, but always for '*the faith*,' concrete, of some person spoken of. And this usage is very marked: for in ch. xi. 1, where he gives a definition of Faith in the abstract, it is ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις, not ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ. The other places where he uses it with the art. are ch. xi. 39, μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως, "by their faith:"—xii. 2, εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ἀρχηγόν, "of the faith:"—and xiii. 7, δὲν μείσθε τὴν πίστιν, "whose faith" . . . So that I conceive we cannot understand here otherwise than, 'in their faith,' although the word 'their' may be too strong when expressed in English, as almost implying the existence of real faith in them, which did *not* exist. And I own this consideration sets so strong a barrier against the rec. reading συγκεκραμένους, that, it seems to me, no difficulty consequent on adopting the other reading can bear me over it. On these grounds then, as well as external evidence, I feel

that the accusative plural should be inflexibly maintained. Then, *how are we to understand the sentence?* The modern Commentators all declare that it cannot be understood at all. The Fathers, with the exceptions of Cyr.-alex. once, Thdrt. in one edition (both unreal ones, see Bleek, p. 505),—and Lucifer of Cagliari, all read the accus.; and mostly explain the clause, that *they (ἐκείνοι) were not mingled in* (in respect of) *faith with those who really listened and obeyed*, viz. Joshua and Caleb. So Chrys.: but his homilies on this Epistle have been so imperfectly reported, that he seems not unfrequently very confused: here, e. g., making Caleb and Joshua those who were not mixed with the multitude; so that Thl., who himself takes the above view, naively says of Chrys., τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην αὐτοῦ κ. βαθείαν σοφίαν ὁ ἅγιος οὗτος εἰπών, ἐμοὶ γούν τῷ ἀναξίῳ οὐκ ἔδωκε νοῆσαι πῶς αὐτὸν εἶπεν. And so Œc. and Photius (in Bleek), Hammond, Cramer, Matthæi, &c. But the objection to this reference will already have been seen by the student. The exceptions to the general unbelief are not brought out by our Writer, anxious to include all under it for the greater warning to his readers. Theodoret, though quoting ἀκούσαντας, seems to have read ἀκούσασιν or ἀκουσθεῖσιν, for he interprets μὴ πιστῶς δεξαμένους, κ. τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμει τεθαβήρ-κώτας, κ. οἷον τοῦ θεοῦ λόγους (one ms. reads θεολόγους) ἀνακραβέντας. And Theodore of Mopsuestia says, οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν τοῖς ἐπαγγελθεῖσι συνημμένοι ὅθεν οὕτως ἀναγνώστειν μὴ συγκεκραμένους τῇ πίστει τοῖς ἀκουσθεῖσιν, ἵνα εἴη ταῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς γεγεννημέναις ἐπαγγελίαις τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ Μωσέως. We have also a testimony from Irenæus of a character hardly to be doubted, pointing to the same reading. It occurs iii. 19. 1, p. 212, "Qui nūde tantum hominem Eum dicunt ex Joseph generatum, perseverantes in servitute pristinae inobedientiae mortuntur, nondum commisit verbo Dei Patris." If we could set aside the objection to ἀκουσθεῖσιν, that it has next to no external authority in its favour, it would be a not improbable reading, for we have this very participle in ch. ii. 1; and in Stobæus xlv. 8, we find these lines from Menander: δεῖ τὸν πολὺτὸν προστάτειν αἰρούμενον τὴν τοῦ λόγου μὲν δύναμιν οὐκ ἐπίφθονον, ἥθει δὲ χρηστῷ συγκεκραμένην ἔχειν. But at present, it cannot

καθὼς ° εἶρηκεν ^P Ὡς ὅμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου ^P Εἰ εἰσελεύ- ^{o ch. i. 13 reff.}
 σονται εἰς τὴν ^P κατάπαυσίν μου. ^a καίτοι τῶν ^r ἔργων ^{ch. iii. 11 (reff.)}
 M. ^{q Acts xiv.}
 17 (xvii. 27 v. r.) only. καίτοιγε, John iv. 2. r GEN ii. 2. = ch. i. 10. 2 Pet. iii. 10.

[καθως ειρ. bef οι πιστ. P. om ως A¹(appy).] om ει A o 108: η C¹ 17(η).

come into question as a reading at all. Besides which, there would be this objection to it, that ἀκούσαντες has already occurred in this passage, and as implying those who heard the word, ch. iii. 16. Taking then τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, and rejecting the idea that it means Caleb and Joshua, or implies yielding assent and obedience, we have but this way open to us, which, though not without difficulty, is yet neither *jūnloš* nor *contertwibrig*. ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς having been mentioned in the general sense of 'the word heard,' οἱ ἀκούσαντες is also in the general sense of 'its hearers,' and the assumption is made, that the word heard has naturally recipients, of whom the normal characteristic is 'faith.' And so these men received no benefit from 'the word of hearing,' because they were not one in faith with its hearers; did not correspond, in their method of receiving it, with faithful hearers, whom it does profit. So that I would take τοῖς ἀκούσασιν not as historical, 'those who heard it,' but as categorical, 'those who have heard it,' as in John v. 25, οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσονται . . . κ. οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσονται. I fairly own that this interpretation does not satisfy me: but it seems the only escape from violation either of the rules of criticism or of those of grammar: and therefore I am constrained to accept it until some better is suggested.

3.] For (taking up again τῇ πίστει in ver. 2: not the καταλειπομένης ἐπαγγελίας of ver. 1, as rendering a new reason for it, as Bengel: nor the καὶ γὰρ ἔσμεν &c. of ver. 2, as De W. and Delitzsch. It may certainly be said, that the emphatic position of εἰσερχόμεθα includes also ver. 1 in that to which γὰρ applies: but then it must not be forgotten that οἱ πιστεύσαντες is equally, if not more emphatic, and thus ver. 2 is included, at the very least) we do enter (are to enter, as δ ἐρχόμενος and the like. On the reading εἰσερχόμεθα, see on Rom. v. 1. Some Commentators have seen a communicative and conciliatory tone in the first person here. So Calvin: "In prima persona loquendo majori eos dulcedine allexit, ab alienis ipsos separans." But Bleek and Lünem. well remark that it is not so; for οἱ πιστεύσαντες brings out a class distinct from the rest, as in ch. vi. 18; xii. 25) into the (aforesaid) rest (not only, as E. V., "into rest," abstract),

we who believed (the aor. is proleptical, the standing-point being the day of entering into the rest: so in reff. It was unbelief which excluded them: the promise still remains unfulfilled, see below: they who at the time of its fulfilment shall be found to have believed, shall enter into it), even as He hath said (this citation evidently does not refer to the whole of what has just been said, but only to the fact, that the rest has not yet been entered into in the sense of the promise. The condition, πιστεύσαντες, is not yet brought into treatment, but follows below in ver. 11 in hortatory form, having in fact been demonstrated already in ch. iii. 12—19. CEC. and THL. understand the πιστεύσαντες as also substantiated by our verse: so also Bengel: "An vero ex hoc testimonio efficitur, nos per fidem ingredi in Dei regnum? minime id quidem per se: sed ita est si omnia connectas, tum præcedentia tum sequentia: nam si infidelitas arcet ab aditu, fides certe introducit." But this seems unnatural: see the connexion below). As I swear in my wrath, If (see above on ch. iii. 11) they shall enter into my rest: although (the context is much disputed. I believe it will be best taken thus: the Writer is leading on to the inference, that the entering into God's rest is a thing YET FUTURE for God's people. And this he thus brings about. ἡ κατάπαυσις μου is not a thing future for God:—He has already entered therein,—καίτοι τοῦ αὐτοῦ end of ver. 4. Still (ver. 5) we have again, after God had thus entered in, the oath, They shall not, &c. Consequently, since (ver. 6) it remains that some must enter in, and they to whom it was first promised did not, on account of unbelief,—for that they did not (i. e. none of them did), is plain by His repeating in David, after the lapse of so many centuries, the same warning again (ver. 7), which He would not have done if Joshua had led Israel into that rest (ver. 8):—since this is so, the sabbatism of God's people is YET FUTURE (ver. 9), and reserved for that time when they shall rest from their labours, as God from His (ver. 10). Then follows a concluding exhortation, vv. 11—16. Thus all is clear, and according to the progress of the argument. The other views have been, a. that of Lyra, Calvin, Beza, Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Kuinoel,

^a Matt. xiii. 35. ^s ἀπὸ st καταβολῆς ^s κόσμου γεννηθέντων ⁴ οἱ εἶρηκεν γὰρ ABCDK
L^{PN}
a b c d
f g h k l
^{xxy} 34. ^u πον περὶ τῆς ^v ἐβδόμης οὕτως, Καὶ ^w κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς
^{Luke xi. 50.} ^{ch. ix. 28.} ^{Rev. xii. 8.} ^{xvii. 8.} ^{πρὸς} 1 Pet. i. 20 reff. ^t alw. w. κόσμῳ. (see above), exc. ch. x. 11 t. 2 Macc. ii. 29 only.
^u so ch. ii. 6. εἴτε γὰρ πον Ὀμηρος, Xen. Symp. iv. 7. ^v = here only. Lev. xxiii. 16 A τὴν ἐβδ., ἦν
^{Εβραίοι σάββατα καλοῦσι, Philo de Abr. § 6, vol. ii. p. 5.} ^w GEN. ii. 2. vv. 8, 10. Acts xiv.
^{18 only. intr., Gen. viii. 22 Ezek i. 24.}

al., most of whom understand a second κατέπαυσιν before τῶν ἔργων,—and render καίτοι, “*idque*,” “*and that*”—“in requiem meam, nempe illam ab operibus a fundatione mundi factis,” as Seb. Schmidt. But this involves two mistakes: καίτοι can never mean *nempe* or *idque*, and this meaning would require τῶν ἀπὸ κατ. κ. &c., without which article it is of necessity a primary, not a secondary predicate. And indeed thus some of the above (Limborch, Cramer) take it, and construe, still however forcing καίτοι,—“namely, into the rest which came in when the works were finished,” &c. β. That of Calvin (“tametsi operibus a creatione mundi perfectis. Ut definiat qualis sit nostra requies, revocat nos ad id, quod refert Moses, Deum statim a creatione mundi requievisse ab operibus suis, et tandem concludit hanc esse veram fideliū requiem, quæ omnibus sæculis durat, si Deo sint conformes”), Beza, Böhme, &c. And there is some portion of truth in this, but it does not rightly represent the context. For the *fact*, that God’s rest is that into which we are to enter, is *not proved*, nor *concluded*, but taken for granted, and underlies the whole argument, the object of which is to shew that that κατέπ. μου is, though not a future rest *for God*, a future rest *for us* to enter into, when we have finished our works, as He his. γ. That of Erasmus.(par.), a-Lapide, Grot., Hamm., Calov., and many others, who hold that *two*, or as Chrys., &c., Thdrt., Thl., that *three* different rests are spoken of (e.g. Thl., ὥσπερ τὸ σάββατον κατέπαυσις λέγεται παρὰ τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐκάλυψε κατέπαυσιν μετὰ ταῦτα λεχθῆναι καὶ τὴν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἐξοδον οὕτως οὐδὲ νῦν κωλύει μετὰ ταύτην πάλιν κατέπαυσιν κληθῆναι τὴν μέλλουσαν, τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν φημι βασιλείαν, εἰς ἣν οἱ ἀπιστήσαντες οὐκ εἰσελεύσονται). But this is manifestly wrong: there is not a word nor a hint of a second or third rest: the ordinance of the Sabbath is not so much as alluded to: ἡ κατέπαυσις μου is, all through, the rest *into which God has entered*; and the object, to shew that into this, God’s people *have yet to enter*. The fact that men did not, by the ordinance of the Sabbath, enter into it, lies, as an easily to be assumed thing, beneath the surface, but is not asserted nor even implied. δ.

It would be hardly worth while to mention Ebrard’s view, were it not for his name and ability. It is strange in the last degree:—ἔργα are “*man’s works*,” not exactly *good works*, for we have none: not the *works of the law*, for they came afterwards: but *all human works* (alles dās, was ἔργα genannt werden können), which had been going on since the creation, yet were not sufficient to bring us into God’s rest, but required a new way of salvation, viz. not one of works, but of faith, to effect this. So that τῶν ἔργων is a contrast to πιστεύσαντες: and in ver. 4, τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ a contrast to τῶν ἔργων here, the one God’s, the other man’s, works. I need but state this to the reader, to shew him how utterly preposterous it is, and foreign from the context, in which not a word is indicated of the contrast between works and faith, but every thing of that between belief and unbelief) the *works* (viz. of God: an expression borrowed from the citation which follows) were constituted (i. e. finished. What Ebrard says against this meaning, that it is making the aorist participle = γεγεννημένον, the perfect, is altogether without force. That the 1 aor. pass. of γίνομαι may almost always be tracked to its original *passive* meaning, once maintained in note on 1 Thess i. 5, does not appear to be a safe assertion: see note there in 3rd and subsequent Edns. of Vol. III. In our Epistle, however, it may generally be done: e.g. ch. v. 5; vi. 4 (x. 33; xi. 34). This being so, τὰ ἔργα ἐγενήθη will simply mean, ‘the works were constituted,’ ‘were settled in their established order,’ ‘were made;’ and so by consequence ‘were finished.’ The word seems to be taken from the constant repetition of ἐγένετο in Gen. i., and the passive used because the agent is here in question) from the foundation (καταβολή occurs in the N. T. only in this connexion, except ch. xi. 11. See on ch. vi. 1) of the world (i. e., as explained above on καίτοι, and substantiated in next verse, though God Himself had not that rest *to enter into*, and did not mean this by ἡ κατ. μου, but had entered into the rest of which He speaks: the key verse to this being ver. 10). 4.] Substantiation of the last assertion. For he (God, not Moses, nor ἡ γραφή: see above on εἶρηκεν: see ch. xiii. 5) hath spoken somewhere (see

εν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ
 5 καὶ ^x ἐν τούτῳ πάλιν, ^p εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν ^p κατά-
 παυσίν μου. ⁶ ἐπεὶ οὖν ^y ἀπολείπεται τινὰς εἰσελθεῖν εἰς
 αὐτήν, καὶ οἱ πρότερον ^z εὐαγγελισθέντες οὐκ εἰσηλθον διὰ
^a ἀπειθείαν, ⁷ πάλιν τινὰ ^b ὀρίζει ἡμέραν, Σήμερον ^c ἐν

 x see ch. v. 6.
 y = ver. 9 ch.
 x 26 only.
 (2 Tim iv. 13.
 Jude 6 al.)
 ἐλπὶς ἀπο-
 λείπεται
 σωτηρίας,
 Polyb. p.
 696. B1. see
 ver. 1.
 b Luke xxi.
 c = Mark

^z ver. 2. ^a Rom. xi. 30, 32 Eph. ii. 2, v. 6. Col. iii. 6. ver. 11 only.
 22. Acts ii. 23. x. 42. xi. 29. xvii. 28, 31. L. only, exc. here & Rom. i. 4. Num. xxxiv. 6.
 i. 2. Rom. ix. 26. see Rom. xi. 2.

4. om εν τη ημ. τη εβδ. A.

5. om ει D¹ d o 123. 8-pe: εἰ D-lat.

6. (δια, so ACL a.) for απειθειαν, απιστιαν B¹ [vulg Cyr].

7. οριζει βετ τινα B¹.

above on ch. ii. 6) concerning the seventh day (so in Hellenistic Greek constantly for the Sabbath: as e.g. in the title of one of Philo's treatises, *περὶ τῆς ἐβδόμης*: and elsewhere: see Bleek. In 2 Macc. xv. 1, the Sabbath is called ἡ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρα) on this wise, And God rested (in classical Greek καταπαύω is transitive, with an accusative of the person and a genitive of the thing: so Xen. Cyr. viii. 5. 25, ἦν τις ἀρχῆς Κύρον ἐπιχειρῇ καταπαύειν. For this other usage, see ver. 10, and reff. LXX. The rest here spoken of must not be understood only as that of one day after the completion of creation; but as an enduring rest, commencing then and still going on,—into which God's people shall hereafter enter. Still less must we find here any discrepancy with such passages as John v. 17: Isa. xl. 28: God's rest is not a rest necessitated by fatigue, nor conditioned by idleness: but it is, in fact, the very continuance in that upholding and governing, of which the Creation was the beginning) on the seventh day from all His works:

5.] and in this (place: but it is hardly necessary to fill up the ellipsis: Bleek quotes from Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 20, *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν τῷδε*. See reff. *τούτῳ* here means, not, *this which follows*, but *this passage* about which we are treating: our present passage) again (i. e. on the other hand: a citation which shall qualify and explain that other, making it impossible that men should have already entered into it), If they shall enter into my rest (these words are to be taken exactly as before, in a strong negative sense; not, as D¹ (see var. read.), and Primas., Böhme, al., indicatively. The point raised is, that in the days of Moses, nay long after, of David, men had not yet, in the full sense at least, entered into that rest, because it was spoken of as yet future: it being of no import to the present argument, whether that future is of an affirmative or negative proposition: the negative denunciation in fact

implying in itself the fact, that *some would* enter therein. So Calov. (in Bleek), "Et in dicto paulo ante loco iterum loquitur Spiritus Sanctus de requie sua, 'Non ingredientur in requiem meam,' significans scilicet hac comminatione, quandam adhuc quietem restare sperandam iis, qui non sunt increduli nec comminationi prædictæ obnoxii").

6.] Since then it yet remains (see reff.: this is the sense in all three places in our Epistle: *remains over*, not having been previously exhausted. ἀπολείπεται, ἀπομένει, Hesych. The time indicated by the present here is that following on the threat above) that some enter into it (viz. by the very expectation implied in the terms of the exclusion—"These shall not": therefore there are that shall: because, the εἰσελεύσεσθαι τινὰς being a portion of God's purposes, the failure of these persons will not change nor set aside that purpose. This latter consideration however does not logically come into treatment, but is enthymematically understood;—"since what God once purposed, He always purposes."

We must beware of Delitzsch's inference, that the τινὰς implies that some *had on each occasion entered into it*, meaning, "there are some left yet to enter." For thus the reasoning, as such, would be quite invalidated; which is concerned in establishing, not that *some part* of the entrance is yet future, but that the entrance itself, as such, is so. That *some have entered in*, as matter of fact, is true enough; but even they not yet perfectly, ch. xi. 39 f.; and the τινὰς here is used, not in respect of others who *have entered in*, but in respect of those who *did not*, when the words were used on the former occasion), and those who were formerly (as contrasted with David's time, and with the present) the subjects of its announcement (viz. the Israelites in the wilderness) did not enter in on account of disobedience (not, "unbelief:" see on ch. iii. 18. The first clause—ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπολ. τινὰς εἰσελθ., was a deduction from the terms

d = Rom. ix.
29. Gal. i. 9.
2 Pet. iii. 2.
Jude 17.
e Psa. xcix. 7.
ch. iii. 7, 8
reff.
f so ch. viii. 8.
g trans. Acts
xiv. 18 only.
Exod. xxxiii. 14. Deut. iii. 20. v. 33. Josh. i. 13 al.

Δαυεὶδ λέγων, μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον, καθὼς ^d προείρηται ABCDK
^e Σήμερον ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε, μὴ ^e σκληρύνητε LFN
τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. ⁸ εἰ γὰρ ^f αὐτοὺς Ἰησοῦς ^g κατέπαυσεν, a b c d
οὐκ ἂν περὶ ἄλλης ἐλάλει μετὰ ταῦτα ἡμέρας· ⁹ ἄρα ^h ἀπο- f g h k l
17. 47

h = ver. 6 reff.

rec ειρηται, with D⁸KL rel (æth) Damasc [Thl] : προειρηκεν B 73. 80: txt ACD¹N[P
47] 17 latt syr copt arm Chr₁ [Euthal-ms] Cyr₁ Thdrt Lucif₁.

8. for ουκ αν, ουκ αρα B : non D-lat Lucif : nunquam vulg.

μετ' αυτα C.

9. om ver N¹(ins N-corr¹).

of the divine denunciation, as to God's general purpose; and now this second clause is a particular concrete instance in which that general purpose was not carried out. Since *some must*, and *they did not*, the implied promise is again found recurring many centuries after), again (emphatic : *anew*) He limiteth (reff. : and Demosth. p. 952. 20, ὁ μὲν τοίνυν νόμος σαφῶς οὕτως τὸν χρόνον ὥρισεν—has fixed, specified, assigned, limited the time. See many more examples in Bleek) a certain day (Valcknaer and Paulus make τῖνα interrogative, the former ending the question at ἡμέραν, the latter, at χρόνον. But this cannot well be, with the emphatic πάλιν prefixed), saying "To-day" (He begins his citation here with the word σήμερον; but having interrupted it by ἐν Δ. λέγων, μετὰ τοσοῦτον χρόνον, καθὼς προείρηται, takes it up again below. This is much the simplest way to take the sentence (so also Delitzsch) : not, as Calv., Beza, Grot., Jac. Cappell., Bleek, De W., Bisping, to make the first σήμερον a terminus in apposition with τινὰ ἡμέραν, "a certain day, viz. 'To-day,'" and then to go on from ἐν to προείρηται before coming to the citation : nor again to understand with Heinrichs, al. and E. V., the first σήμερον as the whole of the first citation, and then to start with the second at καθὼς (προ)είρηται in David ('in,' as in reff. : as we say, 'in Isaiah,' meaning, 'in the book of Isaiah.' This is better and more natural than, with Luther, Grot., Lünem., Delitzsch, al., to understand ἐν instrumental (?), "by David;"—or with Bengel, al., as he understands ch. i. 1, ἐν προφήταις, ἐν νῑφ, i. e. as local, dwelling in, inspiring,—though this is better than the other) after (the lapse of) so long a time (viz. the time between Joshua and David. The blunder of understanding the words, "after such a time as we have before mentioned, viz. forty years (?)" has been endorsed by Dr. Bloomfield from Whitby, although in his previous note he had given the right interpretation, and although he puts καθὼς εἰρηται in a parenthesis in his text), as it has been said

before (viz. ch. iii. 7, 15. According to the reading προείρηται, there can hardly be a question that the reference of the words is backward, to what has been already cited, not forwards to the words which follow. This latter being imagined, the readings προείρηκεν and εἰρηται have arisen), To-day, if ye hear His voice, harden not your hearts.

8.] Confirmation of the above, as against an exception that might be taken, that notwithstanding the exclusion of many by unbelief, those who entered the promised land with Joshua did enter into that rest of God. For if Joshua (Ἰησοῦς is the constant Greek form of the name Ἰησοῦς, or as in the later books, Chron., Ezra, and Nehemiah, Ἰησῶ). It does not appear that any parallel between the typical and the great final Deliverer is intended : but it could hardly fail to be suggested to the readers. Our translators, in retaining the word "Jesus" here, have introduced into the mind of the ordinary English reader utter confusion. It was done in violation of their instructions, which prescribed that all proper names should be rendered as they were commonly used) had given them rest (led them into this rest of which we are treating : for the usage of καταπαύω, see above, on ver. 4: and compare reff.), He (God : the subject of δρίξει and λέγων above) would not speak (not "have spoken," as E. V. Compare Thuc. iii. 55, εἰ δ' ἀποστήναι Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἠθέλησαν (if we had not consented &c.) ὑμῶν κελεύσανταν, οὐκ ἠδικοῦμεν (we should be doing no wrong),—and John xv. 24, εἰ τὰ ἔργα μὴ ἐποίησα ἐν αὐτοῖς, ἃ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐποίησεν, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἴχουσιν, "If I had not done &c.,—they would not have sin") after this of another day.

9.] Consequence from the proposition in ver. 6. Some must enter therein : some, that is, analogous to, inheriting the condition of and promises made to, those first, who did not enter in because of disobedience. These are now specified as 'the people of God,' cf. reff., doubtless with a reference to the true spiritual character of Israelites indeed, represented under

λείπεταιⁱ σαββατισμός τῷⁱ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ. ¹⁰ ὁ γὰρ εἰς-ⁱ here only+.
 ελθὼν εἰς τὴν^k κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ αὐτὸς^l κατέπαυσεν^l xvi. 30 Exod.
 ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ, ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν^m ἰδίων ὁ θεός. ⁱ ch. xi. 25. ^l 1 Pet. ii. 10. ^m see Rom xi. 1.

k ch. iii. 11 reff.

l intr., ver. 4 (reff.).

m so ch. vii. 27. ix. 12. xiii. 12.

ἀπολείται B.

10. aft 1st απο ins παντων D¹ syr Cyr[-p₂]: πα is written over τῷ by K³ but erased.

their external name: and their rest is no longer a *κατάπαυσις*, but (see below) is called by a higher and nobler name. Therefore (see above) there remains (see on ver. 6: remains as yet unexhausted, unoccupied, unrealized) a keeping of sabbath (as regards the word, it is only found, besides here, in Plut. de Superstitione, c. 3, ὡ βάρβαροι ἐξευρόντες, Ἑλληνες κακὰ τῇ δεισιδαιμονίᾳ, πηλώσεις, καταβορβορώσεις, σαββατισμούς, ρίψει ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, αἰσχροῖς προκαθήσεις, ἀλλοκότους προσκυνήσεις. It is regularly formed from *σαββατίζω* (reff.), as *ἐορτασμός* from *ἐορτάζω*. It is used here to correspond to the *κατάπαυσις μου*, specified and explained in ver. 4. God's rest was a *σαββατισμός*; so also will ours be. Thdrt. remarks: *σαββατισμὸν δὲ τὴν κατάπαυσιν ἐκέκληκεν, ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ ἡμέρᾳ κατέπαυσεν ὁ θεὸς ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ὧν ἐποίησεν, ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι δὲ βίβη ἄλυπος ἔσται ζωῇ κ. πόρων ἐλευθέρᾳ καὶ φροντίδων ἀπηλλαγμένη. σαββατισμὸν τοίνυν ὠνόμασε τὴν τῶν σωματικῶν ἔργων ἀπαλλαγὴν. τοῦτο γὰρ δηλοῖ τὰ ἐξῆς.* The idea of the rest hereafter being the antitype of the Sabbath-rest, was familiar to the Jews: see the quotations in Schöttg., Wetst., and Bleek. They spoke of the *tempus futurum* as the "dies qui totus est sabbathum." It is hardly probable that the sacred Writer had in his mind the object which Calvin mentions: "Non dubito quin ad Sabbathum data opera alluserit apostolus, ut Judæos revocaret ab externa ejus observatione: neque enim aliter potest ejus abrogatio intelligi, quam cognitio spirituali fine." Still more alien from the sense and context is it to use this verse, as some have absurdly done, as carrying weight one way or the other in the controversy respecting the obligation of a sabbath under the Christian dispensation. The only indication it furnishes is negative: viz. that no such term as *σαββατισμός* could then have been, in the minds of Christians, associated with the keeping of the Lord's day: otherwise, being already present, it could not be said that it *ἀπολείπεται* for the people of God (the well-known designation of Israel the covenant people. It occurs again, ch. xi. 25. Here it is used of that veritable

Israel, who inherit God's promises by faith in Christ: cf. Gal. vi. 16. So Photius: *καὶ αὕτη οὐ τοῖς τυχοῦσι, ἀλλὰ τῷ λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀφιερωμένη, λαὸς δὲ ἀληθῶς τοῦ θεοῦ οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτὸν κ. φυλάσσοντες τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ*.)

Ver. 10 is taken in two ways (not to mention the untenable interpretation of Schulz, which refers ὁ γὰρ εἰσελθὼν to the people of God, "for, when it has entered," &c. This would be *εἰσελθὼν γὰρ* without the article): 1. as a general axiom, justifying the use of the word *σαββατισμός* above: For he that has entered into his (God's) rest, has himself also rested from his (own) works, like as God rested from his own. This has been the usual explanation. Thl. says, *ἐρμηνεύει πῶς σαββατισμὸν ὠνόμασε τὴν τοιαύτην κατάπαυσιν· διότι φησὶ καταπαύομεν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν ἡμετέρων, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ θεός, καταπαύσας ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων τῶν εἰς σύστασιν τοῦ κόσμου, σάββατον τὴν ἡμέραν ὠνόμασεν.* This explanation labours under two difficulties: α. the aorist *κατέπαυσεν*, which thus is made into a perfect or a present. De Wette regards it as a reminiscence of the same word in ver. 4: so Delitzsch: but this is most unsatisfactory: β. the double reference of *αὐτοῦ*, first to God, and then to the man in question, especially when God's works are taken up by the strong term *τῶν ἰδίων*. 2. The other interpretation has been that of Owen, Alting, Stark, and more recently Ebrard, who refer ὁ εἰσελθὼν to Christ: For He that entered into his (own or God's) rest, Himself also rested from His works like as God rested from His own: and therefore, from our Forerunner having entered into this sabbatism, it is reserved for us, the people of God, to enter into it with and because of Him. Thus, as Ebrard says, Jesus is placed in the liveliest contrast to Joshua, who had not brought God's people to their rest; and is designated as 'That one, who entered into God's rest.' And to this view I own I am strongly inclined, notwithstanding the protest raised against it by Bleek, Lünemann, and Delitzsch. My reasons are, in addition to those implied above, α. the form of the assertion, as regards Joshua here and Jesus in ver. 14. That a contrast

n = 2 Pet. i. 10. 11 n σπουδάσωμεν οὖν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς ἐκείνην τὴν ^kκατάπαυσιν,
 ref
 o bad sense, 2 Pet. ii. 6. ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τις ^oὑποδείγματι ^pπέσῃ τῆς ^qἀπει-
 xii. 15 good, John θείας. 12 r ζῶν γὰρ ὁ ^sλόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ^tἐνεργής, καὶ ^hζῶν
 James v. 10 (ch. xiv. 5 ix. 23 only) + Sur xlii. 16. 2 Macc. vi. 28, 31 only. p Luke xvi. 7. Ps. xxxiv. 8. Ezek. γαρ...
 xxi. 27. q ver. 6 reff. r = Acts vii. 38. John vi. 51. 1 Pet. i. 23. s see note. ABCDH
 t 1 Cor. vi. 9. Philem. 6 only +

11. aft εἰσελθῆν inσ αδελφοι D¹.
 a veritate D-lat: πασθεias o.

om τις N¹.

for απειθειας, αληθειας D¹,

12. ζω C.

εναργης B, evidens Jer¹: efficax vulg Jer².

f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

is intended between the Ἰησοῦς who did not give them rest, and the ἀρχιερέα μέγαν διεκκληθότα τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, seems very plain. And if so, it would be easily accounted for, that Christ should be here introduced merely under the designation of ὁ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τ. κατάπ. αὐτοῦ. β. The introduction of the words καὶ αὐτός, lifting out and dignifying the subject of this clause as compared with ὁ θεός, in a way which would hardly be done, had the assertion been merely of any man generally. γ. Scripture analogy. This rest, into which the Lord Jesus entered, is spoken of, Isa. xi. 10, καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἀνάπαυσις αὐτοῦ, τιμὴ: and this work of His, in Isa. xl. 10, καὶ τὸ ἔργον ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, and by Christ Himself, John ix. 4, ἐμὲ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με ἕως ἡμέρας ἔστιν ἔρχεται νύξ, ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι. δ. The expression ἐκείνην τὴν κατάπαυσιν below, which stands harshly insulated unless it refers to the κατάπαυσιν in this verse. ε. The whole context: see summary at ch. iii. 1. Render then: **For He** that entered into his (either, 'God's'; or more probably merely 'his,' reflective, as in Isa. xi. 10 above: see also Matt. xxv. 21, 23, where the χαρά is τοῦ κυρίου σου) rest, **He Himself** also (on this, see above) rested from his works (see above) as **God** from his own (τῶν ἰδίων not with any distinction of kind, but used only to mark distinction of possession).

11—13.] *Exhortation*, so frequently interspersed in the midst of the argument: see on ch. iii. 1. **Let us** therefore (consequence from vv. 3—7; seeing that the promise is held out to us, as it was to them, and that they failed of it through disobedience) earnestly strive (not, as vulg., "festinamus:" see reff.) to enter into that rest (viz. that mentioned in ver. 10, into which Christ has entered before, cf. ver. 14; ch. vi. 20), lest any one fall into (so vulg., Luth., Beza, Corn. a-Lap., Grot., Abresch, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al., and rightly, both from usage and from the position of the verb. Had πέσῃ been absolute, 'fall,' = ἐκπέσῃ, as Chrys., Ec., Thl., Calv., Schlichting, Wolf, Bengel, Bleek, De W., Thol., al.,

its position in the sentence certainly must have been more prominent. As it stands, it holds the most insignificant place, between the genitive in government and the word governing it. And usage abundantly justifies the idiom πίπτειν ἐν, for 'to fall into.' Cf. πεσεῖν ἐν ὕπνῳ, Pind. Isthm. iv. 39: ἐν ὀρφανίᾳ, Isthm. viii. 14: ἐν ἀφύκτοις γυιοπέδαις πεσόν, Pyth. ii. 75: τίνων ποτ' ἀνδρῶν ἐν μέσοις ἀρκυστάτοις πέπτωχ' ὁ τλήμων; Soph. El. 1475: ἐν κλύδωνι καὶ φρενῶν τaráγματι πέπτωκα δεινῷ, Eurip. Herc. Fur. 1092. The construction is simply a pregnant one—πίπτειν εἰς, so as to be ἐν) the same example (ὑπόδειγμα is found fault with by the Atticists: παράδειγμα λέγει, μὴ ὑπόδειγμα, Thom. Mag.: and similarly Phrynichus. But Bleek shews that it is in frequent use, from Xenophon downwards. Its proper meaning is, something shewn in a light and merely suggestive manner: so in ch. viii. 5, οἵτινες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ λατρεύουσιν τῶν ἑπουρανίων. But it is oftener used, as here, to signify a pattern or example, good or bad: cf. besides reff., Jos. B. J. vi. 1, καλὸν ὑπόδειγμα βουλομένης σώζεσθαι τὴν πατρίδα σοι πρόκειται βασιλεὺς Ἰουδαίων Ἰεχονίας: and other examples (in Bleek) of disobedience (not, unbelief: see on ch. iii. 18. It was of ἀπειθήσαντες who failed to enter in). 12, 13.]

Apart from the difficulties of some terms used, we may give the connexion thus: Such an endeavour is well worth all our σπουδή—for we have One to do with, who can discern and will punish every even the most secret disobedience. **For** the word of God (in what sense? 1. The λόγος ὑποστατικός, Personal Word, has been understood by many, e.g. the Fathers in general (see the copious reff. in Bleek's note here), Ec., Thl. (as commonly supposed, but see below, and judge), Thdrt. (by no means certain), Thom. Aquin., Lyra, Cajetan, Corn. a-Lap. ("Longe apertius et melius alii intelligunt Dei Filium"), Jac. Cappellus, Owen, Le Clerc, al. To this the first obvious objection is, that this mode of expression is confined to St. John among the N. T. writers. This, however, though clearly not to be met by alleging

“ τομώτερος ὕπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν ὡς δίστομον, καὶ ἡ here only + ὅπλον τοῦ λόγου ἀνδρὶ
 τομώτερον ἐστὶ σιδήρου, Callim. Hymn. in Del. 94
 13 only. 3 Kings xix 4. Judg. xi. 25 [24] B. w w μάχ here only. Judg. iii. 16. Prov. v. 4. elsw.
 w. ῥομφαία, Rev. i. 16. ii. 12 only Ps. cxlix. 6. Sir xxi 3

such passages as Luke i. 2 and Acts xx. 32, is not decisive. For our Epistle, though perhaps anterior to all the writings of St. John, is yet so intimately allied to the Alexandrine terminology, that it would be no matter of surprise to find its Writer using a term so nearly ripe for his purpose as we find *ὁ λόγος* in Philo (see below). The real objections to the Personal *λόγος* being simply and directly here meant, lie in the Epistle, and indeed in the passage itself. In the *Epistle*: for we have no where in this term used with any definiteness of our Lord, nor indeed any approach to it; not even where we might have expected it most, in the description of His relation to the Father, ch. i. init. Every where He is the SON of God, not His Word. And in ch. vi. 5; xi. 3, that expression is changed for *ῥῆμα θεοῦ*, when, especially in the latter place, had the idea of the personal *λόγος* been familiar to the Writer, he would almost certainly have said *νοοῦμεν καθη- τίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας λόγῳ θεοῦ*, not *ῥήματι θ.* And in the passage itself: for such adjectives as *ἐνεργῆς* and *κριτικός*, and even *ζῶν*, as matter of emphatic predication, would hardly be used of the Personal *λόγος*: and, which to my mind is stronger evidence still, had these words applied to our Lord, we should not have had him introduced immediately after, ver. 14, as *ἡσοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ*. But, 2. some of the ancient, and the great mass of modern Commentators, have understood by the term, *the revealed word of God*, in the law and in the gospel: or in the gospel alone, as contrasted with the former dispensation. And so even some of those who elsewhere in their writings have understood it of Christ: e.g. Origen (on Matt. xix. 12, tom. xv. 4, vol. iii. p. 656, *εἰ τὸν λόγον τις ἀναλαβὼν τὸν ζῶντα κ. ἐνεργῇ κ.τ.λ., . . . ἐκτέμνει τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς παθητικόν*: on Rom. xii. 7, lib. ix. 3, vol. iv. p. 650: “*Verbum Dei omnia, etiam quæ in occulto sunt, perscrutatur: maxime cum vivens sit, et efficax &c. . . . etenim cum moralis in ecclesia sermo tractatur, tunc uniuscujusque intra semetipsam conscientia stimulat*” &c.), Euseb., Aug. Civ. Dei xx. 21. 2 (vol. vii.) al. But neither does this interpretation seem to meet the requirements of the passage. The qualities here predicated of the *λόγος* do not appear to fit the mere written word: nor does the introduction of the written

word suit the context. I should be rather disposed with Bleek to understand, 3. *the spoken word of God*, the utterance of His power, by which, as in ch. xi. 3, He made the worlds,—by which His Son, as in ch. i. 3, upholds all things. This spoken word it was, which they of old were to hear and not harden their hearts: *σήμερον, ἐὰν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούσητε κ.τ.λ.*: this spoken word, which interdicted them from entering into His rest — *ἔμοσα ἐν τῇ ὀργῇ μου εἰ εἰσελεύσονται εἰς τὴν καταπαυσίν μου*. It seems then much more agreeable to the context, to understand this utterance of God, so nearly connected with God Himself, the *breath of his mouth*: and I would not at the same time shrink from the idea, that the Alexandrine form of expression respecting the *λόγος*, that semi-personification of it without absolutely giving it hypostatical existence, was before the mind of the Writer. Indeed, I do not see how it is possible to escape this inference, in the presence of such passages as this of Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hæc. § 26, vol. i. p. 491, *ἵνα ἐννοῆς θεοῦ τείνοντα, τὰς τε τῶν σωμάτων καὶ πραγμάτων ἐξῆς ἀπάσας ἡρμόσθαι καὶ ἡνώσθαι δοκούσας φύσεις, τῷ τομεῖ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ, ὃς εἰς τὴν δευτέραν ἀκονηθεὶς ἀκμήν, δια- ρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διετέλθῃ κ.τ.λ.*: and again, ib. § 27, p. 492, *οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἀκονησάμενος τὸν τομέα τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγον, διαιρεῖ τὴν τε ἕμωρον καὶ ἄποιον τῶν ὅλων οὐσίαν*. See, on the whole, Delitzsch's note. The idea of Ebrard, that this word, meaning the gospel, is introduced to give weight to *σπουδάσωμεν* — “*Let us do our part, for the gospel of God is not wanting in power on its part,*” is too absurd to need refutation or even mention, were it not for his name) is *living* (not, *in contrast with the dead works of the law* (Ebr.), of which there is no question here; nor, as Carpov, *nourishing*, and able to preserve life: nor *enduring*, as Abresch and Schlichting: but as E. V., *quick*, i. e. having living power, in the same sense in which God himself is so often called “the living God,” e. g. ch. x. 31. So in reff.: so Soph. Œd. Tyr. 482, speaking of the prophecies, *τὰ δ' αἰὲ ζῶντα περιποιτᾶται*, where the Schol. has, *ἐν χύοντα τῇ ἀληθείᾳ*. Thl., who besides

× here only. x διϊκνούμενος y ἄχρι z μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος ABCDH
 Exod. xxvi. KLPN
 28 xxxvi. 33 a b c d
 F. (not in AB) only y = Acts xxii. 4. Rev. ii. 10 xii. 11. z ch. ii. 4 (reff) only. f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

δεικνύμενος D¹. αρχὸς D. rec aft ψυχῆς ins τε, with DK rel [Eg] : om AB
 CHL[P. N b d¹ k 17 [47 (vss)] Orig₃ Eus₂ Ath₂ Epiph₁ Cyr₂ [Cæs₂ Chr Euthal₁ ms Thrt
 Damasc₁]. (None om τε aft arm.)—om ψυχῆς N¹ cord “eadem ut videtur manu.”

finds in ζῶν a proof of the hypostatic Personality, says well: ὥσπερ τότε, φησὶν, οὐ πόλεμος, οὐ μάχαιρα αὐτοὺς ἀπώλεσεν, ἀλλ' ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, αὐτόματοι γὰρ κατέπιπτον, οὕτω καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν ἔσται. ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ ἐκείνους ἐκύλασε καὶ ἡμᾶς κολάσει· ζῇ γὰρ αἰεὶ καὶ οὐκ ἔσβησται. The emphatic position of ζῶν, the omission of ἔσται, the frequent repetition of καὶ, all tend to increase the rhythm and rhetorical force of the sentence. Some have thought that the Writer was citing from some other source: but for this there does not appear any reason) and active (= ἐνεργός, which is the commoner form (see Bleek), found in Xen., Demosth., and often in Polybius, in which latter however the mss. often give us ἐνεργῆς. In one place, xi. 23. 2, this latter seems undoubted, —ἐνεργῇ ποιούμενοι τὴν ἔφοδον. It is a word of the κοινὴ or Macedonian dialect. This activity is the very first quality and attribute of life: so that the predicates form a climax: not only living, but energizing: not only energizing, but τομώτερος κ.τ.λ.: and not only that, but διϊκνούμενος κ.τ.λ.: nor that only, but reaching even to the spirit, κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων κ. ἐννοιῶν καρδίας), and sharper (τομῶς, an adj. formed from τέμνω, is found in Plato, Tim. 61 ε: Plut. Sympos. vi. 8; viii. 9: its comparative in ref. and Lucian, Toxar. ii. al.: the superlative, in the well-known exordium of Ajax's dying speech, Soph. Aj. 815) than (Bleek has shewn that the construction τομώτερος ὑπὲρ μάχαιραν, for τόμος ὑπὲρ μ. or τομώτερος μαχαίρας, is not Hebraistic; for in Heb. there is no comparative; we have it in ref. Judges, ἀγαθώτερος σὺ ὑπὲρ Βαλὰκ υἱὸν Ζεφφάρ: and the similar construction with παρά in ch. i. 4, where see remarks) every two-edged sword (lit. two-mouthed: meaning, sharpened on both sides, both edge and back. The expression (reff.) is found in classic poetry, e. g. δίστομον ξίφος, Eurip. Hel. 992: δίστομα φάσγαντα, id. Orest. 1296, and other instances in Bleek. The more usual word is ἀμφήκης, Il. κ. 256: Soph. Aj. 286: Electr. 485. We have ἀμφίθηκτος, Antig. 1309. As regards the comparison itself, of the word of God or of men to a sword, it is common in Scripture: see Ps. lvii. 4; lix. 7; lxi. 3: Wisd. xviii. 15, 16: Rev. i. 16: and above all, Eph. vi. 17. It has been questioned,

whether the office here ascribed to the word of God is *punitive*, or merely *searching*: whether it regards the foes, or the servants of God. There seems no reason why we should separate the two. The same WORD, to which evidently by the succeeding clause is attributed the searching power, is powerful also to punish. The μάχαιρα belongs to the surgeon, and to the judge: has its probing as well as its smiting office. And so Chrys.: αὐτὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ κρίνει· ἐκεῖ γὰρ διαβαίνει καὶ κολάζων καὶ ἐξετάζων. Bleek points out the close relation of this similitude to a series of passages in Philo, especially in the treatise Quis Rerum Divinarum Hæres. There, in speaking of Abraham's sacrifice, and explaining διέλεν αὐτὰ μέσα, which act he refers to God, he says: τῷ τομῇ τῶν συμπάντων αὐτοῦ λόγῳ· ὅς, εἰς τὴν δυνάτην ἀκουηθεὶς ἀκμήν, διαιρῶν οὐδέποτε λήγει τὰ αἰσθητὰ πάντα, ἐπειδὴν δὲ μέχρι τῶν ἀτόμων καὶ λεγομένων ἀμερῶν διεξέλθῃ, πάλιν ἀπὸ τούτων τὰ λόγῳ θεωρητὰ εἰς ἀμυθήτους καὶ ἀπεριγράφους μοίρας ἄρχεται διαιρεῖν οὗτος ὁ τομεύς, § 26, vol. i. p. 491. And further on, he divides these διχοτομήματα made by the λόγος into triads, and says, ψυχὴ γὰρ τριμερὴς ἔστι, δίχα δὲ ἕκαστον τῶν μερῶν, ὡς ἐδείχθη, τέμνεται μοιρῶν δὲ γινομένων ἕξ, ἑβδομος εἰκότος τομεύς ἦν ἀπάντων, ὁ ἱερός καὶ θεῖος λόγος. From these and similar passages (cf. esp. Quod Deterior Potiori Insid. § 29, p. 212: De Cherubim, § 9, p. 144 ff.), we may reasonably infer, that the writings of Philo were not unknown to the Writer of this Epistle. The same conclusion has been also drawn by Grotius and Bleek. See Prolegg. § i. 155), and reaching through (so ἰκνεῖται λόγος διὰ στήθεων, Æsch. Sept. c. Theb. 515: δικνεῖσθαι δι' ὥτων ποτὶ τὰν ψυχάν, Tim. Locr. p. 101 A: ἡ δόξα δίκτο μέχρι βασιλέως, Plut. Dem. 20) even to dividing of soul and spirit, both joints and marrow (there has been considerable diversity in the taking of these genitives. I have regarded them as follows: ψυχῆς and πνεύματος, not coupled by τε καί, but only by καί, denote two separate departments of man's being, each subordinate to the process indicated by μερισμοῦ. The λόγος pierces to the dividing, not of the ψυχὴ from the πνεῦμα, but of the ψυχὴ itself and of the

^a ἄρμων τε καὶ ^b μυελῶν, καὶ ^c κριτικὸς ^d ἐνθυμήσεω καὶ ^a here only t. Sir xxiii. 2

b here only. Gen. xlv. 18. Job xxi. 24 only
xvii. 29 only t. Job xxi. 27 Symm. (-μημα, Jer. vii. 24 al.)

c here only t.

d Matt. ix. 4. xii. 25. Acts

ἐνθυμήσεως C¹D¹, *animi* D-lat Lucif₁ Ambr₂.

for καὶ ἐννοίων, ἐνν. τε D¹.

πνεῦμα itself: the former being the lower portion of man's invisible part, which he has in common with the brutes, the *λογον τῆς ψυχῆς* of Philo; the latter the higher portion, receptive of the Spirit of God, the *λογικὸν τῆς ψυχῆς* of the same; *both which* are pierced and divided by the sword of the Spirit, the word of God. Then, passing on to ἄρμων τε κ. μυελῶν, I do not regard these terms as co-ordinate with the former *ψυχῆς* κ. *πνεύματος*, but as subordinate to them, and as used in a spiritual sense, not a corporeal (as many Commentators and recently Delitzsch): implying that both the ἄρμοι and the μυελοὶ of the *ψυχή* and of the *πνεῦμα* are pierced and divided by the *λόγος*. This I conceive is necessitated both by the τε, expressed in this second clause, and by the sense, which otherwise would degenerate into an anti-climax, if ἄρμων τε κ. μυελῶν were to be understood of the body. (The metaphorical sense of *μυελός* is amply justified by such expressions as *εἰςδεδυνκία* (ὀδὸν) *εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν μυελὸν τῆς ψυχῆς*, Themist. Orat. 32, p. 357: *χρῆν γὰρ μετρίαις εἰς ἀλλήλους φιλίας θνητοὺς ἀνακίρνασθαι καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἄκρον μυελὸν ψυχῆς*, Eur. Hippol. 255 ff. And ἄρμος is not an anatomical, but a common term, which might be applied to any kind of compages, as ἄρμος *θύρας*, Dion. Hal. v. 7: ἄρμοι *λίθων*, ref. Sir. &c.) This, which is in the main the sense given by Grot., Kuin., Bl., De W., Lünem. (nearly also of Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. p. 258 f., who somewhat harshly makes the genitives *ψυχῆς* κ. *πνεύματος* dependent on ἄρμων τε κ. μυελῶν), being laid down, I proceed to examine the divergences from it. 1. That which regards the *μερισμός* as being a division of the *soul from the spirit, the joints from the marrow* (on this latter see below). This is given as early as by Chrys. as an alternative: *ἡ γὰρ ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα διαίρει ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς, λέγει· ἡ ὅτι καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀσωμάτων δικενέται*. And Ec., understanding *πνεῦμα* of the Holy Spirit: *ἡγοῦμαι οὖν νῦν τοῦτο εἰρησθαι, ὅτι χωρισμὸν ἐργάζεται τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, κ. ἀφαιρεῖται αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς*: and so, but giving the alternative, Thl. And so Erasmus-paraph. ("adeo ut dissecet animam a spiritu"), J. Cappellus, Wolf, Bengel, al. The objections to this are both psychological and contextual. It has been rightly urged (see especially Ebrard's

note here) that the soul and spirit cannot be said to be separated in any such sense as this: and on the other hand, the ἄρμοι and μυελοὶ could not be thus said to be separated, having never been in contact with one another. 2. Many Commentators, who hold the division of soul from spirit, are not prepared to apply the same interpretation to the ἄρμων τ. κ. μυελῶν; although, reading the former τε, it becomes philosophically necessary that the two clauses should be strictly parallel. Not reading the former τε, it becomes possible to make ἄρμων τε κ. μυελῶν dependent, not on *μερισμῷ* but on ἄχρι, which has been done by Cyril of Alexandria, de Fest. Pasch. Hom. xxii. vol. x. p. 275 b, *καθικνεῖται δὲ καὶ μέχρις ἄρμων τε καὶ μυελῶν*, and De Adorat. xvi. vol. i. p. 561, *μέχρις ἄρμων τε κ. μυελῶν τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καθικνεῖσθαι λόγον*, and Schlichting (see below), C. F. Schmid, Paulus, al. But certainly, had this been meant, the ἄχρις would have been repeated before ἄρμων. Otherwise it would be exceedingly harsh. 3. Many understand *μερισμῷ* to mean, not the act of division, but the *place where the division occurs*. So Böhme, "Ita ut per intervalla, si quæ sint, animæ animique, et compagum medullarumque penetret, seque insinuet." Schlichting, "Ad loca usque abditissima ubi anima cum spiritu connectitur, itemque ubi sunt membrorum compages et medullæ." And so, more recently, Ebrard. The objection to this is, partly the omission of what would in that case be the requisite article before *μερισμῷ*, and partly as before, that thus ἄρι. τ. κ. μυ. must be constructed with ἄχρι: see above. 4. One meaning is given by Ec. (after Cyril: *ὁ ἐν ἁγίοις Κύριλλος ἐν προσφύρῳ χωρίῳ καὶ οὕτως ἐδέξατο . . . τὸ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ κήρυγμα διαίρει φσι καὶ μερίζει τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρη, δεκτικὴν ποίων κ. χωρητικὴν τῶν ἀκουσμένων*), and Thl. (but not approved by the latter, as Bl. who has been misled by the Latin: for he says *τινὲς δὲ οὕτως ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν οὐκ ἀκολουθῶς τῷ ἀποστολικῷ σκοπῷ*, and then proceeds as Ec., except that he puts τὸ *μυστηρίου* for τῶν ἀκουσμένων). But clearly this cannot be the meaning, with γὰρ after a caution, and a *judger* (or, *discerner*: not as Kuinoel, *condemner*. The word is good Greek, as a simple predicate: so Plato, Pol. 260 c, τὸ *κριτικὸν μέρος*: with a gen., it seems to be of later usage: Palm and Rost

e 1 Pet. iv. 1 only. P¹⁰⁹.
 xxi. 19.
 (there also w.
 καρδ) al.
 f. — Rom. i. 25.
 vii. 30.
 Judith ix. 12.
 xii. 6 al.
 e έννοιών καρδιάς. 13 και οὐκ ἔστιν f κτίσις g ἀφανῆς h ἐνώ-
 πιον αὐτοῦ πάντα δὲ i γυμνὰ καὶ j τετραχηλισμένα τοῖς
 ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ. k πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ k λόγος.
 g here only †. Sir xx 30 2 Macc iii 34 only
 i = Job xxi 6 j here only †. (see note.) h Heb., ch. xiii 21 only. = Luke
 k 3 Kings ii 14. 4 Kings ix. 5

ABCDH
 KLPN
 a b c d
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

13. κρισις D[¹-gr].

quote ὀφθαλμοὶ κριτικοὶ τοῦ κάλλους from Basil the Great: but the government of a gen. by verbals in -ικός is regular: we have παρασκευαστικός τῶν εἰς τὸν πόλεμον, κ. ποριστικός τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, Xen. Mem. iii. 1. 6: διδασκαλικὸς τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας, Plato, Euthyph. p. 3 c: see Kuhner, § 530 h h: it is the genitivus materiæ of (the) thoughts (ἐνθύμημα is the commoner word: but Thucyd. (i. 123), Eurip. (Frag. 20), Isæus, and Aristotle (Bl.) use -ησις in much the same sense; -ησις being properly the actiō of the thought itself, -ημα the thing conceived or thought of. But these two become frequently confused in later Greek) and ideas (this seems the nearest term to έννοια. Plato gives rather a mysterious definition of it—συντονία διανοίας. But the usage, where the word wavers, as here, between the process in the mind itself and that which is the result of the process, points very much to our 'idea.' Thus έννοιαν λαμβάνειν τινός, Demosth. p. 157 18: ἡ κοινὴ έννοιά τινος, Polyb. x. 27. 8. In ib. i. 4. 9, we have έννοια distinguished from ἐπιστήμη: έννοιαν μὲν γὰρ λαβεῖν ἀπὸ μέρους τῶν δλων δυνατόν ἐπιστήμην δὲ καὶ γνῶσιν ἀπρεκεῖ ἔχειν, ἀδύνατον. Certainly the "intentiones" of the vulg. ("intents," E. V.), though apparently answering to the Platonic definition, does not give it here (though this seems the sense in 1 Pet. iv. 1), nor does "consilia" of Erasmus: "conceptus" of Crell. is better. Bengel says, "ἐνθύμησις, intentio, involvit affectum; έννοια, cogitatio, quæ dicit simplicius, prius et interius quiddam." But though strictly speaking this might be the meaning of ἐνθύμησις (ἐν θυμῷ), it does not carry so much in ordinary usage) of the heart (the inner and thinking and feeling part of man in Scripture psychology; die innere Mitte des menschlichen Wesenbestandes, in welcher das breisache Leben des Menschen zusammenläuft, Delitzsch, biblische Psychologie, § 12 init., which see; and Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, p. 63 ff.): 13.] and there is not a creature (for the concrete κτίσμα, as so often, see reff. The term embraces all created things, visible and invisible, cf. Col. i. 16) unseen (a classical word: see Palm. and Rost's references) in his presence (first as to the gen. pron. αὐτοῦ: to what does it refer? to ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, or to τοῦ θεοῦ

itself? The idea of its referring to *Christ* falls with the untenableness of the personal meaning of λόγος: although Calov., Schöttgen, al., abandoning that, yet hold it. Then of the two other, it seems much the more obvious to refer it to τοῦ θεοῦ, especially in the presence of τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς αὐτοῦ, and πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος below. Nor is there any harshness in this; from speaking of the uttered word of God, whose powers are not its own but His, the transition to Himself, with Whom that word is so nearly identified, is simple and obvious. The expression ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, common in the N. T. and especially in St. Luke, is apparently Alexandrine, and borrowed from the LXX, where it answers to the Heb. נֶפֶשׁ: but (δέ, in the strongly adversative sense which it several times has in our Epistle: cf. ch. ii. 6, and note there, also ver. 15 below; ch. ix. 12; x. 27; xii. 13. This it gains by its force of passing altogether to a new subject, excluding entirely from view that which is last treated: q. d. "tantum absit, ut . . . ut . . ." all things are naked (it had been said by Böhme, that this metaphorical meaning of γυμνός was unknown to the Greeks: but see Herod. viii. 19, ταῦτα μὲν εἰς τοσοῦτο παρεγύμνου: also i. 126; ix. 44: and γυμνῶν τῶν πραγμάτων θεωρουμένων, Diod. Sic. i. p. 69. The herald in the Areopagus forbade the witnesses ληρεῖν πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν καὶ περιπέττειν τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ὡς γυμνὰ τὰ γεγενημένα οἱ Ἀρεοπαγῖται βλέποιεν, Lucian, Gymnas. p. 401. And Marc. Antonin. xii. 2, says, in language very similar to this, ὁ θεὸς πάντα τὰ ἡγεμονικά γυμνὰ τῶν ὑλικῶν ἀγγείων καὶ φλοίων καὶ καθαυμάτων ὀρεῖ) and prostrate (see at the end of this note: *resupinata, manifestata; πεφανερωμένα*, Hesych. The various meanings given to this difficult word *τραχηλίζειν*, form a curious chapter in the history of exegesis. Its first and most common classical acceptation seems to be, to take by the throat, as an adversary in a struggle, or an athlete in wrestling might do, for the purpose of overthrowing. So (to give merely one example among many which will be found in Wetstein, and better arranged in Bleek) *δρᾶτε τὸν ἀθλητὴν ὑπὸ παιδισκαρίου τραχηλίζόμενον*, Plut. de Curiositate, p. 521 b. And

14 Ἐχοντες οὖν ¹ ἀρχιερέα ^m μέγαν ⁿ διεληλυθότα τοὺς ^{1 ch n 17 ioff.}
^{m - ch. x 21}
^{act. 20. Acts}
^{viii. 9 al. Lev. xxi. 10 al. fr.} ^{n Luke n. 15. viii. 22 al. fr. (see note).}

14. διεληλυθα (sic) κ.

thus some have interpreted it here: "*laid open*," as an athlete, caught by the neck and overthrown, lies for all to see. But as Bl. remarks, this last particular, which does in fact carry the whole weight of the comparison, comes in far too accidentally and subordinately. Another meaning has been proposed by Perizonius (on Ælian, Var. Hist. xii. 58) derived from the practice of stripping and bending back the necks of malefactors, that all might see their faces and shame, so producing the very opposite of the privacy which a man seeks when ashamed, by bowing down his head and covering his face. Thus Sueton. Vitell. 17: "(Vitellius) relegatis post tergamanibus, injecto cervicibus laqueo, veste discissa, seminudus in forum tractus est—reducto coma capite ceu noxii solent, atque etiam mento mucrone gladii subrecto, ut visendam præberet faciem, neves submitteret." And Pliny, Panegy. 34. 3: "Nihil tamen gratius, nihil sæculo dignius, quam quod contigit desuper intueri delatorum supina ora retortasque cervices, agnoscebamus et fruebamur, quum velut piaculares publicæ sollicitudinis victimæ supra sanguinem noxiorum ad lenta supplicia gravioreque pœnas ducerentur." And this is the interpretation followed by Elsner, Wolf, Baumgarten, Kuinoel, Bretschneider, Bleek, De Wette, al. But here again, though the meaning is apposite enough, we have no precedent for the Greek word being thus used, or for any such custom being familiar to Greeks. So that this interpretation can hardly be the true one. The ancients give very various renderings. Chrys. says: *τετραχλισμένα ἔπεν ἀπὸ μεταφορὰς τῶν δερμάτων τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν σφαζομένων ἱερῶν ἐξελκομένων*: but does not justify such an application of the word. (Ec.: *τετραχλισμένα δὲ φησὶ τὰ γυμνά, ἀπὸ μεταφορὰς τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐκ τοῦ τραχήλου ἡρτημένων κ. γεγυμνωμένων τῆς δορᾶς ἢ . . ἀντὶ τοῦ κάτω κύπτοντα κ. τὸν τράχηλον ἐπικλινόντα, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἰσχύειν ἀτενίσαι τῇ δόρῃ ἐκείνῃ τοῦ κριτοῦ καὶ θεοῦ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ.* Thdr̄t.: *ἐκ μεταφορὰς τέθεικε τῶν θυομένων ζώων, ἃ παντελῶς ἄφωνα κείται, τῆς σφαγῆς τὴν ζῶην ἀφελομένης, καὶ μετὰ τῆς ζῆς τὴν φωνήν. οὕτω, φησὶ, καὶ ἡμεῖς κρινόμενοι θεώμεθα μὲν ἅπαντα τὰ δυσσεβῶς παρ' ἡμῶν ἢ παρανόμως γαγγυμένα· σιγῶντες δὲ τὴν τῆς τιμωρίας δεχόμεθα ψήφον, ἅτε δὴ τὸ δίκαιον αὐτῆς ἐπιστάμενοι.* Thl.: *ἀπὸ μεταφορὰς τῶν ἐκδερ-*

μένων προβάτων. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκείνων τραχηλισθέντων, ἦτοι κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου τὴν μάχαιραν δεξαμένων καὶ σφαγόντων, μετὰ τὸ καθελकुσθῆναι τὸ δέρμα πάντα καὶ τὰ ἔνδον ἐκκαλύπτεται· οὕτω καὶ τῷ θεῷ πάντα ὅλα. τινὲς δέ, τετραχλισμένα, τὰ ἐκ τοῦ τραχήλου, ἢ μάλλον κατὰ τοῦ τραχήλου κρεμάμενα ἐνόησαν. He then mentions the second alternative of (Ec. above, and ends, *σὺ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον δέξαι.* I have given all these to shew how various have been the renderings, and how universally acknowledged the difficulty of the word. The objection to the *sacrificial* rendering is, that the word never seems to have been used of any such process:—see all the meanings given in Palm and Rost sub voce. In seeking for a way out of the difficulty, it seems to me that the frequent use of the word by Philo, ought, in a passage cast so much, as we have seen, in Philo's mode of rhetorical expression, to enter as a considerable element into our decision. Wetst. gives us twenty passages in which the word and its compound *ἐτραχλίζω* occur in that writer: and the uniform meaning is, to *lay prostrate*, generally in a metaphorical sense: e. g. De Cherub. § 24, vol. i. p. 153, *μηδ' ὅσον ἀνακύβει δυνάμενος, ἀλλὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπιτρέχουσι καὶ τραχλίζουσι δεινοῖς ὑποβλημένος*: De Vita Mos. i. 54, vol. ii. p. 127, *τραχλίζόμενοι δὲ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας πάντ' ὑπομένουσι δρᾶν τε καὶ πάσχειν*: Quod Omnis Probus Liber, § 22, p. 470, *ὅφ' ἡδονῆς δελεάζεται, ἢ φόβῳ ἐκλύει, ἢ λύπῃ συστέλλεται, ἢ ὑπ' ἀπορίας τραχλίζεται*. And as we have seen in the beginning of this note, this is the simplest and most frequent sense in the classical writers. See also very numerous examples in Wetstein. I would therefore accept this metaphorical sense here, and regard the word as signifying entire prostration and subjugation under the eye of God: not only naked, stripped of all covering and concealment,—but also laid prostrate in their exposure, before His eye. I own myself not thoroughly satisfied with this, but I am unable to find a better rendering which shall at the same time be philologically justified) to His eyes (dat. commodi: for His eyes to see); with Whom we have to do (there could not be a happier rendering than this of the E. V., expressing our whole concern and relation with God, One who is not to be trifled with, considering that His word is so power-

ο Eph. iv. 10. ° οὐρανούς, Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, ῥ κρατῶμεν τῆς
 ch. vii. 26.
 viii. 1 al.
 p Heb. ch. vi 18 only (there also w. gen.). Prov. xii. 21. = w. acc., Paul, Col ii 19. 2 Thess. ii. 15. also Mark vii.
 3, 8. Rev. ii. 13 al.

ful, and His eye so discerning. And so Calv., Beza, Bengel, Kuin., Bleek, De W., Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. The ancients, without exception, confined this relation to one solemn particular of it, and rendered, "*to whom our account must be given:*" so Chrys.: ἀντὶ τοῦ αὐτῷ μέλλομεν δοῦναι εὐθύνas τῶν πεπραγμένων. And many of the moderns also take this view: e. g. Erasmi. (par.), Michaelis, Bretschneider, Stuart, al. Others suppose it to mean, "concerning whom is our discourse," referring to ch. v. 11, περὶ οὗ πολλὸς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος. So Luther, a-Lapide, Schlichting, Grot., Wolf, al. But, even conceding that πρὸς may well bear this meaning, which has not been shewn (see Bleek, p. 591 note), the meaning itself is far too vapid here, and finds no fit representation in the Epistle itself, which cannot be said to be, in any such sense, πρὸς θεόν or περὶ θεοῦ.

As regards the punctuation, and emphasis, it seems better to make πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος an independent clause and to set a colon at αὐτοῦ, than as commonly done, to join αὐτοῦ, πρὸς ὃν. For by so doing, we weaken very much the force of the sentence, in which, after the predicative clause, the stress is on ἡμῖν: and besides, we violate the strict propriety of αὐτοῦ, making it = ἐκεῖνου. 14—16.]

Hortatory conclusion of this second course of comparison (see summary at ch. iii. 1); taking up again by anticipation that which is now to be followed out in detail, viz. *the High Priesthood of Jesus*. This point is regarded by many (e. g. Bl., De W., Lünem., Thol., Hofm.,—Schr. ii. 1. 44,—after Beza, who says: "Hinc potius oportuerat novam sectionem aperiri") as the opening of the new portion of the Epistle: but on account of its hortatory and collective character, I prefer regarding it, with Ebrard, as the conclusion of the preceding: being of course at the same time transitional, as the close connexion of ch. v. 1 with our ver. 15 shews. It is much in the manner of the Writer, to *anticipate*, by frequently dropped hints, and by *asserting* that, which he intends very soon to *demonstrate*.

14.] *Having therefore* (οὖν refers rather to the whole exhortation than to the ἔχοντες: see Delitzsch) a *great High Priest* (the fact of this being Christ's office is as yet *assumed*: see above ch. ii. 17; iii. 1; and Philo cited in note there:—but now with more points of contact with what has been already said; e. g. ver. 10, where the εἰσελθὼν εἰς τ. κατάπαυσιν αὐτοῦ has

close connexion with the High Priest entering within the veil. μέγαν, as in ch. xiii. 20, τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων τὸν μέγαν: answering very much to the use of ἀληθινός, in St. John,—ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ἀμπελος ἡ ἀληθινή,—ἦν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν:—one archetypal High Priest,—one above all) *passed through* (not "*into*," as E. V., Calvin, al.: see below) *the heavens* (as the earthly high priest passed through the veil into the holiest place, so the great High Priest *through* the heavens to God's throne (on this, and its bearing on the Lutheran doctrine of Christ's ubiquity, see Bleek, Tholuck, and Delitzsch in loc.): cf. ch. ix. 11: with reference also to ver. 10, the entering of Jesus into His rest. In this fact, His greatness is substantiated. On οὐρανούς, plur., see on ch. i. 10. "Per coelos intelliguntur omnes coeli, qui inter nos et Deum sunt interjecti: nempe et tota aeris regio, quæ etiam cælum in scriptura vocatur, et coeli in quibus sunt sol, luna, cæteræque stellæ ac mundi luminaria, quibus omnibus Christus sublimior est factus, infra vii. 26: Eph. iv. 10. Post hos omnes est cælum illud, in quo Deus habitat, immortalitatis domicilium, quod ingressus est pontifex noster, non supergressus." Schlichting. Thl. gives another expansion of the reference of this clause which may also have been intended: οὐ τοιοῦτος οἷος Μωσῆς ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ οὔτε αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὴν κατάπαυσιν, οὔτε τὸν λαὸν εἰσῆγαγεν· οὗτος δὲ διελθὼς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς συνεδριάζει τῷ πατρί, κ. δύναται ἡμῖν τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς εἰσοδὸν δοῦναι, καὶ τῆς ἐν ἐπαγγελίᾳ καταπαύσεως κληρονόμους ποιῆσαι), *Jesus the Son of God* (certainly not so named in this connexion without an allusion to the Ἰησοῦς above mentioned. We cannot conceive that even a careful ordinary writer would have used the *same name* of two *different persons*, so designating the second of them, without intention. At the same time, there is no reason for supposing that such an allusion exhausts the sense of the weighty addition. It brings out the majesty of our High Priest, and justifies at the same time the preceding clause, leading the mind to supply 'to God, whose Son He is.' Besides which, it adds infinite weight to the exhortation which follows, *let us hold fast* (not as Tittmann, al., "*lay hold of*:" it is the opposite to παραπίπτειν, ch. vi. 6; παραρῆναι, ii. 1. On the genitive, see reff. In ch. vi. 18, the aor. gives the sense '*lay hold of*') *the*

^a ὁμολογίας. ¹⁵ οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα μὴ δυνάμενον ^{q ch. iii. 1 reff.}
^r συνπαθῆσαι ταῖς ἀσθενείαις ἡμῶν, ^s πεπειρασμένον δὲ ^{r here only. Symm Job ii. 11.}
^t κατὰ πάντα ^u καθ' ^v ὁμοίότητα ^w χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. ^{u ch. vii. xii. 26. s Matt. iv. 1 al fr. 3 Kings x. 1 t ch. ii. 17 reff. u ch. vii. 15 only. Gen. i. 11, 12. 1 as above (u). Wisd. xiv. 19 only. w = Matt. xiii. 34. Heb. viii. 17. 1 Cor. u ch. vii.}

15. (συνπαθῆσαι, so AB¹CD¹HN.)

Steph πεπειραμενον, with CKL[P] rel Orig, [Syn-ep-Ant] Eriph³ Cyr[-p₁] Nyss³ Chr-s-mss Thdr^t: txt ABD⁸ Orig³ Damasc [Thl].

confession (viz. of our Christian faith: not merely of Christ's ascension, nor merely of Christ as our High Priest: cf. ch. iii. 1 and note, and ch. x. 23, which gives more the subjective side, here necessarily to be understood also. See also ch. iii. 6.

Corn. a-Lapide gives a beautiful paraphrase: "Agite Hebraei, persistite in fide Christi, ad requiem in caelis properate: esto caeli longe a nobis absint, facile eos conscendemus et penetrabimus, duce Christo, qui eos penetravit, eosque nobis pervios fecit, dummodo confessionem, i. e. professionem, scilicet fidei et spei nostrae, constanter retineamus"). 15.] For (how connected? certainly not as grounding the facts just stated; but as furnishing a motive for κρατεῖν τῆς ὁμολογίας. The effort is not hopeless, notwithstanding the majesty of our High Priest, and the power of the Word of our God: for we are sympathized with and helped by Him. As Schlichting, "Occupat objectionem. Poterat enim aliquis dicere: quid me magnus iste Pontifex dura confessionis nostrae causa patientem juvabit, qui quanto major est, quanto a nobis remotior, tanto minore fortassis nostri cura tangetur?" To suppose, as some have done, that a contrast to the Jewish high priests is intended, is to contradict directly ch. v. 2. Rather is our great High Priest in this respect expressly identified with them) we have not a high priest unable (thus better than "who is not able," τὸν μὴ δυνάμενον) to sympathize with ("The verb συμπάθεω, immediately from συμπαθής, as by the same analogy ἀντιπαθέω, δυσπαθέω, εὐπαθέω, ἡδυσπαθέω, μετριοπαθέω, ὁμοιοπαθέω, is like all these derivative forms, good Greek. Stephanus states it is to be found in Isocrates: ὥστε καὶ ταῖς μικραῖς ἀνυχταῖς ἕκαστος ἡμῶν πολλοὺς εἶχε συμπάθησοντας. Philo de Septenar. § 13, vol. ii. p. 290: τῷ δὲ ἀπὸρως ἔχοντι συνεπάθησε καὶ μετέδωκεν ἐλέους κ.τ.λ. In St. Paul, we have συμπάσχειν (reff.) which our Epistle has not, but in a somewhat different meaning, that of actual community in suffering with another, whereas our word is spoken of one sympathizing, taking part in heart with the sufferings of another. Erasmus (annot.): 'Est affici moverique sensu alieni

mali.' συμπάσχειν might indeed be used in this sense, but hardly συμπάθεῖν in the other." Bleek) our infirmities (not sufferings, as Chrys., Thdr^t, al. For the idea would be here out of place, and the word cannot have this meaning. Bleek has well examined its region of significance; and shewn that it can only betoken primarily the inner and a priori weakness,—be that physical, and thereby leading to exposure to suffering and disease, which itself is sometimes called by this name (see John xi. 4: Luke v. 15; viii. 2 al.: ch. xi. 34),—or spiritual and moral,—whereby misery arises, and sin finds entrance, as in ch. v. 2; vii. 8. Both these, indeed all human infirmities, are here included. With all does the Son of God sympathize, and for the reason now to be given), nay rather (on δέ being a stronger adversative than ἀλλά, see on ver. 13 above), (one) tempted (Ebrard has a good note on the subject of our Lord's temptations) in all things (see on ch. ii. 17) according to (our) similitude (ἡμῶν is the natural word to supply. So in ch. vii. 15, κατὰ τὴν ὁμοίότητα Μελαχισεδέκ. It might be πρὸς ἡμᾶς: so Aristot. de Mundo (B1.), κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ταῦτα ὁμοίότητα: Philo de Profugis, § 9, vol. i. p. 553, κατὰ τὴν πρὸς ἄλλα ὁμοίότητα, see ref. Gen. St. Paul uses ὁμοίωμα, not ὁμοίότης: cf. Rom. i. 23; v. 14; vi. 5; viii. 3: Phil. ii. 7) apart from sin (so that throughout these temptations, in their origin, in their process, in their result,—sin had nothing in Him: He was free and separate from it. This general reference is the only one which fully gives the general predication, χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. And so it has been usually taken. But there are considerable divergences. Ec.: ὅτι οὐχ ἁμαρτιῶν ἐτίμνε δίκην ταῦτα, φησί, πάσχω. So Thl. altern.: Schlichting, "Ut ostendat, Christum innoxium prorsus fuisse, nec ullo modo hæc mala quæ passus est commercium:" al. But this would require πεπειρασμένον to be confined in its meaning to such sufferings as might be inflicted on account of sin: and would altogether deprive it of the meaning 'tempted,' 'solicited towards, but short of sin.' Again, very many Commentators take the words to imply, that He was

x see note. 16 x προσερχώμεθα οὖν y μετὰ z παρρησίας τῷ a θρόνῳ τῆς ABCDK
 1 Pet. ii. 4. a χάριτος, ἵνα b λάβωμεν bc ἔλεος καὶ d χάριν d εὐρωμεν εἰς LFN
 Jer. vii. 16. a χάριτος, ἵνα b λάβωμεν bc ἔλεος καὶ d χάριν d εὐρωμεν εἰς a b c d
 y Mark iii. 5. Luke xxiv. e εὐκαιρον f βοήθειαν. V. 1 Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀν- fg h k l
 52 Eph. iv. 2 al fr. e εὐκαιρον f βοήθειαν. V. 1 Πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐξ ἀν- m n o
 1 Chron. xxix. 22. z = ch. iii. 6 reff. a see ch. vii. 1 reff. b here only c = 2 Tim. 17. 47
 1 18. Jude 21. d Luke i. 30. Acts vii. 46 only Deut xxiv 3 (1) al fr e Mark vi 21 only. Ps.
 ciii. 28. 2 Macc. xiv. 29. x. 20 only. f = here (Acts xxvii. 17) only. Ps. vii. 10 al.

16. rec ελεον, with C²D³L rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt ABC¹D¹K[P]N g l 17
 Antch., om ευρωμεν B. om eis D¹: om eis ευκαιρον f.

tempted in all other points, but not in sin: "sin only excepted." So Jac. Capellus, Storr, Ernesti, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, Schleusner, Wahl, and Bretschneider, and al. But the words certainly do not lead to any such interpretation. They would rather in this case be, εἰ μὴ καθ' ἁμαρτίαν, or χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας would stand before καθ' ὁμοιότητα. The Commentators refer to passages of Philo in which he states the High Priesthood and the sinlessness of the λόγος in a manner very similar: e. g. De Profugis, § 20, p. 562: λέγομεν γὰρ, τὸν ἀρχιερέα οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ λόγον θεῖον εἶναι, πάντων οὐχ ἑκουσίων μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκουσίων ἀδικημάτων ἀμέτοχον). 16.]

Exhortation to confidence, even in our guilt and need, grounded on this sympathy of our great High Priest. Let us therefore approach (προσερχεσθαι, only once used by St. Paul, 1 Tim. vi. 3, and that in a totally different sense, προσέρχεσθαι ὑγιαίνουσιν λόγοις, is a favourite word in this Epistle, cf. ch. vii. 25; x. 1, 22; xi. 6; xii. 18, 22, and generally in the same sense as here, that of approach to God, either, as under the O. T., by sacrifices, or, as under the N. T., by the one sacrifice of Christ. The same idea is expressed Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12, by the word *προσάγωγή*: see also reff.) with confidence (ref. and note there) to the throne of grace (i. e. not, as Seb. Schmidt, al., Christ Himself,—nor, as Chrys., Eccl., Thl., Thdrt., Primasius, Limborch, al., the throne of Christ,—nor is there any allusion to the lid of the ark of the covenant as the mercy-seat, which both would here be alien from the immediate context, and would introduce a confusion of metaphors in a purely spiritual passage: but, by the analogy of this Epistle, it is the throne of God, at the right hand of which (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, ch. viii. 1; ἐν δεξ. τ. θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, xii. 2) Jesus our Forerunner is seated. That it is here called the throne of *grace*, is owing to the complexion of the passage, in which the grace and mercy of our reconciled God are described as ensured to us by the sympathy and power of our great High Priest), that we may receive (λαμβάνειν here clearly in its passive recipient sense, as ch. ii. 2 al.) compassion

(corresponding to that συμπάθεια of our High Priest above spoken of: but extending further than our ἀσθένεια, to the forgiveness of our sins by God's mercy in Christ), and may find grace (we have εὐρίσκειν ἔλεος, in ref. 2 Tim. εὐρ. χάριν is common in the LXX. The meaning is not very different from λαβεῖν ἔλεος. Many distinctions have been set up, but none appear to hold. Both, the receiving ἔλεος and finding χάριν, apply to the next clause) for help in time (i. e. σήμερον, while it is yet open to us: as Chrys., ἀν νῦν προσέλθης, φησί, λήψη καὶ χάριν καὶ ἔλεον εὐκαίρως γὰρ προσέρχη. ἀν δέ ποτε προσέλθης, οὐκέτι ἄκαιρος γὰρ ἡ πρόσδοσις: οὐ γὰρ ἔστι τότε. θρόνος χάριτος: θρόνος χάριτος ἐστὶν ἕως καθῆται χαριζόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς, ὅταν δὲ ἡ συντέλεια γένηται, τότε ἐγείρεται εἰς κρίσιν,—Thl., Calvin, referring to 2 Cor. vi. 2 (from Isa. xlix. 8), καιρῷ δεκτῷ ἐκήκουσά σου . . . ἰδοὺ νῦν καιρὸς εὐπρόσδεκτος,—Estius, al., Bleek, De W., Lunem., Ebrard, Tholuck. This is decidedly the right interpretation, and not as many Commentators and the E. V., "in time of need," "as often as we want it," which would be both flat, and hardly justified by usage, cf. ref. Mark. Delitzsch objects to the above view as *weber dem Ausdruck noch der Situation recht entsprechend*: but his own, that they were to apply for help which might come in good time, before the danger which surrounded them became so pressing that they must sink under it from inability to resist,—surely comes nearly to the same. There is no reason why the two should not be united: *εὐκαιρον*,—while the throne of grace is open, and you yourselves not overwhelmed by the danger).

CHAP. V. 1—X. 18.] THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST: and this in several points of view. That which has before been twice by anticipation hinted at, ch. ii. 17; iii. 1; iv. 14, 15, is now taken up and thoroughly discussed. First of all, vv. 1—10, two necessary qualifications of a high priest are stated, and Christ is proved to have fulfilled both: a. vv. 1—3, *he must be taken from among men, capable, in respect of infirmity, of feeling for men*, and, B. vv. 4—10, *he must not have taken*

θρόπων ἡ λαμβανόμενος ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἡ καθίσταται ἰ τὰ ἡ = Num. viii.
 πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ἵνα^{klm} προσφέρῃ ἰ δῶρά τε καὶ ἡ¹⁴ θυσίας
 ἡ¹ ὑπὲρ ἡ² ἁμαρτιῶν, ἡ² ο μετροπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἡ² ἀγνοοῦ-
 3. Exod. ii. 14. 1 Chron. xii. 18. 1 ch. ii. 17 reff. k Heb., vv. 3, 7 al. Paul
 never. 1 Matt. ii. 11 v. 23, 24 viii. 4 ch. viii. 3, 4. ix. 9. Lev. i. 2, 3 al. m Acts vii.
 42 (from Amos v. 25). xxi. 26. ch. viii. 3 ix. 9. x. 1, &c. Gen. iv. 3 al. n 1 Cor. xv. 3 ch. vii.
 7. x. 12. Ezek. xlv. 22. o here only t. Philo, de Abr. § 44, vol. u. p. 57. p = 1 Tim. i.
 12. Num. xii. 11. Gen. xx. 4.

CHAP. V. 1. om τε B D²(appy) [vss(exc syr)].

the dignity upon himself, but have been appointed by God.

1.] For (takes up again ch. iv. 15 with a view to substantiate it: see remarks below) every high priest (in the sense, Levitical high priest, the only class here in question. Delitzsch is however right in maintaining, that it is not right to limit the words to this sense, or to see in them this condition, which indeed is not brought forward, but only exists in the nature of the case, no other high priests being in view), being taken from among men (this participial clause belongs to the predicative portion of the sentence, and indeed carries the chief weight of it, having a slight causal force; 'inasmuch as he is taken from among men.' And thus the clause is understood by Chrys., Thl., Primas., and Calv., Schlicht., Grot., Beng., Bl., De W., Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. Others, as Luth., Seb. Schm., Wetst., Storr, Kuinoel, al., take it as belonging to the *subject*, as does the E. V., "Every high priest taken from among men," and see in it a contrast, as in ch. vii. 28, between human high priests, and the Son of God. But such contrast here is not only not in, but inconsistent with, the context: which does not bring out as yet any difference between Christ and the Jewish high priests, but rather (see below) treats of the attributes of a high priest from their example. λαμβανόμενος is no technical word, as 'capi' in Latin: "Eximie virgines Vestales, sed flamines quoque Diales, item pontifices et augures capi dicebantur," Aul. Gell. i. 12: for the question here is not of electing or appointing, which comes below in καθίσταται, but simply of *taking from among*, as in reff.), is appointed (the ordinary classical word: *ιατροὺς κατέστησαν ὀκτώ*, Xen. Anab. iii. 4. 30: and the pass., *ἔδει βασιλέα καθίστασθαι*, id. Ages. iii. 1, see also reff., and numerous examples in Bleek) for (on behalf of, for the benefit of: vicariousness must not be introduced where the context, as here, does not require it: see note on ch. ii. 9) men (the stress is both times on this genitive and its preposition, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος, ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων καθίσταται: the former justifying the latter. This is a powerful additional rea-

son for taking ἐξ ἀνθρ. λαμβ. predicatively: for if it be taken as attached to the subject, "every high priest taken from among men," with a necessary stress in such case on 'men,' the same stress must be laid on 'men' in the ὑπὲρ ἀνθρ., with an implication that Christ, with whom on this hypothesis the human high priest is contrasted, was *not* appointed for men) in matters relating to God (see note on ch. ii. 17. It is extraordinary how Calvin and Kypke could, in the face of usage and of ch. ii. 17 and vii. 28; viii. 3, have supposed καθίσταται to be active, and τὰ πρ. τ. θ. accus. after it: "Curat Pontifex, vel ordinat, quæ ad Deum pertinent: . . . constructio melius fluit, et sententia est plenior," Calv.: "Cultum divinum instituit," Kypke. So also Stuart in his summary, "that he may superintend or direct the concerns which men have with God;" but not in his commentary. All the instances of an active (dynamic) sense of the middle of καθίσταται adduced by Kypke are in the aorists, which stand on different ground from the present), that he may offer (the technical word: see reff.) both gifts and sacrifices for sins (δῶρα and θυσίας are both to be taken with ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν, as the τε shews: not, as Grot., Bengel, al., δῶρα alone, and θυσ. ὑπὲρ ἁμ. together; nor, as Delitzsch, is ὑπὲρ to be taken with προσφέρῃ. And the sentence ἵνα προσφ. κ.τ.λ. is not, as Thl., a mere epexegetis of τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, but is intimately connected by the word ἁμαρτιῶν with what follows: see below. ὑπὲρ, i. e. to atone for, = εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας τοῦ λαοῦ, ch. ii. 17: see also reff. No satisfactory distinction can be set up between δῶρα and θυσίας: properly speaking, the former would be *any manner of offerings*, the latter *slain beasts* only: but this usage is not observed in Scripture: see reff. Thl. says, κατὰ μὲν τὸν ἀκριβῆ λόγον διαφέρουσι, παρὰ δὲ τῇ γραφῇ ἀδιαφόρως κείνται, 2.] being (one who is) able (this clause is closely bound to the last, and belongs to it, not to the whole sentence. It is in fact a conditioning participial clause to ἵνα προσφέρῃ, and at the same time a retrospective epexegetis of ἐξ ἀνθρώπων λαμβανόμενος) to be compas-

q Matt. xxi. 29 ff. 1 Cor. vi. 9. 2 Tim. iii. 13. James v. 19. Isa. xlv. 8. r const. Acts xxviii. 20 (ch. xii. 1 reff.). only. u 17. ver. 12 f. u ver. 1 reff. s Rom. vi. 19. 2 Cor. xii. 9. ch. iv. 15. t = 1 Cor. vii. 36. ch. 17. 47

σιν καὶ ἡ πλανωμένοις, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ὑπερίκειται ἡ ἀσθένεια³ καὶ δι' αὐτὴν ὑποφέρει καθὼς περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ οὕτως καὶ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ ὑποφέρει περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν. ⁴ καὶ οὐχ

2. for εἰ καὶ, καὶ γὰρ D¹; quoniam D-lat.

3. rec δια ταυτην, with C³D³KL rel syr-mg Chr[-montf Antch.] Thdr̄t; propterea vulg copt: propter illam D-lat: txt A¹B¹C¹ D¹[-gr P]N¹ 17 syrr Chr-2-mss [Euthal-ms] Cyr, Thdr̄t, for εαυτου, αυτου BD¹ [Thdr̄t], rec (for 3rd περι υπερ, with C³D³KL rel Chr[-montf] Thdr̄t, [Antch, Damasc]: txt ABC¹D¹[P]N¹ 17 [47] Chr-mss Thdr̄t, [Euthal-ms Cyr],

sionate (μετριοπαθέω is a word apparently invented to serve the view of the Peripatetic school, as opposed to the ἀπάθεια of the Stoics. They held that we ought to rule our passions by reason, and denominated such moderation μετριοπάθεια. The word is not found,—except in a Pythagorean fragment of Archytas in Stobæus, of doubtful authenticity,—before the time of Alexander: Diog. Laert. v. 31 says, ἔφη δὲ (Aristotle) τὸν σοφὸν μὴ εἶναι μὲν ἀπαθῆ, μετριοπαθῆ δέ. See numerous other examples in Bleek. Hence we have the verb and its cognates frequently used of moderating the passion of anger: Plut. de Ira Cohib. p. 453, ἀναστῆσαι κ. σώσαι κ. φέισασθαι κ. καρτερῆσαι παρόητος ἐστὶ κ. συγγνώμης καὶ μετριοπαθείας: Appian, Bell. Hisp. p. 529, εἰ μετριοπαθὺς σφίσι χρήσεται, παραδοῦσιν ἑαυτούς: Jos. Autt. xii. 3. 2, Οὐσεπατιάνου δ' ἦν τις καὶ Τίτου τὴν μεγαλοφροσύνην εἰκότως ἐκπλαγείη, μετὰ πολέμου κ. τηλικούτους ἀγῶνας, οὓς ἔσχον πρὸς ἡμᾶς, μετριοπαθῆσαντων. So the Etym. Mag., μετριοπαθεῖν ἐκ μέρους τὰ πάθη καταδέχεσθαι, συγγινώσκειν: Hesych. μετριοπαθῆς· μικρὰ πάσχων, ἢ συγγινώσκων ἐπιεικῶς. The meaning here therefore must be given according to this analogy, and the dative following explained as one of *direction*, or perhaps *commotō* towards the ignorant and erring (the former mild word, though frequently used of sinners elsewhere without (e.g. Hosea iv. 15: Sir. v. 15; xxiii. 2 al.: Judith v. 20: Esdr. viii. 75 (72): cf. 2 Chron. xvi. 9: and so Thl. here, ὅρα δέ, ὅτι πᾶν ἁμαρτήμα ἄγνοια κ. πλάνη γεννᾷ) as well as with the implication of ignorance (see Eccles. v. 5: Levit. iv. 13; v. 18), seems to be here placed, as well as πλανωμένοις, itself at all events a milder term than ἁμαρτάνουσιν, as snitable to the tone of the sentence, in which the feeling of a sinner towards his fellow-sinners is expressed. The sense might be filled up, 'towards those who (possibly after all) are ignorant and deluded.' And thus the propriety of the next clause is rendered still greater; both these, ἄγνοια

and πλάνη, being the results of ἀσθένεια, with which he himself is encompassed. On the exclusion on the one side from these designations of 'sinners with a high hand,' and the inclusion in them, as above, of much more than sins, strictly speaking, of ignorance, see Delitzsch's note), seeing that he himself also is compassed about with infirmity (on this construction of an acc. with ὑπερίκειμαι, compare ref. Acts: so τείχος περιβαλίσθαι τὴν πόλιν, Herod. i. 163: Eustath. on Il. τ. p. 1229: ὅρα δέ καὶ ὅτι τὸ περιεῖσθαι δοτικῇ συντάξει, λαβὼν αὐτὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ συγκείσθαι κ. περιπεπλέχθαι ἢ μέντοι συνήθεια ἐπὶ τοῦ βαστάζειν κ. φορεῖν τὴν λέξιν τίθησι κ. αἰτιατικῇ συντάξει, ὥς ἐν τῷ ὑπερίκειται τύφον ἢ πλοῦτον ἢ δυνάσκειαν. ἀσθένεια, as in ch. vii. 28, that moral weakness which makes men capable of sin. It is never predicated of Christ in this sense: nay, by the terms of vii. 28, He is excluded from it. That ἀσθένεια of the flesh, which He bore on Him, and thereby was capable of suffering and of death, was entirely distinct from this. Some have gone even further here, as Ec.—τὸ "περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν" εἰπὼν, σαφῶς ἐδήλωσεν ὅτι ἀσθένειαν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐκάλεσεν).

3.] And on account of it (the infirmity wherewith he himself is encompassed; not fem. for neut., as Bengel, altern.: nor is αὐτῇ, Matt. xxi. 42, which he alleges, the slightest justification for such a notion) he must (not meaning, it is his appointed duty according to the law: but, it is necessary for him, a priori, on higher ground than, and before, the ordinance of the law. See on ch. ii. 17) even as for the people, so also for himself, offer (here only used absolutely in N. T., see Num. vii. 18) for (see on ch. x. 6) sins (and accordingly, such was the ordinance of the law: cf. Levit. iv. 3; ix. 7; xvi. 6 al. Much has been said as to the applicability or otherwise of these considerations to Christ. Some have considered all that has hitherto been said as spoken of human high priests in contradistinction to Him: but it is better to understand it all as spoken of high priests

ἡ ἑαυτῷ τὶς ἡ λαμβάνει τὴν ἡ τιμὴν, ἀλλὰ ἡ καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἡ καθὼς περ καὶ ἡ Ἀαρών. ἡ οὕτως καὶ ὁ χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἡ ἐδόξασεν ἡ γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ ὁ τοῦ μου εἰ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγεννηκά σε

8. Isa. xlii. 6. xlviii. 12. see ch. ix. 15. Rom. viii. 30. y here only. see ch. iv. 2. z = John viii. 54 al. fr. Esth. iii. 1. Isa. i. 2 al. see Acts iii. 13. Rom. vii. 30. u inf., Mark vii. 4. Acts xv. 10. Col. iv. 6. Rev. xvi. 9. winner, § 44. 1. b Acts xiii. 33. ch. i. 5. Psal. ii. 7. x = ch. xi.

4. λαμβάνει bef tis D m: tis is insd above the line B¹[^{2,3}(Tischdf)]. rec avt αλλα ins o, with C³L[P] rel Cyr[-p Phot.] Thdrt Thl: om ABC¹DK² b d h k l m o [Chr¹ Procop¹ Damasc]. rec καθάπερ, with C²D³KL[P]³ rel [Euthal-ms] Thdrt₂ Phot₁: καθως C¹(appy) Chr Procop: txt AB(C¹?)D¹ 17 [Cyr₁ Chron₁] Damasc. om kai (C¹?)D¹ [vulg Syr Cyr₁ Chron₁]. rec ins o bef ααρων, with Thdrt₁: om ABCDKL[P]³ rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr₁ Chron₁ Damasc].

5. γενεσθαι A 71 [arm(-ed Rieu)] Cyr-jer[-ed, Cyr₁ Chron₁ Phot₁].

in general: and then, as Ebrard well says, leave it to the Writer himself, ver. 5 ff., to determine how far these requisites are satisfied in Christ. The progress of the argument itself will shew us, ver. 8 f., and further on, ch. vii. 27, in how far Christ is unlike the O. T. high priest. 4—10.]

Second requisite: *divine appointment*.

4.] And (couples to ver. 1, of which the subsequent verses have been expegetical) none taketh (λαμβάνει, not altogether perhaps without an allusion to λαμβανόμενος above, ver. 1. So in Xiphilinus Galb. p. 187, νομίζων οὐκ εἰληφέναι τὴν ἀρχήν, ἀλλὰ δεδόσθαι αὐτῷ) the office (of the high priesthood: so τιμὴ, Herod. ii. 59, οὕτε τιμὰς τὰς εὐσίας συνταράξας (Πεισίστρατος), οὕτε θέσμια μεταλλάξας: see other examples in Bleek. Josephus uses it frequently of the high-priestly office: e. g. Antt. iii. 8. 1, αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς Ἀαρὼν τῆς τιμῆς ταύτης ἄξιον ἔκρινε) to himself (dat. commodi: and carrying the stress of the sentence, although the construction of λαμβάνει with both clauses must be somewhat Zeugmatic: it must have rather a more active sense in the case where he takes it to himself, than in that where he only receives it, being called by God. This is denied by Delitzsch, but I see not how we can altogether escape it. The construction with ἑαυτῷ in the one case necessarily throws a different tinge over the verb than when it is understood with καλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) but (only when) called by God (with the ὁ of the rec. text, it would be, 'but only he who is called by God'), as indeed was Aaron (see Exod. xxviii. 1; xxix. 4: Levit. viii. 1: Num. iii. 10; but especially Num. xvi.—xvii. Schöttgen quotes from the Rabbinical Bammidbar Rabba, § 18, fol. 234, "Moses ad Corachum ejusque socios dixit: Si Aaron frater meus sibimetipsi sacerdotium sumpsit (וַיִּשְׁמַח אֶת הַכֹּהֲנִים = λαμβάνειν ἑαυτῷ) recte egistis, quod contra ipsum insurrexistis: jam vero Deus id ipsi dedit,"

&c. This divine ordinance of Aaron and his sons to be high priests endured long in the Jewish polity: but long before this time the rule had been disturbed: Jos. Antt. xx. 10. 5, relates, τὴν δὲ βασιλείαν Ἡρώδης παρὰ Ῥωμαίων ἐγχειρισθεῖς, οὐκ ἐτί τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ Ἀσσυριανοῦ γένους καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς, ἀλλὰ τισὶν ἀσσημοῖς, καὶ μόνον ἐξ ἱερέων οὖσι, πλὴν ἐνὸς Ἀριστοβούλου, τὴν τιμὴν ἀπένευε. Some of the early Commentators, e. g. Eccl. Thl., Primas., imagine that an allusion to this irregularity is here intended: αἰνιττεται δὲ ἐν ταῦθα τοὺς τότε ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, οἱ ἐπεπῆδον τῇ τιμῇ, ὡνητὴν ταύτην κτῶμενοι, καὶ τὸν νόμον διαφθείροντες, &c. But, though even Bleek imagines such an allusion may have been in the Writer's mind, it seems I own to me very improbable).

5.] Thus Christ also (as well as those others) did not glorify HIMSELF to be made High Priest (i. e. did not raise Himself to the office of High Priest. δοξάζειν is here used in its most general sense, of all those steps of elevation by which the dignity might be attained: see especially ref. John, which is exceedingly useful to the right understanding here. De Wette (so also Hofmann, Schrb. ii. 1. 182. See Delitzsch's note) is certainly very far wrong, in taking ἐδόξασεν of the ultimate well-known glorification of Christ, properly so called (ch. ii. 9), for thus confusion is introduced into the members of the parallel, seeing that this sentence, οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενεθ. ἀρχ., ought to correspond to οὐχ ἑαυτῷ λαμβάνει τὴν τιμὴν above. In the construction, the inf. γεννηθῆναι contains rather the result than the definite purpose: 'did not exalt himself so as to be made,' i. e. 'did not use that self-exaltation which might make him'), but He (i. e. the Father) who spake to Him, Thou art my son, I have this day begotten thee (see ch. i. 5, where this same saying is similarly adduced as spoken by the Heavenly Father to the

^c see ch. iv. 5. ^d Ps. cix. 4. Luke i. 8. 1 Cor. xiv. 40. Col. ii. 6. ver. 10. ch. vi. 20. vii. 11, &c. only. = 2 Macc. ix. 18 (see note). 20. Phil. i. 22, 24.

e = 1 Pet. iv. 2. 2 Cor. x. 3. Gal. ii.

ABCDK
LPN
a b c d
e f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

6. aft εν ετερω ins παλιν D¹[-gr. aft συ ins ει P 47(Mill) syr copt basm arm Chron]. melchisedech (here and vii. 1) A vulg.

7. aft os ins ων D¹[-gr].

Son. It must be carefully observed, that the Writer does not adduce this text as containing a direct proof of Christ's divine appointment to the High Priesthood: that follows in the next verse: nor again, does it merely assert, without any close connexion (cf. καθὼς καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει), that the same Divine Person appointed Him High Priest, who said to Him "Thou art my Son:" but it asserts, that such divine appointment was wrapped up and already involved in that eternal generation to the Sonship which was declared in these words. So Thl.: δοκεῖ δὲ ἀνάμυστος εἶναι ἡ ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου ψαλμοῦ προφητεία πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον προύκειτο μὲν γὰρ δῆπουθεν ἀποδειχθῆναι ἀρχιερεῖα τὸν χριστόν, αὕτη δὲ ἡ μαρτυρία τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθῆναι δηλοῖ. μάλιστα μὲν οὖν καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγενῆσθαι προκατασκευῇ ἐστὶ τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χειροτονηθῆναι. And similarly Chrys. Then again, we must beware of imagining that ὁ λαλήσας . . . γεγέννηκά σε is a mere periphrasis of ὁ πατήρ, as some have done. The true account seems to be this: the word ἐδόξασεν contains in it the whole process of exaltation (through suffering) by which the Lord Jesus has attained the heavenly High Priesthood. This whole process was not *his own work*, but the Father's, John viii. 54. And in saying this, we involve every step of it, from the very beginning. Of these, unquestionably the first was His eternal generation by the Father. He did not constitute *himself* the Son of God, in virtue ultimately of which sonship He ἐγενήθη ἀρχιερεὺς. And therefore in proving this, the sacred Writer adduces first the declaration of the Father which sets forth this His generation as Son of God, on which all His δοξασθῆναι depended,—and then, when He was completed by sufferings, vv. 7—10, the direct declaration of his High Priesthood, also by the Father. This class of interpretations has been much impugned, principally by the Socinian interpreters, and those who lean that way. Schlichting, Grot., Hammond, Limborch, Peirce, Storr, De Wette, and even Tholuck, refer the saying to the time of Christ's exaltation through death: and therein the more directly Socinian of them (e.g. Schlichtg.) see a disproof of the eternal generation of the Son. To take one of the arguments by

which even such Commentators as Tholuck support this view; he alleges that it best agrees with the τελείωσις spoken of vv. 7 ff., in which Christ by obedience became perfect as our High Priest. How fallacious this is, may readily be seen from the words *καίπερ ὧν υἱός*, which according to this view He was not, in the present sense, till those sufferings were ended. Delitzsch also would understand the words entirely of His triumphant glorified state, beginning with the Resurrection: on the ground that there is no connexion in the proposition that He who designated Him as His Eternal Son, also appointed Him to the High Priesthood. But surely this is not so: see above. On the whole question of the interpretation of the words themselves, as cited from the Psalm, see on ch. i. 5, where I have fully discussed it). 6.] even as also he saith in another (place) (see on ref., ἐν τούτῳ), Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek (on the relation of this Psalm to Christ, see generally on ch. i. 13. I may add to what was there said, that it is thus declared, that He, in whom all the theocratic promises find their fulfilment, in whom the true Kingdom of God comes and is summed up, was to be, as in Zech. vi. 12 ff., "a priest upon His throne," and such a priest (i. e. necessarily *High* Priest, if a King; as indeed the word is given in ver. 10 and ch. vi. 20) as should be after the order of Melchisedek. In examining this last predication, we find that κατὰ τὴν τάξιν, according to the ordinary meaning of τάξις, imports, according to the office or order, the rank which Melchisedek held. So Jos. Antt. vii. 11. 6, David appointed Amasa commander, καὶ τὴν τάξιν αὐτῷ ἐφ' ἧς Ἰωάβος ἦν, διδώσιν: Polyb. ii. 24. 9, ἐφεδρέας ἔχοντες τάξιν: Demosth. 313. 13, οἰκέτον τάξιν, οὐκ ἐλευθέρου παιδός, ἔχων. See many other examples in Bleek. So that κατὰ τὴν τάξιν will be very nearly the same as κατὰ τὴν ὁμοιότητα, ch. vii. 15: and the Peschito has this latter expression both in the Psalm, and throughout our Epistle. On εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, as indeed on the detailed application of the several expressions to Christ, see on ch. vii. 20 ff.).

7 ff.] The sufferings of Christ are now adduced, as a portion of his δοξασθῆναι to be made High Priest. They were all in subjection to the will of the Father: they

αὐτοῦ ¹εἰς δέησεις τε καὶ ²ἱκετηρίας πρὸς τὸν δυνάμενον ³ἡμεῖς ⁴σώζειν αὐτὸν ⁵ἐκ θανάτου ⁶μετὰ ⁷ἱκranγγῆς ⁸ἰσχυρὰς καὶ ⁹δακρύων ¹⁰προσενέγκας, καὶ ¹¹οἰς εἰσακουσθεὶς ¹²ἅπλο τῆς

16 1 Pet. iii. 12, from Ps xxxiii. 15. Job xl. 22 (27). so Polyb. iii. 112. 8. 1 = (see note) John xii. 27. James v. 20. Jude only. Job as above 2 Macc ix. 18 only. 5. 1 Macc. ii. 59. Acts xix. 19, 31. ch. xii. 17. 1 Matt. xxv. 6. Acts xxiii. 9. Eph. iv. 31. Rev. xiv. 18. xxi. 4 only. = Esth. iv. 3. m = Rev. xviii. 2. Dan. vi. 20 Theod. n John xvi. 2 (see note) o Matt. ii. 7. Luke i. 13. Acts x. 31. 1 Cor. xiv. 21 only. Ps. xxi. 2. cxi. v. 1. p = Luke ix. 3. xxi. 41. John xxi. 6. Acts xii. 14. xx. 9. xxii. 11. Ps. cxviii. 28. ὅπως θαυμασθῇ ἀπὸ τῆς ἰσχυροφίας, Thuc. vi. 12.

om τε K o [Did.] Chr-4-mss: expressed in syr, not in latt Syr copt [basin æth arm]. for εἰσακ., ακουσθ. D¹.

were all parts of his τελείωσις, by virtue of which He is now, in the fullest and most glorious sense, our High Priest. So that these verses are no digression, but stand directly in the course of the argument, as proving the proposition, οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γεννηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα. Part of this connexion is recognized by Bleek, but not all. He regards the verses as introduced to shew that Christ was never, not even in his deepest humiliation, severed from the Father, whose Son He was, and who subsequently, at his resurrection, appointed Him to his High Priesthood: thus missing the one link which binds this passage into the argument, viz. that this obedience and these sufferings were all a *part of His being glorified* for his High Priestly office: a *part of that office itself*, performed before He was perfected by entrance, through the veil of His flesh by death, into the most holy place. This mistake about the time of commencement of the High Priesthood of Christ has misled several of the Commentators throughout this part of the Epistle. ^{δς ἐν κ.τ.λ.}

It will be best to mark at once what I believe to be the connexion of this much-disputed sentence, and then to justify each portion in detail afterwards. Who in the days of his flesh, in that he offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to save him from death, and was heard by reason of his reverent submission, though He was a son, learned, from the things which He suffered, his obedience, and being made perfect, became the cause of eternal salvation to all who obey Him, being addressed by God as High Priest after the order of Melchisedek. That is, being paraphrased,—‘who had a course of glorifying for the High Priest’s office to go through, not of his own choice, but appointed for Him by the Father, as is shewn by that sharp lesson of obedience (not as contrasted with disobedience, but as indicating a glorious degree of perfect obedience, τὴν ὑπακ.), familiar to us all, which He, though God’s own Son, learned during the days of his

flesh: when He cried to God with tears for deliverance from death, and was heard on account of His resignation to the Father’s will (“Not my will, but Thine be done”),’ &c. Then as to details: ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ I understand as a general wide date for the incident which is about to be brought in,—as contrasted with His present days of glorification in the Spirit.

προσφέρειν δέησιν is found in Achil. Tat. vii. 1 (Bl.), ὡς δὲ οὐκ ἔπειθεν . . . δεινέραν αὐτῷ προσφέρειν δέησιν, and Longin. Pastoral. ii. 23: Jos., B. J. iii. 8. 3, has προσφέρει εὐχὴν. ἱκετηρία is properly an adjective used of κλάδος, ῥάβδος, &c. held out by the ἱκέτης. So Philo, Legat. ad Caium, § 36, vol. ii. p. 586, γραφὴ δὲ μηνύσει μου τὴν δέησιν, ἢν ἀνθ’ ἱκετηρίας προτείνω. But it also was used as = ἱκεσία or ἱκετεία: so, joined as here with δέησις, by Isocr. de Pace 46, πολλὰς ἱκετηρίας καὶ δέησεις: see reff. and more instances in Bleek.

πρὸς τὸν δυνάμ. is to be taken with the substantives δέησις τε καὶ ἱκετ., not with the verb προσενέγκας, in which case the words would most probably be placed after μετὰ κranγγῆς. ἰσχ. κ. δακρ., next the verb. σώζειν αὐτὸν ἐκ θανάτου is by Estius, Schulz, al. understood to mean, not as generally, to rescue Him from death, but “ut celeriter eriperetur a morte quam erat passurus: quod,” Estius adds, “factum est, quando a morte ad vitam immortalem resurrexit tertia die.” So also more recently Ebrard. But this is not only against the usage of σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου: cf. reff., and the examples given in Bl.: e. g. Od. δ. 755, ἥ γὰρ κέν μιν ἔπειτα καὶ ἐκ θανάτοιο σώσῃσι: Aristid. Plat. i. p. 90, (ὁ κυβερνήτης) σώζων ἐκ θανάτου καὶ οὗτος ἀνθρώπους κ. αὐτοὺς κ. χρήματα,—but still more decidedly against the truth of the sacred narrative: “Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me:” for we must of course assume, that in such a designation of the Father, the contents of the prayer made to Him are also indicated.

The μετὰ δακρύων is not distinctly asserted in the sacred narrative: but is a most obvious inference from what is there: cf. Matt. xxvi. 37 ||. Bl. has noticed that

q ch. xii 28 only. Josh. xxii 24. Prov. xxviii. 14. Wisd xvi 8 only. (-βής, Luke ii. 25 -βείσθαι, ch. xi. 7.) r w. particip. ch. u = Matt. vi. 5. xii. 17 Phil. iii. 4. 2 Pet. i. 12 only. s so ch. iii 6. t = Phil. iv. 11. xxiv. 32 || Mk. v constr., i Cor. vi. 1. ch. ii. 18 (there also w. πάσχειν) al.

ABCDK
LPN
a b c d
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

from the juxtaposition of **κραυγή** and **εἰσακουσθεῖς**, it is probable that the Writer may have had before his mind such passages from the Psalms as xxi. 2, *ὁ θεός μου, κεκράζομαι ἡμέρας πρὸς σε καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσῃ*: ib. ver. 24, *καὶ ἐν τῷ κεκραγέμαι με πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσήκουσέ (ἐπήκ. Α) με*: Ps. cxiv. (cxvi.) 1. I may remark, that there seems no reason for understanding the *κραυγὴ ἰσχυρά* and *δάκρυα* of any other time than the agony at Gethsemane, as some have done. This is adduced as the most illustrious instance of that learning obedience from suffering. Epiphanius reports that this *weeping* of the Lord in His agony was once related in some texts of St. Luke: see note on Luke xxii. 43, 44.

εἰσακουσθεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας is rendered in three different ways. 1. "*He was heard on account of His pious resignation.*" 2. "*He was heard, and so delivered, from that which He feared.*" 3. "*He was heard by Him who was His fear.*" Of these, (3) may shortly be discussed. It is cited by Wolf, Curæ in loc., as the view of Albert Ehlers, and is justified by God being called "*the Fear of Isaac.*" Gen. xxxi. 42, 53. See also Isa. viii. 13. But as Wolf answers, "*Si Deum indicare voluisset Apostolus, procul dubio scripsisset, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, vel ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, cum antea τοῦ δυναμένου σώζειν, i. e. Dei facta fuisset mentio.*" And usage would be wholly against such a sense of **εὐλαβεία**. (2) has found a formidable phalanx of supporters. The old Latin versions, "*exauditus a metu.*" Ambrose on Ps. lxi. p. 957, "*exauditus ab illo metu.*" Calv., Beza, Schlichting, Grot., Gerhard, Erasm. Schmid, Jac. Cappell., Hammond, Limborch, Schöttgen, Wolf, Bengel, Wetst., Storr, Ernesti, Bretschn., Kuinoel, De Wette, Stuart, Tholuck, Ebrard, and many others. Of these, most understand **εὐλαβεία** of *His own fear* (abstr.), from which, by strengthening Him, God delivered Him: some, as Calv., Schlicht., Hamm., take it (concr.) of *the thing itself which He feared*, viz. death: "*ex eo quod timebat.*" Calv. But neither can this be maintained. Bleek has most elaborately discussed the meanings of **εὐλαβεία**, and shewn, that however near it may seem to approach in some Greek sentences, to *fear*, yet it is always the fear of caution or modesty, not of terror: and even could it be thus taken (which Delitzsch, though interpreting the passage as I have done below, yet maintains it may be, on the strength of such examples as Sir. xli. 3, *μὴ εὐλαβοῦ κρίμα*

θανάτου), it would not be agreeable either to the propriety of the passage to express that Christ was delivered from death in such a phrase, when *σώζειν ἐκ θανάτου* has immediately preceded,—nor to its purpose, to predicate such a deliverance from death of Him at all, seeing that He did actually undergo that death which He feared. This would apply to the *concrete* acceptance of **εὐλάβεια**: and the *abstract* is precluded by the usage of the word. Besides which, the expression **εἰσηκούσθη ἀπὸ** would be, if not altogether unprecedented, yet so harsh as to be exceedingly improbable. None of the precedents alleged for it apply. In Ps. xxii. 22, "*Thou hast heard me from among the horns of the unicorns,*" the LXX (xxi. 21) have *κ. ἀπὸ κεράτων μονοκεράτων τὴν ταπείνωσίν μου*, which is no example: in Job xxxv. 12, *ἐκεῖ κεκράζονται καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσῃ καὶ (om. καὶ Α) ἀπὸ ὕβρεως πονηρῶν*, the *ἀπὸ* belongs to the former verb *κεκράζονται*. The only case of a pregnant construction at all similar, seems to be, Ps. cxvii. 5, *εἰσήκουσέ μου εἰς πλατυσμὸν (κύριος)*: but as BL remarks, it surely is no reason, because a *translator* reproduces a Hebrew pregnancy, that a writer should have a far harsher construction of the same kind attributed to him when there is no such justifying reason. The other instances, from our Epistle, ch. x. 22, *βεραντισμένοι . . . ἀπὸ συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς*, vi. 1, are to no purpose, as the verbs there carry in them the idea of being cleansed, or of turning, *from* something, and the prep. therefore naturally follows. It remains then to examine (1), against which it is urged by Beza, and even by Tholuck (but not in his last edn.), that *ἀπὸ* will not bear the meaning "*on account of.*" It is surprising that a scholar should ever have made such an objection, in the face of the instances in the ref., to which many more might be added out of the classics from those given by Bleek. The objection which Tholuck still brings, that such an interpretation would require *αὐτοῦ* after *τῆς εὐλαβ.*, is equally futile, the unusual expression of the art. after a preposition carrying the full force of a possessive. On the other hand it must be urged, that this meaning, "*He was heard on account of His pious resignation,*" as it is that given by all the Greek expositors, so is the only one which will satisfy the usage of **εὐλάβεια**. The account of the word, which I take mainly from Bleek, is this: it is derived from **εὐλαβής**, and that from **εὐ** and **λαμ-**

τὴν ^W ὑπακοήν, ⁹ καὶ ^X τελειωθεὶς ἐγένετο πᾶσιν τοῖς ^Y ὑπ- ^W Heb., here only, ^{claw.} ¹ Pet. i. 2, 14, 22, and Paul (Rom. i. 5 all¹⁰). ² Kings xxii. 36 only. ^X ch. ii. 10 reff. ^Y ch. xi. 8 reff.

9. *rec* τοῖς *υπακ.* *αὐτῷ* *bef* *πασιν*, with *KL* *rel* *Thdrt.*, *Damasc.*, (*Ec*: *txt* *ABCD*[*P*]*X* *m* 17 [47] *latt* *syrr* *copt* [*æth* *arm*] *Chr.*, *Cyr.*, *Thdrt.*, [*Euthal*-*ms* *Antch.*, *Damasc.*, *Thl.*].

βάνειν, denoting one who lays hold of any thing well, i.e. carefully, so as not to break or injure it; and is used of a man proceeding cautiously in his design, so as to avoid injury to himself or another. As such, it is opposed to *θράσος* by Demosth. 517. 21, κ. γὰρ ἐκ τούτου φανερά πᾶσιν ὕμιν ἡ τε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ὕμῶν εὐλάβεια γενήσεται κ. τὸ τούτου θράσος. Thus again in Plut. Marc. 9, p. 252, τὸ θαρράλειον αὐτοῦ κ. δραστήριον πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου κεραυνύντες κ. ἀρμόττοντες εὐλάβειαν κ. πρόνοιαν. And Polyb. iii. 105. 8, διὰ μὲν τὴν Μάρκου τόλμαν ἀπόλωλε τὰ ὅλα, διὰ δὲ τὴν εὐλάβειαν τοῦ Φαβίου σέσωσται καὶ πρὸ τοῦ καὶ νῦν. And hence the meaning sometimes approaches very near to *fear*: but, as above observed, always the fear of great caution or great modesty, not that of terror in any case. So Liban. iv. 265 a, μεστός ἐστιν εὐλαβείας κ. δέδοικεν: Jos. Antt. vi. 9. 2, μὴ ταπεινὸν ἔστω φρόνημα μηδ' εὐλαβείας, ὧ βασιλεῦ. And in Antt. xi. 6. 9, Esther is said to have come in to the king μετὰ δέους, but he laid the sceptre on her neck, εὐλαβείας αὐτὴν ἀπολύων. So far is the word from representing the fear of terror, that it is expressly opposed to it: as e.g. by Demosth. 405. 19, τίνα δὲ οὗτοι μὲν ἄτολμον κ. δειλὸν πρὸς τοὺς ὄχλους φασὶν εἶναι, ἐγὼ δὲ εὐλαβῆ; ἐμέ. Diog. Laert. says of Zeno, τὴν δ' εὐλάβειαν (ἐναντίαν φησὶν εἶναι τῇ φόβῳ) οὖσαν ἐλογον ἐκκλησίαν φοβηθήσεσθαι μὲν γὰρ τὸν σοφὸν οὐδαμῶς, εὐλαβηθήσεσθαι δέ. See also in Bleek a remarkable extract from Plutarch, where he mentions εὐλάβεια being used by the Stoics as an euphemism for φόβος. From these meanings the transition was very easy to that cautious reverence with which the pious man approaches a Divine Being. So Plut. Camill., τὴν τοῦ Ἀλβίνου πρὸς τὸ θεῖον εὐλάβειαν κ. τιμὴν: Plato, Legg. vi. p. 879, εὐλαβεῖσθαι θεόν: Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 6, vol. i. p. 476, εὐλαβεῖα τὸ θαρροῦν ἀνακέκραιται. τὸ μὲν γὰρ "τί μοι δάσεις (Gen. xv. 2);" θάρσος ἐμφαίνει: τὸ δὲ "ὧ δέσποτα," εὐλάβειαν: cf. also reff., especially ch. xii. 28, the only other place where it is found in the N. T. And this religious sense certainly suits remarkably well in our passage. No term could more exactly express the reverent submission to His Heavenly Father's will which is shewn in those words, "Not my will, but thine be done:" none the constant

humbling of himself in comparison with the Father, and exalting Him in word and deed, of which our Saviour's life is full. I have no hesitation therefore in adopting this rendering, and feeling entirely satisfied with it. Besides fulfilling the requisites of philology and of fact, it admirably suits the context here, where the appointment of Christ by the Father to his High Priesthood and the various steps by which that High Priesthood was perfected, are in question. As the ancient schol. says, εἰ καὶ χάριτι, φησί, πατρικῇ ὡς υἱὸς εἰσηκουσθῇ, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας εὐλαβείας, εὐλαβείας γὰρ ἦν τὸ λέγειν Πλὴν οὐχ ὡς ἐγὼ θέλω, ἀλλ' ὡς σύ. The matter of fact represented by *εἰσακουσθεῖς* may require some explanation. He *was heard*, not in the sense of the cup passing away from Him, which indeed was not the prayer of his εὐλάβεια,—but in strength being ministered to Him to do and to suffer that will of his Father, to fulfil which *was* the prayer of his εὐλάβεια—"Not my will, but thine be done." And I have little doubt that the word immediately refers to the "angel from heaven, strengthening Him," of Luke xxii. 43. Calvin's remarks ("Ita sæpe fit, ut hoc verb illud petamus, sed in alium finem: ipse vero Deus quod petieramus, eo modo quo petieramus, non concedens, interea modum invenit, quo nobis succurrat"), however true in the Christian life, do not apply here, because the real prayer of our Lord, as *εὐλαβῆς πρὸς τὸν πατέρα*, was granted in the very form in which it was expressed, not in another. *καίπερ ὢν υἱός*] This clause, according to all analogy of the use of *καίπερ* with a participle, is to be taken by itself, not with what follows. So *καίπερ πολλὰ παθόντα*, Od. η. 224; *καίπερ ο' στέργων ὕμῳ*, Æsch. Sept. c. Theb. 714: &c. Bleek, who adduces many more examples, doubts whether any authentic instance of the use of *καίπερ* with a finite verb can be produced (not Rev. xvii. 8: see text there): see also reff. Thus much being certain, the next question is, to what these words are to be applied. A threefold connexion is mentioned by Photius (in *Ec.*). The first alternative involves an inversion which would be unnatural in the last degree: *ὅς ἐν τ. ἡμ. τῆς σαρκ. αὐτ., καίπερ ὢν υἱός, δεήσεις κ. ἰκ. . . . προσενέγκας*. The second is to take the words with the clause immediately pre-

^z here only.

¹ Kings xxiii.

22.

a here only. Isa. xlv. 17. see ch. vi. 2. ix. 12.

ceding: *εἰσηκούσθη, φησί, καίπερ ὢν υἱός, κ. μὴ δέόμενος εἰσακουσθῆναι*. And so Thl. (Chrys. in one place, but see also below; Phot. prefers it among the three), al. And this doubtless is possible, both grammatically and contextually. For the *καίπερ ὢν υἱός* would thus come in as an exceptional clause, not to *εἰσακουσθεῖς*, in which light Bleek, Lünem., al. object to it, seeing that his being a Son would be rather the reason why He should than why He should not be heard,—but to the whole clause *εἰσακ. ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας*,—though He was a Son, yet not this, but his *εὐλάβεια*, was the ground of his being heard: which gives an undoubted good sense. Not much dissimilar will be the sense given by the other and more general way: viz. to take the words with the following clause, *ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν τὴν ὑπακοήν*: although He was a Son, He learned his obedience, not from this relation, but from his sufferings. So Chrys. (*τί λέγεις; ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπὸ εὐλαβείας ἡκούετο; καὶ τί περὶ τῶν προφητῶν πλέον ἐν εἰποὶ τις; ποῖα δὲ καὶ ἀκολουθία εἰπεῖν εἰσακουσθεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας, καὶ ἐπαγαγεῖν, καίπερ ὢν υἱὸς ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν*; but see also above), Ambrose (Ep. lxiii. vol. iii. p. 1033: “et ex iis quæ passus est, quamvis esset filius Dei, discere videretur obedientiam:” and alibi), and almost all the moderns. And there can be little doubt that this yields the better sense, and points to the deeper truth. Christ was a Son: as a Son, He was ever obedient, and ever in union with his Father's will; but ἡ ὑπακοή, *His special* obedience, that course of submission by which He became perfected as our High Priest, was gone through *in Time*, and matter of *acquirement* for Him, and *practice*, by suffering. The expression, *ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθεν*, brings to mind a number of Greek sayings founded on the proverb, *παθήματα, μαθήματα*. So Herod. i. 207, of Cræsus, *τὰ δέ μοι παθήματα, ἐόντα ἀχάριστα, μαθήματα γέγονεν*: Æschyl. Agam. 177, *τὸν πάθει μῦθος βέντα*, and a very long list of examples in Wetstein and Bleek. The ancients found this assertion startling, attributing too narrow a sense to our Lord's *παθήματα*: so Thdr̄t., *τὸ δὲ ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν, ἡπερβολικῶς ὁ ἀπόστολος τέθεικε τὴν γὰρ ὑπακοήν οὐ μετὰ τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους ἀπεδείξατο*. And Chrys., *ὁ μέχρι θανάτου πρὸ τούτου ὑπακούσας ὡς πατρὶ υἱός, πῶς δὲ καὶ ὕστερον ἐμαθεν*; This indeed would be a difficulty, were the Writer speaking of the Passion

^a σωτηρίας ^a αἰώνιου, ¹⁰ ^b προσαγο-
^z here only. Deut. xxiii. 6. = 2 Macc. iv. 7 x. 9. xiv 37. ABCDK
L^{PN}
a b c d

only, in its stricter sense; but he is speaking, I take it, of that continuous course of new obedience entered on by new suffering, of which the prayer in Gethsemane furnishes indeed the most notable instance, but of which also almost every act of His life on earth was an example. Thl. is so scandalized by the whole passage as applied to Christ that he says, *εἶδες πῶς διὰ τὴν τῶν ἀκροατῶν ὠφέλειαν οὕτω συγκατέβη Παῦλος, ὥστε καὶ ὑποπὰ τινα λέγων φαίνεσθαι*. Two mistakes must be avoided: 1. though He *was the Son*, which I find in Craik's new translation of the Epistle: cf. ch. iii. 5, 6, *Μωυσῆς, ὡς θεράπων . . . χριστός, ὡς υἱός*: and consider besides, that if we take from the simple predicative force of *υἱός*, as a well-known relative, we take from the *καίπερ ὢν* at the same time, by diminishing the general appreciation of the exceptional *καίπερ*: and, 2. that of Whitby, that *ἐμαθεν* here means “*taught (us)*.” If such a meaning ever could be admitted, least of all could it, from the context, here, where the subject treated is entirely Christ Himself, in his completion as our High Priest, and not till this is finished does that which He became to others come into question. *τελειωθείς*,

see note on ch. ii. 10, *perfected*, completed, brought to his goal of learning and suffering, through death: the time to which the word would apply is that of the Resurrection, when his triumph began: so our Lord Himself on the way to Emmaus, *οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν, καὶ (τελειωθείς would come in here) εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ*; Thdr̄t., *τελειώσιν δὲ τὴν ἀνάστασιν κ. τὴν ἀθανάσιαν ἐκάλεσε τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ πέρασ. ἐγένετο*, by means of that course which ended in His *τελειώσει*. In *πᾶσιν τοῖς ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ* there is probably an allusion to the *ὑπακοή* above. As He obeyed the Father, so must we obey Him, if we would be brought to that *σωτηρία αἰώνιος* into which He has led the way. The expression is strictly parallel with *οἱ πιστεύσαντες*, ch. iv. 3, and *τοὺς προσερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ*, ch. vii. 25. Some have thought that in *πᾶσιν*, the Writer hints to his Jewish readers, that such salvation was not confined to them alone. But it hardly seems likely that such a by-purpose should lie in the word. This unlikelihood is increased if *πᾶσιν* (as it must do) begins, instead of closing the clause as in rec. *αὐτῷ* is of course Christ.

αἴτιος εἶναι τινὶ τινος is good Greek, and often found: see examples in Bleek, e. g. Xen. Cyr. viii. 5. 2, *πολλῶν κ. ἀγαθῶν*

f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

ρευθείς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν ᾠδήν Μελ-
χισεδέκ.

¹¹ Περὶ οὗ πολλὸς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ ὁ δυσερμηνεύτος

11. ins και bef περι D¹[-gr: add δε Syr].

om o D¹[P arm].

αἱτιοὶ ἀλλήλοις ἔσσεσθε: Diod. Sic. iv. 82, τοῖς ἄλλοις αἱτιος ἐγένετο τῆς σωτηρίας: and the same expression in Jos. Antt. iii. 3. 1; vii. 1. 1: Philo de Agric. § 22, vol. i. p. 315: De Vita Contempl. § 11, vol. ii. p. 485. See ref. also on σωτηρία αἰώνιος.

The next clause, *προσαγορευθεὶς κ.τ.λ.*, depends closely upon *τελειωθεὶς κ.τ.λ.* above, and belongs to the time of Christ's exaltation, indicated by *τελειωθεὶς*: and therefore must not be divided by a colon, as done by Griesbach, Bengel, Matthäi, al., from the foregoing, nor supposed to refer to the whole from ver. 7. As to the word itself, it refers to the passage of the Psalm above, and carries with it a slight causal force, 'being,' or 'inasmuch as He is, named.' *προσαγορεύω* in this connexion has a force of solemnity and formal appellation: so, Xen. Cyr. vii. 2. 4, Cræsus says to Cyrus, χαῖρε ὦ δέσποτα τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ τύχη καὶ ἔχειν . . . διδωσί σοι, καὶ ἐμοὶ *προσαγορεύειν*: Diod. Sic. i. 4, Γάιος Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ, ὁ διὰ τὰς πράξεις *προσαγορευθεὶς* θεός. See ref. 2 Mac., and many more examples in Bleek. So that it here implies, not 'appointed' or 'inaugurated,' but 'addressed as,' 'named,' it being of course implied that He was both appointed and inaugurated.

11—VI. 20.] *Digression*, before entering on the comparison of Christ with Melchisedek, *complaining of the low state of spiritual attainment of the readers* (11—14): *warning them of the necessity of progress and the peril of falling back* (vi. 1—8): *but at the same time encouraging them by God's faithfulness in bearing in mind their previous labour of love, and in His promises generally, to persevere in faith and patience to the end* (vi. 9—20).

11.] *Concerning whom* (i. e. *Melchisedek*, as Syr. (which expresses Melchisedek after the relative), Calv., a-Lap., al., Bleek, De W., Tholuck, al.: not as Ec., Prim., al., and Lünem., *Christ*, of whom such an expression as this would hardly here be used, seeing that the whole Epistle hitherto has been concerning Him: nor is οὗ neuter, as Schlichting, Grot., Storr, Kuinoel, al.: and more recently, Delitzsch (*περὶ τοῦ εἶναι χριστὸν ἀρχ. κατὰ τ. ταξ. Μ.*): for the *Writer returns to Melchisedek*, ch. vii. 1) *our discourse* (that which we have to say. The plural pronoun, not with any definite

reference to Timothy or other companions of the *Writer*, nor intended to include the readers, which is here impossible: but as in some other places of the Epistle, see ref., merely indicating the *Writer* himself, as so frequently in the Epistles of St. Paul) is (not, as Erasm., Luther, a-Lap., al., "would be:" for we may safely say that in that case *εἴη* or *ἂν εἴη* would be supplied, as in the passage of Lysias cited below, and Dion. Hal. i. 23, *περὶ ὧν πολλὸς ἂν εἴη λόγος, εἰ βουλομένη τὴν ἀκρίβειαν γράφειν*) much, and difficult of interpretation to speak (the connexion of *δυσερμηνεύτος* with *λέγειν* is somewhat dubious. Who is the *ἐρμηνεύτης*? the *Writer*, so that it should be difficult for him to explain what he has to say to his readers, or the *readers*, so that it should be difficult for them to understand it for themselves? This latter alternative is taken by Grot. ("quem si eloquerer, ægre intelligeretis"), Jac. Cappel, Peirce, Valcknaer, al. But surely this would be inadmissible as matter of construction, and would require *ἐν τῷ λέγειν* or *ἐν τῷ λέγεσθαι*. And in consequence, some who take this view connect *λέγειν* with *λόγος*, πολ. ἡμ. δ. λ. κ. *δυσερμ. λέγειν*, referring, as Wetst., to Lysias adv. Panceleon. p. 167. 25, *ὅσα μὲν οὖν αὐτόθι ἐρρήθη, πολλὸς ἂν εἴη μοι λόγος διηγέσθαι*. But, as Bleek has noticed, there is this difference between the passages: that in ours, the adjectives are almost necessarily predicates, whereas in Lysias they are epithets: and, in consequence, here the verb must depend on *δυσερμηνεύτος*. We are driven then to the other alternative, of making the *Writer* the subject to be supplied: so Chrys. (*ὅταν γάρ τις πρὸς ἀνθρώπους ἔχῃ μὴ παρακολουθούντας, μῆδὲ τὰ λεγόμενα νοούντας, ἐρμηνεύσαι καλῶς αὐτοῖς οὐ δύναται*), and Thl. (*διὰ τὴν ὑμετέρων οὖν νωθρείαν, φησί, δυσερμηνεύτος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος ὁ περὶ τοῦ πῶς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, καὶ διότι οὐ συνίετε ὑμεῖς, διὰ τοῦτο ἐγὼ καλῶς ἐρμηνεύσαι οὐ δύναμαι*), Erasm. ("sed omnia perdifficile fuerit enarrare vobis, eo quod" &c.), Schlichting ("sermo difficilis ad eloquendum sic ut facile ab audientibus percipi et intelligi queat"), al.: Bleek, De W., Lünem., al. Then the infin. follows, as *ὅπως ἂν ὦσιν* (οἱ λόγοι) *ὡς πιθανώτατοι λέγειν*, Plato, Gorg. p. 479 c: *σημα ταυρόπουν ὄραν*,

c ver. 6.
d plur., so ch.
ii. 5. vi. 9,
11.
e here only t.
Philo de
Somn. i.
f 32, vol. i. p. 649.

f constr., see note. ^f λέγειν, ἐπεὶ ^ε νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ^h ἀκοαῖς. ¹² καὶ γὰρ ^{ABCDK} ὀφείλουτον εἶναι διδάσκαλοι ⁱ διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ^{LPN} πάλιν ^{a b c d} χρεῖαν ^k ἔχετε τοῦ ^k διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς τὴν τὰ ¹ στοιχεῖα τῆς ^{fg h k l} 17. 47

g ch vi 12 only. i Sir. iv 28 xii. 29. 12 only. see Prov. xii. 8. k h = Mark iii. 35. Luke vii. 1. Acts xvii. 20 al. 2 Macc. xv. 39. οἷς ὅτα μὲν ἔστιν, ἀκοαὶ δὲ οὐκ ἔναισιν, Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hæres, § 3, vol. i. p. 474. 1 ver. 3. j = here only. see note k constr., see note and Matt iii. 14. xiv 16. John xiii 10. 1 Thess. i. 8. Dan. iii 18. 1 Gal. iv. 3, 9. Col. ii. 8, 20. 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12 only. t. Wisd. vii 17. xix. 18 only.

12. om *τινα* 67².—*τίνα* (*interrog.*) CL[P](putting a stop bef it) [also B²]D³ latt syr

Eur. Iph. Aul. 275: Γαλάτεια . . . λευκότερα πακτᾶς ποτιδεῖν, Theocr. xi. 20: and as in our phrase 'beautiful to look upon,' 'hard to work upon,' &c. Bleek (after Storr) and Lünemann have supposed that a kind ofzeugma is necessary to connect λόγος with both predicates, πολὺς regarding more the discourse itself and the explanation of the subject given by the Writer,—δυσερμήνευτος, the contents of the λόγος, as thus explained. But it does not seem to me that such a supposition is needed: our λόγος, that which we have to say, is both πολὺς, abundant in quantity, and δυσερμήνευτος, difficult to state perspicuously to you, in quality. And so also Delitzsch), since (probably renders a reason only for the δυσερμήνευτος λέγειν, not belonging also to πολὺς) ye are become (not, "are," as E. V., Luther (not De W.), al. Chrys. says well, δηλοῦντος ἦν, ὅτι πάσαι ὑγίαινον καὶ ἦσαν ἰσχυροί, τῇ προθυμίᾳ ζέοντες, καὶ ὕστερον αὐτοὺς τοῦτο παθεῖν μαρτυρεῖ) dull (νωθρός, a lengthened and later form of νωθός. It is found as early as Plato, Theætet. p. 144 B, but more commonly in the later writers, Aristid., Plut., Polyb., al. See Elsn. and Wetst. Bleek thinks the most probable formation of it is from the negative νη and ὠθέω, as νωδός toothless, νωδυνος painless, νώνυμος nameless, νήπιος from ἔπω, = 'in-fans.' Thus the two words mean, 'difficult to move': so ὄνος νωθός, Il. B. 559: ὄνον νωθρὸν δέμας, Oppian, Halieut. iii. 140. And so likewise as applied to the soul, Plut. Lyeurg. 51 e: νωθρᾶς . . . κ. πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἀφιλοτιμίου ψυχῆς σημείον: and to the senses, Heliodor. v. 10, ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ᾔσθόμην . . . τάχα μὲν που καὶ δι' ἡλικίαν νωθρότερος ἂν τὴν ἀκοήν νόσος γὰρ ἔλλανεν τε καὶ ὥτων τὸ γῆρας. See many more examples in Bleek and Wetst.) in your hearing (more usually the accus., as in the last citation: but frequently in the (local or referential) dative, as e. g. 1 Cor. xiv. 20, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζεσθε. See examples in Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 6. ἀκοή is used in good Greek writers of the ear, with however this distinction, that it is of the ear with reference to the act of hearing, not merely as a member of the body. Philo draws the distinction, in ref.

It is related to οὖς as ὕψις to ὀφθαλμός: cf. Xen. Mem. i. 4. 11, καὶ ὕψιν κ. ἀκοήν κ. στόμα ἐνεποιήσαν: Herod. i. 38, διεφθαρμένος τὴν ἀκοήν: and other examples in Bleek. The plur. here denotes not only the plurality of persons addressed, but also, as in ref. Mark, the double organ of hearing in each person.) 12.] For though (or, "when:" but in the presence of διὰ τὸν χρόνον, which gives the temporal reference, it is perhaps better not to repeat it) ye ought (see on ver. 3, and ch. ii. 17) on account of the time (i. e. the length of time during which you have been believers: οὕτω δὲ δεικνύναι ἐκ πολλοῦ πιστευκτότας αὐτοὺς, &c. Cf. Polyb. ii. 21. 2, οἱ μὲν αὐτόπται γεγονότες τῶν δεινῶν ἐκ τοῦ ζῆν ἐξεχώρησαν διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ἐπεγέγοντο δὲ νέοι: Diod. Sic. i. 12, βραχὺ μετατιθείσης διὰ τὸν χρόνον τῆς λέξεως: ib. c. 27, κατέφθαρται διὰ τὸν χρόνον: and other examples in Bleek. So that it is not "jamdudum," as Luther, al., nor "after so long a time (διὰ χρόνον)," as Schulz: nor "on account of the present time (διὰ τὸν καιρὸν)," as proposed (not preferred, as Bl.) by Owen, and given by Braun: nor can we understand it, with a-Lapide, "pro longitudine temporis, quod in lege Mosi, quum in Christianismo estis eruditi." On the evidence given by expressions of this kind as to the time of writing the Epistle, and the persons to whom it is addressed, see Prolegg.) to be teachers, ye again have need that some one teach you (it is doubtful whether *τινα* represent the accus. sing. masc. (τινά) or the accus. plur. neut. (τίνα). The latter has been taken by our E. V., after considerable authorities: e. g. the Syr.: the Latin attached to D, "iterum necesse est doceri nos, quæ sint," &c.; vulg.; Aug. Tract. 98 in Joann. (vol. iii. pt. ii.): and indeed most Commentators, including Grot., Wolf, Bengel, Kuin., De Wette, Tholuck, Delitzsch. But the other rendering has also ancient authority for it: &c. says, πάλιν χρ. ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς *τινα*. τί δὲ διδάσκειν; τὰ στοιχεῖα φησι. And so Luth., Calv. ("ut quis vos doceat elementa"), al., and Lachmann, Bleek, Ebrard, Lünem. And indeed it is the only one which will fit either the context, or the construction strictly considered. The context: for it

^m ἀρχῆς τῶν ⁿ λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ^o γεγόνατε ^p χρεῖαν ^m ch. vi. 1.
^o ἔχοντες ^q γάλακτος, καὶ οὐ ^r στερεῶς ^s τροφῆς. ¹³ πᾶς ⁿ Acts vii. 38
 Rom. iii. 2.
 1 Pet. iv. 11
 only. Num.
 xxiv. 4, 16. = Ps. cxi. 11, cxliii. 67, 172. Isa. v. 24. o constr. Mark i. 4. ix. 3, 7. 2 Cor. vi.
 14. Col. i. 18. Rev. iii. 2. xvi. 10. p w. gen. Matt vi. 8. ix. 12. 1 Cor. xii. 21. 1 Thess. iv.
 12 ch. x 36. Rev. xxi. 23. Isa. xiii. 17. q 1 Cor. iii. 2. ix. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 2 only. Gen. xviii. 8.
 r = here bis (2 Tim. ii. 19 1 Pet. v. 9) only. (Deut. xxxii. 13 al.) Diod. Sic. ii. 4 ul. in Bl. = τέλειος
 οἰ κραταιότερος in Philo. s Matt. iii. 4. Acts ii. 46 xxvii. 33 al. Ps. cxlv. 7.

copt [æth] Jer₁ Aug₁ διδασκεσθαι τινα Orig₁ syr-mg. λογων D¹ 3. 10-1. 108.
 verborum D-lat, sermonum vulg [Jer₁: simply copt æth arm]. om last καὶ B²CN¹
 17 vulg copt Orig₃[int₂ Euthal-ms] Chr-2-mss, Cyr₁ Aug₁: ins AB¹DKL[P]N³ rel.

was not loss of power in them to distinguish between first elements and other portions of Christian doctrine, of which he complains, but ignorance altogether, and slowness of ear to receive divine knowledge: and they wanted *some one* to begin again with them and teach them the very first elements. And so far from *τινα*, 'some one,' being, as Delitzsch most absurdly says, *matt und nicht[agend]*, it carries with it the fine keen edge of reproach; q. d. 'to teach you what all know, and any can teach.' Then again, had *τινα* been interrogative, we should have expected *διδάσκειν*, or some personal pronoun before *διδάσκειν*. This is perhaps not altogether certain, in the face of *οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε γράφειν*, 1 Thess. iv. 9, where I have retained the rec. (as against the correction *ἔχομεν*, admitted by Lachmann) and defended it as a mixture of two constructions. Still we have no right to assume such an irregularity where the context manifestly admits the common construction. Cf. 1 Thess. v. 1, *οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχετε ὑμῖν γράφειν*: and *reff*. The acceptance of τοῦ διδάσκειν as a substantival infinitive (*of the teaching*) is precluded by *ὕμᾱς* following) the rudiments (or 'elements': see Gal. iv. 3 and note, and Elliott there: the simple parts, out of which a body is compounded: Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 1, *βούλει σκοπῶμεν, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς ὥσπερ ἀπὸ τῶν στοιχείων*: Galen, *adv. Lycum*, *δὴλός ἐστι μηδὲ τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς ἱπποκράτους τέχνης ἐπιστάμενος*: which are afterwards called *αἱ συλλαβαὶ τῆς τέχνης*, and *τὰ πρῶτα τῆς τέχνης*) of the beginning (so "prima elementa," Quintil. Instit. i. 1: Hor. Sat. i. 1. 26: "prima pueritiæ elementa," Justin. Hist. vii. 5. The genitive specifies the elements, that they are not only such, but also belong to the *very beginning* of divine knowledge) of the oracles (λόγιον, properly a diminutive from λόγος, is used both in classical and Hellenistic Greek for an *oracle*, or a *divine utterance*. Very numerous instances are given in Bleek from both sources: and such will occur at once to every scholar. See Herod. iv. 178: Thucyd. ii. 8: and *reff*. Here it betokens that Christian doc-

trine (cf. ch. vi. 1), which rests entirely on revelations from God: as Schlichting: "doctrinæ Christianæ, quæ nil nisi Dei eloquia et oracula continet") of God: and *ye have become* (*καὶ οὐκ εἶπε χρεῖαν ἔχετε, ἀλλὰ γεγόνατε χρ. ἔχοντες* 'τούτ' ἐστιν ὑμεῖς ἠθελήσατε, ὑμεῖς ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τοῦτο κατεστήσατε, εἰς ταύτην τὴν χρεῖαν. Chrys.: and Ec., *γεγόνατε ἐκ βαθυλάς, οὐκ ὄντες τοιοῦτοι*: and Thl. even stronger, *ἐκ προαιρέσεως τοιοῦτοι γεγονότες*) (persons) having need of milk, and not of solid food (see 1 Cor. iii. 2. The similitude is very common with Philo: see extracts in Wetst. and Bleek. Arrian, Epictet. ii. 17, has the contrast as here, *οὐ θέλεις ἤδη ὡς τὰ παιδία ἀπογαλακτισθῆναι, κ. ἀπτεσθαι τροφῆς στερεωτέρας*. What is the milk in the Writer's meaning, is plain from ch. vi. 1, where he enumerates several portions of Christian doctrine as parts of *ὁ τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ λόγος*. The Fathers for the most part take the *στοιχεῖα* and the *γάλα* to mean the doctrine of the incarnation: so Chrys., *στοιχεῖα ἀρχῆς τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα φησίν. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ξέων γραμμάτων πρῶτον τὰ στοιχεῖα δεῖ μαθεῖν, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν θείων λόγων πρῶτον περὶ τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος δεῖ διδάσκειν*: and similarly Thl. and Ec. Primasius more explicitly: "Lac ergo simplicis doctrinæ est incarnatio filii Dei, passio, resurrectio illius, ascensio ad cælos; solidus vero cibus perfecti sermonis est mysterium Trinitatis, quomodo tres sint in personis et unum in substantia Deitatis." But nothing of this is found in the context: add to which, that the Writer has actually treated of the *præ-existent* state of Christ and of His incarnation, ch. i. ii. Thl. reckons the explanation about Melchisedek among the *στοιχεῖα*, not even to understanding which were they equal: and certainly this *might* be so: but from the form of the contrast drawn, and from ch. vi. 1, it is much more probable that the Writer regards that explanation as one of the more recondite things, and those enumerated ch. vi. 1, as the first principles. But it does not thence follow that these *στοιχεῖα* are of less importance than those deeper mysteries: these are the founda-

t ch. ii. 14

reff.

u here only.

1 Kings xvii.

39 Ald.

compl.

Zech. xi. 15

(Jer ii. 6 passive).

Wisd xiii. 18 only.

ἀπ. τῆς ναυτικῆς, Herod. viii. 1, and passim in

classics, see Bl.

γ = ch. vi. 1.

w = (see, etc) ch. vii. 2.

25 L. Rom ii. 20

1 Cor ii. 1.

Eph. iv. 14.

Ps cxviii. 129.

Pind P; th. iii. 148.

γ = 1 Cor. ii.

6 xiv. 20.

Eph. iv. 13

al. gen.

Acts i. 7.

Rom. ix. 16.

γὰρ ὁ ἑμετέχων ἡ γάλακτος ἡ ἄπειρος ὁ λόγος ὁ δικαιοσύνη. ἡ νῆπιος γὰρ ἐστίν. 14 ὁ τελείων δὲ ἐστίν ἡ ὁ στερεὰ

ABCDK

LPN

a b c d

f g h k l

m n o

17. 47

13. aft δικαιοσύνης ins ἐστίν D¹ latt [Orig-int₃(om Orig₂) Aug.].

aft γὰρ ins

ακμην D¹, adhuc D-lat.

tions, without which no building whatever can be raised. This is well expressed by Limborch, as cited by Bleek: "Hæc itaque sublimior doctrina non vocatur solidior: cibus quia ad fidem Christianam magis est necessaria quam principia illa religionis: nihil minus: illis enim ignoratis, modo principia religionis Christianæ quis solida fide amplectatur, potest esse Christianus: non autem est Christianus, nisi illa firma fide amplexus fuerit: sed eo solum respectu, quod faciunt ad solidiorem doctrinæ Christi confirmationem: sicuti solidus cibus non præcise est necessarius ad vitæ conservationem, sed ad virum majorem quæ ad labores sustinendos requiruntur, acquisitionem. Idque potissimum locum habet in Hebræis, qui multum addicti allegoricis interpretationibus, et de legis suæ divinitate persuasi, valde in fide Christiana confirmari poterant dilucida et distincta applicatione typorum V. T. ad Christum ejusque pontificatum"). Ver. 13 renders a reason for vv. 11, 12, and especially for *δυσερμήνευτος*. Having before stated that what he had to say would be hard for him to explain to them, and then that they were become persons needing milk and not solid food, he now proceeds to join these two positions together: **For every one who partakes of** (in the sense of *has for his share*, in ordinary feeding: not, partakes of in common with other things, for that adults do: see 1 Cor. x. 21) **milk, is unskilled in** (*ἄπειρος*, from *πείρα*, trial: opposed to *ἐμπεiros*, experienced: not to be confounded with another *ἄπειρος*, from *πéρας*: Etym. Mag., *ἄπειρος*, ὁ μὲν ἀμαθής, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πείραν· ὁ δὲ, μέγας, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν πέρας. It is of frequent use in the classics in this sense of unskilled: see numerous examples in Bleek: e. g. Plato, Rep. ix. p. 737, *ἄπειροι ἀληθείας*, and a passage not unlike this in its cast, Herodian v. 5. 1, *αὐτὸς γὰρ ἦν νέος τε τὴν ἡλικίαν, πραγμάτων τε κ. παιδείας ἄπειρος*) **the word of righteousness: for he is an infant** (that is, 'for every partaker of milk, in the metaphorical sense in which I just now used the word, i. e. every one who requires yet to be taught the first principles &c., is devoid of understanding in the word of righteousness, in that is, the positions and arguments which treat of God's salvation

by Christ: for he is an infant: takes the same rank in spiritual understanding, that an infant does in worldly.' Thus taken, I can see no difficulty such as Bleek represents in the contextual connexion. There is of course a mingling of the figure and the thing represented, which however is easy enough to any reader to whom both figure and thing are already familiar. But it is necessary to fix more satisfactorily the meaning of the somewhat obscure expression *λόγος δικαιοσύνης*. Chrys. says, *ἐσταυθὰ μοι δοκεῖ καὶ βίον ἀνίττεσθαι· ὅπερ καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἔλεγεν, 'Εὰν μὴ περισσῇ ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλέον κ.τ.λ. τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς φησιν· ἄπειρος λόγος δικαιοσύνης, τοῦτέστι, τῆς ἀνὸ φιλοσοφίας ἄπειρος, οὐ δύναται παραδύσασθαι βίον ἄκρον κ. ἡκριβωμένον*. Similarly Thl., giving however the alternative that *δικαιοσύνη* may mean *χριστὸς αὐτός*. Ec. says, *λόγον δὲ δικαιοσύνης λέγει τὸν περὶ τῆς θεότητος τοῦ κυρίου*. Thdr., generally, *τὰ τελειότερα δόγματα*. Primasius, "Alienus est a discretionē perfectæ justitiæ, quia nondum potest penetrare arcana mysteriorum, nec scit, ut expedit, discretionem facere inter bonum et malum." And so a-Lapide, Bretschn., al. Others, as Beza, Pyle, Storr, Tholuck, al., take *δικαιοσύνη* of the doctrine of justification before God by faith in Christ: or, as Bengel and Cramer, justification and sanctification as well: uprightness of doctrine and practice. Calvin says, "justitiæ nomine perfectionem intelligens, de qua paulo post loquitur" (ch. vi. 1). Many others take *λόγον δικαιοσύνης* as = *λόγον δικαίον*: so Schlichting, Grot., Wahl, Kuinoel, al. Others again have appealed to the Heb. usage of *אמת* for 'truth', and understood it "verbum veritatis:" so, with minor differences, Michaelis, Zachariæ, Dindorf. Bleek half adopts a hint given by Carpzov, who interprets it of the "doctrina de sacerdotio Jesu Christi Melchisedeciano, quæ dicitur *λόγος δικαιοσύνης* propterea quod Melchisedecus, vi nominis, βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης vertitur, vii. 2, eaque appellatio ad Christum sacerdotem applicatur, cujus *πρόπον* fuit *πληρῶσαι πάσαν δικαιοσύνην*, Matt. iii. 15:" Bleek, however, not accepting the reference in this shape, supposes that *δικαιοσύνη* is here used as belonging to the whole subject

^a τροφή, τῶν διὰ τὴν ^z ἔξιν τὰ ^a αἰσθητήρια ^b γεγυμνασμένα ^z here only †.
 ἐχόντων ^c πρὸς ^d διάκρισιν ^e καλοῦ τε καὶ ^e κακοῦ. VI. 1 Διὸ
 (Judg. xiv. 9
 9 A. Ald.
 compl.
 1 Kings xvi.
 b 1 Tim iv. 7. ch.

7. Sir. xxx. 14 only. Dan. vii. 15 Theod.) a here only Jer. iv. 19 only b 1 Tim iv. 7. ch.
 xii. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 14 only †. 2 Mac. x. 15 only. δὲ μὲν γὰρ τὸ αἰσθητήριον ἔχει γεγυμνασμένον
 ἑαυτῷ. . . . οὗτος ἄριστος ἂν εἴη γινώσκων, Galen, de Dign. Puls. iii. (νασία, 1 Tim. iv. 8.)
 c = Acts ii. 10. ch. vi. 11. ix. 13. d Rom. xiv. 1. 1 Cor. xii. 10 only. Job xxx. ii. 16 only.
 e so (ποιητοῦ) 1 Thess. v. 22. (ἀγαθ.) Deut. i. 39. Isa. vii. 16.

to which Melchisedek, as the βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, also belongs: and that the δικαιοσύνη is that righteousness of which the fulness dwells in Christ, but of which Melchisedek, by his very name, was a type. But to this De Wette justly answers, that it would be very unnatural, to find a reference to an expression which, where it occurs, is not, any more than its cognate βασιλεὺς εἰρήνης, followed up,—and, so far from clearing this passage, itself needs explanation. I incline more to Lünemann's view of the meaning, based as it is on the requirements of the passage, in which the stress is not on λόγον δικαιοσύνης, but on ἄπειρος, and λόγ. δικ. follows as something of course and generally understood. Feeling this, he interprets it of the gospel in general: that λόγος of which the central point is, the righteousness which is of God. And he refers to 2 Cor. iii. 9, ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης, and xi. 15, διακονοὶ δικαιοσύνης. This acceptance would not altogether preclude βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης falling under the same general head, and thus would bring the two expressions into union, though without any distinct reference from one to another.

Deltzsch, whose commentary I have seen since writing the above, explains λόγ. δικ. "the capability to speak agreeably to righteousness" (die Fähigkeit, gerechtigt zu sprechen), and takes the genitive as one of attribute. But I cannot see how the general context justifies this. It is not speaking, but apprehending, which is here surely required of the readers):

14.] but (continuation of and contrast to ver. 13) solid food belongs to (is the portion of) the grown up (so τέλειος often: e.g. Xen. Cyr. viii. 7. 3, ἐγὼ γὰρ παῖς τε ὢν τὰ ἐν παισὶ νομιζόμενα καλὰ δοκῶ κεκαρπῶσθαι ἐπεὶ δὲ ἤβησα, τὰ ἐν νεανίσκοις τέλειός τε ἂν ᾖ γενόμενος, τὰ ἐν ἀνδράσι: Polyb. v. 29. 2, ἐλπίσαντες ὡς παιδίῳ νηπίῳ χρήσασθαι τῷ Φιλίππῳ, εὖρον αὐτὸν τέλειον ἄνδρα. The spiritual sense is found in reff.: Thl. says, ὁρᾷς νηπιότητα ἐτέραν, ἣν καὶ γέροντες ἔχουσι, τὴν τῶν φρενῶν, καὶ τελειότητα, ἣν καὶ νέους ἔχειν οὐδὲν ἐμποδίζει. Then the qualification of τελείων follows), to those who by virtue of their (long) habit (ἔξιν from ἔχω, as 'habitus' from 'habeo.' Quintil. Inst. x. i iuit., "Sed hæc eloquendi præcepta, sicut cognitioni sunt necessaria,

ita non satis ad vim dicendi valent, nisi illis firma quædam facilitas, quæ apud Græcos ἔξις vocatur, acceperit: quam scribendo plus, an legendo, an dicendo, consequamur, solere quæri scio." Aristot. Rhet. i. 1, οἱ μὲν εἰκῇ ταῦτα δρῶσιν, οἱ δὲ διὰ συνήθειαν ἀπὸ ἔξεως. Observe, on account of this meaning of the word as well as the accus. after διὰ, it is not, "by means of skill acquired in practice," as Ec. (τὴν ἔξιν λέγει τὴν τελειότητα, so also Thl., adding, καὶ τὴν παγιότητα τῶν ἔθων), Bengel ("ἔξις notat h. l. robor facultatis cognoscentis ex maturitate ætatis spiritualis existens"): but, "on account of (their) long usage," so that ἔξις stands in a causal, not in an instrumental relation to the result. Notice also that διὰ τὴν ἔξιν is not = δι' ἔξιν, 'by virtue of habit' (abstract),—and that, on account of its position, it belongs not to γεγυμνασμένα, but to the whole sentence) have their organs of sense (not, their senses themselves. Wetst. quotes a definition ascribed to Galen, τὸ αἰσθητήριον, τὸ αἰσθῆσθαι τινα ἐμπεισιτευμένον ὄργανον . . . ἦτοι ὀφθαλμός, ἡ ρίς, ἡ γλῶττα, ἃ καὶ ὄργανα αἰσθητικά προσγορεῖται. Here again there manifestly is a mixture of the figure and the thing signified: on account of what follows, we must necessarily understand these αἰσθητήρια of the inner organs of the soul: as Ec., τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αἰσθητήρια λέγει exercised (reff.) with a view to (so in ref. 1 Tim., γυμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν πρὸς εὐσέβειαν: see also reff. here. πρὸς most likely belongs to γεγυμνασμένα, not to the whole τῶν . . . ἐχόντων, because of the art. τὰ, which makes γεγυμνασμένα a predicate, not an epithet. See the very similar passage of Galen in reff.) distinction of good and evil (this puts us in mind, as Bleek remarks, of the common O. T. expression in describing childhood: e.g. Deut. i. 39, πᾶν παιδίον νέον, ὅστις οὐκ οἶδεν σήμερον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν: Isa. vii. 16, πρὶν γνῶναι τὸ παιδίον ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν. Cf. Sext. Empir. Hyp. Pyrrh. iii. 19, λέιπεται δὲ τὸ ἠθικόν, ὅπερ δοκεῖ περὶ τὴν διάκρισιν τῶν τε καλῶν καὶ κακῶν καὶ ἀδιαφόρων καταγίγνεσθαι. The reference here of good and evil is manifestly not to moral qualities, but to excellence and inferiority, wholeness and corruptness in doctrine. Chrys. explains it well: νῦν οὐ περὶ βίου

f Matt. iv. 20, 22 xviii 12. Mark vii. 8. Judg. ix 9. ^{τὴν ἀρχὴν} ἀφείς πρὸς τὴν τελευτὴν, ὕστερον οὖσαν, φέρῃ. Eurip. Androm 393, al in Bleek. g = ch v 12. 14. h = ch v 13. i = here only ἤξει δ' ἵσως ἐπ' ἐκείνου τὸν λόγον φερόμενος, Lyeurg. r.dv. Leocr. p. 138, al in Bleek. k Col iii 14 only. Judg ix 16, 19. 11 Cor ii 11 2 Tim ii 19 m here only. see note. (τιθέσθαι θ, Luke vi. 48, 49 al. διδόναι, Ezra v 16. ἐμβάλλεσθαι, Esdr. vi. 20.) n = here (2 Cor. iv 9) only ἄ. (-βολή, ch. iv. 3)

ABCDK
LPS
a b c d
e f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

CHAP. VI. 1. φερομεθα D¹ (but βαπτισμον below) K[P] o (but τελειωτητα) syr.

ὁ λόγος, ὅταν λέγῃ πρὸς διάκρ. καλοῦ κ. κακοῦ τούτο γὰρ παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ δυνατόν εἶδέναι κ. εὐκολόν· ἀλλὰ περὶ δογμάτων ὑγιῶν κ. ὑψηλῶν διεφθαρμένων τε καὶ ταπεινῶν. τὸ παιδίον οὐκ οἶδε τὴν φαύλην κ. τὴν δόκιμον τροφὴν διαίρειν· πολλάκις γοῦν καὶ χοῦν ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὸ στόμα, καὶ τὸ βλαβερὸν ἐδέξατο, καὶ πάντα ἀδιακρίτως ποιεῖ· ἄλλ' οὐ τὸ τέλειον τοιοῦτον. τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν οἱ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς προσέχοντες, κ. ἀδιακρίτως τὰς ἀκοὰς ἐκδιδόντες ἀδοκίμως. καὶ τούτους αἰτιάται ὡς ἀπλῶς περιφερομένους, κ. νῦν μὲν τούτοις νῦν δὲ ἐκείνους διδόντας ἑαυτούς· ὃ καὶ πρὸς τῷ τελεῖ ἦν εἶναι λέγων· διδασκαίᾳ ποικίλαις κ. ξέναις μὴ παραφέρεσθε. τοῦτό ἐστι πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ· ἀλρυγὲς μὲν γὰρ οὔτα γέυεται, ψυχὴ δὲ δοκιμάζει λόγους. But we must beware of the mistake to which Chrys. gives some countenance, and which Ec. and Thl. repeat, that the καλὸν represents δόγματα ὑψηλά, and κακὸν, δόγματα ταπεινά.

CHAP. VI. 1.] Therefore (on the connexion, see below) leaving (as behind, and done with; in order to go on to another thing. "Jubet omitti ejusmodi elementa, non quod eorum oblivisci unquam debeant fideles, sed quia in illis minime est hœrendum. Quod melius patet ex fundamenti similitudine quæ mox sequitur. Nam in extruenda dōmo, nunquam a fundamento discedere oportet: in eo tamen jaciendo semper laborare ridiculum." Calvin) the word of the beginning of Christ (= ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν λογίων τοῦ θεοῦ above, ch. v. 12: that word, or discourse, which has respect to the fundamental and elementary things mentioned below), let us press on to maturity (φέρομαι in this sense is not uncommon: see Lyeurg. in ref.: Xen. Venat. 3. 10, ἅν ποθεν ἀκούσσωι κραυγῆς, καταλείπονται τὰ αὐτῶν ἔργα ἀπρονοήτως ἐπὶ τοῦτο φέρονται: Polyb. v. 26. 6, πᾶσιν ἄδηλος ἦν, ἐπὶ τί φέρεται, καὶ ἐπὶ ποίας ὑπάρχει γνάμης. Bleek cites on Valcknaer's authority φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν: and in the Pythagorean school our very expression, φέρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα, was current. A question of some difficulty has divided the Commentators here: whether this sentence be meant as expressing the resolution of the Writer, as we say, 'let us

now proceed' to this or that,—or as conveying an exhortation to the readers. Each view has a formidable array of supporters. On the side of the former are Primasius, Erasmus, Luther, a-Lapide, Grot., Limborch, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, al., and Storr, Heinrichs, Abresch, Wahl, Bretschn., Kuinoel, Baumg. Crus., De Wette, Tholuck, Conybeare, al. The latter is adopted by Chrys., Thdrt., Phot., and Gennadius (in Ec.), Thl. (not decidedly), Calvin, Justiniani, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Böhme, Stuart, Bleek, Ebrard, Lünemann, Hofm. (Schr. i. 553). Owen tries (and so also Delitzsch) to comprehend both meanings: giving, however, the alternative very lucidly: "The Apostle either assumes the Hebrews unto himself, as to his work, or joins himself with them as to their duty. For if the words be taken the first way, they declare his resolution in teaching: if in the latter, their duty in learning." Between these two, both equally legitimate, the context must decide. And in seeking for elements of decision, I own that the alternative seems to me to have been put too exclusively. What I mean will be plain, when we consider on the one hand that θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι can hardly be properly said of any but a teacher: and on the other, that vv. 4 ff., ἀδύνατον γὰρ κ.τ.λ., must necessarily have a general reference of warning to the hearers. It seems to me that the fact may be best stated thus: The whole is a συγκατάβασις of the Writer to his readers: he with his work of teaching comes down to their level of learning, and regards that teaching and learning as all one work, going on together: himself and them as bound up in one progress. Thus best may we explain the expressions, which seem to oscillate alternately between writer and readers. And thus will διό retain all its proper meaning, which on the first hypothesis was obliged to be wrested: so Schlichting, its advocate, confesses, and joins διό to ch. v. 11. But now it will mean, 'Wherefore, seeing that we (you and I, by communication) are in so low a state, babes, instead of grown men, let us,' &c.): not again laying the foundation (θεμ. καταβάλλεσθαι is a phrase of common occurrence in later writers. Dion. Hal. iii.

βαλλόμενοι ° μετανοίας ° ἀπὸ ¹⁹ νεκρῶν ² ἔργων καὶ ¹ πίσ- ^o ^{here only. see Acts viii. 22. Jer. viii. 6. p Rom vii.}
 τως ¹⁸ ἐπὶ θεόν, ² ^t βαπτισμῶν διδασκῆς ^u ἐπιθέσεώς τε

8. James i. 17, 26.

q ch ix. 14.

21. πρόσ, 1 Thess. i. 8. gen obj., Mark xi. 22.)

t Mark vii. 4. [8] ch. ix. 10. Col. ii. 12 only t.

18. 14. 2 Tim. i. 6 only ‡. 2 Chron. xxv. 27.

1 here only. (ἐν, Gal. iii. 26 εἰς, Acts xx.

s Acts xi. 17. xxi. 31. xvi. 19 Rom. iv. 5, 24.

u (N. T. always w. χειρῶν) Acts viii. 18. 1 Tim.

2. διδασκῆν B, doctrinam D-lat.

69, Ταρκύνιος . . . τοὺς τε θεμελίους (τοῦ νεῶ) κατεβάλετο: Porphy. de Abstin. viii. 10, οἰκίας θεμέλια καταβάλλεσθαι: Galen, Rat. Medendi ix., χρῆ γὰρ οἷμα τὰ θεμέλια τοῖς οἰκοδομήμασιν ἰσχυρὰ προκαταβεβλήσθαι: Jos. Antt. xi. 4. 4, εὐθὺς τοὺς θεμελίους κατεβάλετο: ib. xv. 11. 3, ἀνελὼν δὲ τοὺς ἀρχαίους θεμελίους, καὶ καταβαλόμενος ἐτέρους. Cf. 2 Macc. ii. 29, ἀρχιτέκτονι τῆς ὁλης καταβολῆς, and see examples also of βάλλεσθαι, in Bleek. It is a curious instance of the occasional singularity and perversity of Ebrard's exposition, that he insists here on καταβαλλόμενοι meaning "pulling down:" (which however, as Delitzsch remarks, partakes of the infirmity of all would-be original interpretations, falling under the proverb, "There is nothing new under the sun:" for the old Latin has "non iterum fundamenta diruentes.") Not to dwell on the entire inconsistency with the context, how can one be said καταβάλλεσθαι θεμελίον, which is in the ground already?

The subjects to be supplied to καταβαλλόμενοι are the readers, with whom the Writer unites himself, as above explained) of (the genitives here indicate the materials of which the foundation consists. They are all matters belonging to the λόγος τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ: extending indeed in their influence over the whole Christian life, just as the shape of the foundation is that of the building: but to be laid down once for all and not afterwards repeated) repentance from dead works, and faith on God (so in the opening of the Gospel, Mark i. 15, μετανοεῖτε κ. πιστεύετε ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ: and in its progress, Acts xx. 21, διαμαρτυρόμενος Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν τὴν εἰς θεὸν μετάνοιαν καὶ πίστιν εἰς τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν. These were the common conditions on which all mankind were invited to embrace the Gospel. And as the readers here were Jews, so would these words especially remind them of the form in which they were first invited by Christ's messengers. But we have to notice the qualifications which here follow each term—μετάνοια ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων—πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν. The νεκρά ἔργα are taken by all the patristic expositors to mean sinful works: so Chrys., τὰ ἡμαρτημένα: Thdr., τὴν πονηρίαν: Thl., τούτεστι, τὴν ἀπο-

ταγὴν τῶν ἔργων τοῦ σατανᾶ: Primas., "Poenitentiam ab operibus mortuis agere, est ipsa opera mala per poenitentiam delere, quæ animum mortificabant: opera namque mortis sunt peccata." And so the great majority of modern Commentators also. And the justification of such an expression as νεκρά ἔργα for sins is variously given: as causing death eternal, Schlichting, J. Cappell, Liimb., Peirce, Stuart, al.: as polluting, like the touch of a dead body, Chrys. (on ch. ix. 14, καλῶς εἶπεν, ἀπὸ νεκρῶν ἔργων. εἴ τις γὰρ ᾗψατο τότε νεκροῦ, ἐμάλινετο καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἴ τις ἄναιτο νεκροῦ ἔργου, μολύνεται διὰ τῆς συνευδύσεως), Ec. (ibid.), Storr, al. But neither of these meanings is borne out: the former being contrary to usage, the latter far-fetched and unlikely. It is much better to take νεκρός in its common and obvious meaning; dead, devoid of life and power: cf. νεκρά πίστις, and νεκρά ἁμαρτία in the reff. St. Paul speaks, Eph. v. 11, in nearly the same sense: cf. τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἄκαρπα τοῦ σκότους. And Tholuck cites from Epict. Dissert. iii. 23, 29, νεκρὸς λόγος, in the sense of discourse without convincing power. But such dead or lifeless works again may be variously understood: either of the works of the flesh in the unconverted man, or of the Jewish works of the law which could not give life. Considering the readers and object of the Epistle, it is much more likely that the latter are here meant: those works by which they sought to set up a righteousness of their own, before they submitted themselves to God's righteousness. And so, nearly, Delitzsch, and Hofm. Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 166. The best explanation of πίστις ἐπὶ θεόν is found in St. Paul's language, Rom. iv. 5, τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεῦοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ εἰς δικαιοσύνην. And by this, our expression is defined to mean, full trust, rested on God, that He has fulfilled his promises in Christ: so Wittich, cited in Bleek: "Fides evangelio adhibita, hæc fides dicitur ἐπὶ θεόν, quia dum evangelio creditur, creditur præstitisse Deum promissa facta patribus eaque in Christo implevisse." We may observe, that the genitives arrange themselves in groups of pairs, of which this is the first), 2.] of the

v Heb., ch. xi.

45 bis only.

w Matt xxii.

31. Acts xviii. 32. xxiii. 6 al

28. ch. v 9 reff.

x = Acts xxiv 25 1 Pet. iv 17 Rev. xx. 4

y Mark iii.

ABCDK
LPS
a b c d
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

χειρῶν ^v ἀναστάσεώς τε ^w νεκρῶν καὶ ^x κλήματος ^y αἰωνίου. ABCDK

om 2nd τε B D¹[-gr P].for νεκρων, χειρων D¹[-gr].

doctrine of washings (not *baptisms*: βάπτισμα is generally the N. T. word for both Christian baptism and that of John. In reff., the word is used as here of washing, or lustration with water. On the meaning, see below. Our first question is, respecting the construction. The words are taken in two other ways besides that given above. 1. Some have taken βαπτισμῶν and διδασκῆς as two distinct genitives: so Chrys. (apparently, for he says, εἰ γὰρ πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐβάπτισε καὶ ἔνωθεν κατήχησε, καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βαπτισθέντες ἐδιδάσκοντο τὰ πρακτέα κ.τ.λ.), an interp. given in (Ec., . . . λόγον ποῖον δὴ τοῦτον; τὸν τῶν βαπτισμῶν καὶ διδασκῆς καὶ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν κ.τ.λ.: and so Cajetan, Luther, Semler, Michaelis, al., and De Wette. But this seems very improbable. The rhythm of the sentence, which in all the other cases has two substantives in a clause, seems to forbid insulating the two words and forming a clause out of each: besides which, a double objection arises from the words themselves; that thus the plural βαπτισμῶν would not be accounted for, and that thus also διδασκῆς would have to bear a meaning which it is very doubtful if it can bear. 2. The two substantives being taken together, διδασκῆς is made the genitive dependent on βαπτισμῶν,—those baptisms which were accompanied with διδασκῆς, in distinction from those other washings, which were not so accompanied. This view is taken by Bengel (“B. d. erant baptismi quos qui suscipiebant, doctrinæ sacræ Judæorum sese addicebant; itaque adjecto διδασκῆς distinguuntur a lotionibus cæteris leviticis”), Winer (making however the distinction between Christian and Jewish baptism, § 30. 3, Rem. 4, edn. 6), Michaelis, al. Still it cannot be denied that this would be a very strange expression, and that thus the plur. βαπτισμῶν would be more unaccountable than ever, seeing that it would apply to one kind of baptism only, viz. the Christian. As regards the plur. βαπτισμῶν, it has been very variously taken: by some as put for the singular, in which number the Syr. translates it: by Chrys. (to whom Calv. assents), as implying the repetition of baptism involved in the πάλιν,—τί αὐτὸ πληθυντικῶς εἶπε; διὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν, μὴ πάλιν θεμ. καταβ. μετανοίας. εἰ γὰρ πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἐβάπτισε, καὶ ἔνωθεν κατήχησε, καὶ πάλιν ἐξ ἀρχῆς βαπτισθέντες ἐδιδάσκοντο τὰ πρακτέα, καὶ τὰ μὴ πρακ-

τέα, διηνεκῶς ἔμελλον ἀδιόρθωτοι μένειν: by Thl. and (Ec. as pointing to a practice among the Hebrews of frequently repeating baptism (ἴσως δὲ οὗτοι ὡς ἔτι τοῦ νόμου ἀντεχόμενοι πολλοὺς βαπτισμοὺς Ἰουδαϊκῶς καὶ ἐν τῇ χάριτι ἐπρέσβευον, Thl.): by others, as referring to the threefold immersion in baptism: by Grot., al., “de duplici baptismo, interiore et exteriori:” by Thdrt. of the plurality of the recipients, ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ τῆς τοῦ βαπτισματος ἀπολαύουσι χάριτος: so Primas, Beza, Erasm. Schmid. But none of these seem to reach the point so well as that given above, which includes in the idea those various washings which were under the law, the baptism of John and even Christian baptism also perhaps included, the nature of which, and their distinctions from one another, would naturally be one of the fundamental and primary objects of teaching to Hebrew converts. This meaning, which is that of Jac. Cappellus, Seb. Schmidt, Schöttg., Wolf, al., and Böhm, Kuinoel, Klee, Bleek, Tholuck, al., is strongly combated by Lünemann, and the insecurity of the consideration arising from the different form of βαπτισμός and -μα is urged on the ground that the Writer never uses βάπτισμα: but against this we may fairly allege that he *does* use βαπτισμός again (ch. ix. 10), and in the ordinary sense of Jewish washings, not in that of Christian baptism. When it is objected to the view (as e. g. by Stuart) that the doctrine of Jewish washings would have had nothing to do with the elements of Christian teaching, we may fairly say that such objection is brought in mere thoughtlessness. The converts being Jews, their first and most obviously elementary instruction would be, the teaching them the typical significance of their own ceremonial law in its Christian fulfilment. It is obvious from what has been above said, that we must not, as Erasm., Calv., Beza, Schlichting, al., understand “the teaching given as *introductory to baptism* :” Calvin identifying it with the other genitive terms of the sentence: “Quæ enim baptismatis est doctrina, nisi quam hic recenset de fide in Deum, de poenitentia et de judicio, ac similibus?”) and of *laying on of hands* (first, it is almost necessary, on account of the transposed place of βαπτισμῶν, and the coupling by τε, to understand ἐπιθέσεώς τε as gen. after διδασκῆς, and not after θεμέλιον (of the succeeding genitives, see

3 καὶ τοῦτο * ποιήσομεν ^z ἐάνπερ ^a ἐπιτρέπη ὁ θεός. 4 ^b ἂδύ- ^z ch. iii. (6
a = 1 Cor. xvi. 7. Xen. Cyr. i. 1. 2. v. 5. 9. γ. τ.) 14 only.
b ver. 18. ch. x. 4. xi. 6.

3. * ποιήσωμεν ACD[P 47] arm Chr-ms [Euthal-ms] Thdr₂ Damasc: ποιησομεν BKL⁸ rel latt Chr-montf₁ [Thl] Ambr₁.

below). And thus the doctrine of laying on of hands, like that of washings, not being confined to any one special rite, will mean, the reference and import of all that imposition of hands which was practised under the law, and found in some cases its continuance under the gospel. By laying on of hands, the sick were healed, Mark xvi. 18: Acts ix. 12, 17; xxviii. 8: cf. 2 Kings v. 11: Matt. ix. 18 al.; officers and teachers of the Church were admitted to their calling, Acts vi. 6; xiii. 3: 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22: Num. viii. 10; xxvii. 18, 23: Deut. xxxiv. 9; converts were fully admitted into the Christian Church after baptism, Acts viii. 17; xix. 6: 2 Tim. i. 6. And there can be little doubt that it is mainly to this last that the attention of the readers is here called, as the Writer is speaking of the beginning of Christian teaching: so Chrys., οὕτω γὰρ τὸ πνεῦμα ἐλάβανον: and Thdr₁, διὰ τῆς ἱερατικῆς χειρὸς ὑποδέχονται τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος. Some have thought that the principal reference is to the laying of hands on the scapegoat as a type of our Lord's taking our sins upon Him: but this is unlikely) and of resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment (these words, as well as the foregoing clause, depend on διδαχῆς. This would be evident, were it merely for the sense, seeing that it is not the facts themselves of the resurrection and the judgment which would be laid as the foundation of the τοῦ χριστοῦ λόγος, but the doctrine of these, that apprehension and recognition of them consequent on their being taught, as διδαχὴ implies. And then notice, that these also were points of Jewish doctrine, confirmed and brought into clearer light by the Gospel. Some, as Est., Schlicht., Schöttg., Michaelis, Storr, al., have supposed ἀναστ. νεκρῶν to refer only to the righteous, as in John vi. 39, 40, 44, 54,—κρίματος αἰωνίου only to the wicked. But it is more probable, in a passage of such very general reference, that the Writer speaks generally, without any such distinction here in view, of the two doctrines: of the ἀνάστασις ζωῆς and the ἀνάστασις κρίσεως of John v. 29. And it is probable that he uses κρίματος in the same indefinite meaning. Cf. ref. Acts. κρίμα, properly the result of κρίσις, gradually became in later Greek, as other substantives in -μα, confounded with the process in σις, and the two used convertibly. Our Writer has both: cf. ch. x. 27. αἰωνίου,

probably as part of the proceedings of eternity, and thus bearing the character and stamp of eternal: or perhaps as Thl., τουτέστι, τῆς κρίσεως τῆς αἰωνία διδουσης ἢ ἀγαθὰ ἢ κολάσεις. So Erasm. (par.) and many others). 3.] And this (viz. ἐπὶ τὴν τελείωτητα φέρεσθαι, see below) we will do (on the reading, see digest. ποιήσομεν has been variously interpreted. Schlichting, Grot., Wetst., and several others, who suppose (see above) that φερώμεθα expresses the determination of the Writer, take it as referring to the participial clause μὴ πάλ. θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι, and as meaning, "even (καὶ) this (τὸ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβάλλουσιν) we will do." But surely this is impossible: first, we have to refer τοῦτο to a dependent clause, not to the whole sentence going before: and even if this could be got over, the μὴ attached to καταβαλλόμενοι is put aside, and the clause taken as if it were a positive one. Besides which, no convenient sense would be yielded by such a reference. For having asserted on this hypothesis that even the relaying of the foundation should be done, if God will, he goes οἱ to say ἂδύνατον γὰρ κ.τ.λ., which would in no way (see below) fit in to the context. This being so, others, still regarding φερώμεθα as the first, refer the future ποιήσομεν to the φερώμεθα. So Primasius, "Et hoc faciemus, i. e. et ad majora nos ducemus, et de his omnibus quæ enumeravimus plenissime docebimus nos, ut non sit iterum necesse ex toto et a capite ponere fundamentum:" and Thl., τοῦτο ποιήσομεν. ποῖον; τὸ ἐπὶ τὴν τελείωτητα φέρεσθαι. And doubtless so a very good sense is given. In favour of ποιήσωμεν, it may be said, that it corresponds better with the hortatory tone of φερώμεθα, and though the less obvious reading, is more in accordance with the style of the Epistle) if, that is (the force of περ in composition is to give thoroughness and universal reference to the particle to which it is attached: ἐάν, &c.: ἐάνπερ, 'si omnino:' so Hom. Il. ψ. 97, μίνυνθά περ ἀμφιβρόντε ἀλλήλους, "brevis omnino amplexu fruentes." See this well worked out, and its relation to περί, πέρας, &c. established, in Hartung's chapter on the particle, Partikellehre i. 327—344. The effect of this meaning in hypothetical sentences like the present, is to assume the hypothesis as altogether requisite to the previous position: so Soph. CEd. C. 999, εἴτερ ζῆν

c ch. ix. 7, 26, 27, 28 a. 2. *νατον γὰρ τοὺς ἑ ἀπαξ ἡ φωτισθέντας ἑ γευσασμένους τε τῆς* ABCDK
 2 Cor. xi. 25 Phil. iv. 16 1 Thess. ii. 18 1 Pet. iii. 18, 20. Jude 3, 5 only Ps lxxxviii. 35. d = John i. *α b c d*
 9 Eph. i. 18. iii. 9 ch. x. 32 Judg. xiii. 8, and 23 A. Ald. compl. 4 Kings xi. 2 al e ch. ii. 9. 1 Pet. ii. f g h k l
 3. Ps. xxxiii. 8. ἐγύσατο ἀρχῆς, Herod. iv. 147. ἐλευθερίας γευσάμενοι, ib. vi. 5 m n o
 17 47

φιλεῖς, "if, that is, thou lovest life?" Æsch. Ag. 28, εἴπερ Ἰάλιον πόλις ἐάλωκεν, ὥς δ' φρυκτὸς ἀγγέλων πρέπει), God permit (Rsc., τὸ εἰπερ οὐ πρὸς τοῦτο εἶπεν, ὥς τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ πάντως ἐπιτρέποντος—ἐπιτρέπει γὰρ αἰεὶ ὁ θεὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ τέλεια—ἀλλ' ὥς ἔθος ἡμῖν λέγειν—θεοῦ θέλοντος τοῦτο ποιήσωμεν. And Thl., better, ἔμα δὲ καὶ διδάσκει ἡμᾶς ἐντεῦθεν, τὸ πᾶν τῆς ἐκείνου ἑξαγτᾶν θελήσεως, καὶ μηδὲ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμολογουμένων καλῶν τῇ οἰκείᾳ θαρβεῖν κ. κρίσει κ. δυνάμει. It may here again be said, that the addition after the hortatory ποιήσωμεν is as delicate and beautiful, as it is frigid in the common acceptance after the indicative ποιήσομεν. For it is God who worketh in us both to will and to do of his good pleasure, Phil. ii. 13. And it leads the way beautifully to what follows: 'If,' I say, 'God permit: for when men have once fallen away, it is a thing impossible,' &c.). 4.] For (depends on the whole foregoing sentence, including the reference to the divine permission: not as Whitby and De Wette, on μὴ πάλιν θεμ. καταβαλλόμενοι. The connexion is: we *must* go on, for if we go back, it will be to perdition—a thing which (ver. 9) we do not think of you, and therefore expect your advance) it is impossible, in the case of (these words I insert, not as belonging to the Greek construction, but as necessary in English, to prevent the entire inversion of the Greek order of the sentence) those who have been (or, were: but the English perfect here represents idiomatically the Greek aorist, ἀπαξ in this clause referring pointedly enough to the time when the event took place. And indeed where there is no such plain reference as in the subsequent clauses, we are in the habit of expressing priority more by the perfect, the Greeks by the aorist. And here it is quite necessary to take our English perfect: for our indefinite past, 'who were enlightened and tasted . . . and were made . . . and tasted . . .' would convey to the mere English reader the idea that all this took place at one and the same time, viz. baptism,—whereas the participles clearly indicate progressive steps of the spiritual life. These remarks do not apply to cases like that of Acts xix. 2 f., but only to those where an aorist participle indicates priority to some present action) once (for all: indicating that the process needs not, or admits not, repetition: cf. reff. ἀπαξ occurs eight times in our

Epistle, which is oftener than in all the rest of the N. T.) enlightened (Bleek gives a good résumé of the usage and meanings of φωτίζειν. It is a word of later Greek, principally found in the N. T. and LXX (reff.). It occurs in Polyb. xxx. 8. 1, τῶν γραμμάτων ἐλαωκότων κ. πεφωτισμένων, "taken and brought to light:" xxiii. 3. 10, ἐφώτισε τὴν ἐκατέρωθεν αἵρεσιν: Arrian, Epict. i. 4, τῷ . . . τὴν ἀλήθειαν . . . φωτίσαντι καὶ εἰς ἅπαντας ἀνθρώπους ἐξενέγκαντι: Diog. Laert. i. 57, μᾶλλον οὖν Σόλων "Ὀμηρον ἐφώτισεν ἢ Πεισίπτατος. In all these places the sense is to *bring to light*, or *cast light upon*. The other meaning, to *enlighten*, applied to a person, is purely Hellenistic. So in ref. Judg., φωτίσάτω ἡμᾶς, τί ποιήσωμεν τῷ παιδαρίῳ τῷ τικτομένῳ. And the LXX usage is generally simply to *teach*, to *instruct*: so in ref. 4 Kings, and ib. xvii. 27, φωτιοῦσιν αὐτοὺς τὸ κρίμα τοῦ θεοῦ τῆς γῆς. Here it implies, *taught, by the preaching of the word of God*. An historic interest belongs to the occurrence of this word here, as having in all probability given rise to a meaning of φωτίζειν and φωτισμός, as denoting *baptism*, which was current throughout the Church down to the Reformation. Justin Mart. Apol. i. 61, p. 80 says, καλεῖται δὲ τοῦτο τὸ λούτρον φωτισμός, ὥς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μανθανόντων. Chrys. has two κατηχήσεις πρὸς τοὺς μέλλοντας φωτίζεσθαι, in the first of which (vol. ii. p. 228) he justifies the name *φῶτισμα* for baptism by reference to the two places in this Epistle. Suicer (sub voce) gives a full account of this usage, from which it appears that the word never came simply and purely to signify outward baptism, but always included that illumination of the new birth which is the thing signified in the sacrament. So Ps.-Chrys., Hom. on John i. 1, vol. xii. p. 418, (οἱ αἵρετικοὶ) βάπτισμα ἔχουσιν, οὐ φῶτισμα. καὶ βαπτίζονται μὲν σώματι, ψυχῇ δὲ οὐ φωτίζονται ὥστε γὰρ καὶ Σίμων ἐβαπτίσθη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη οὕτω καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀκολούθως εὐρίσκονται. The Syr. here translates, "qui semel ad baptismum descenderunt." And so all the ancient Commentators here, and some of the moderns, as Justiniani, Estius, a-Lapide, Calmet, Hammond, Pyle, Ernesti. Erasmus seems the first who interpreted the word aright ("qui semel reliquerint tenebras vitæ prioris, illuminati per doctrinam evangelicam"), and

ἡ δωρεὰς τῆς ἑ ἐπουρανίου καὶ ἡ μετόχους γεννηθέντας πνεύ- ^{f John iv. 10.}
 ματος ἁγίου ^g καὶ ^h καλὸν ἵ γευσταμένους θεοῦ ^{ik ῥῆμα} ^l δν- ^{Acts viii. 20.}
^{g ch. iii. 1 reff.} ^{h ch. iii. 14 reff.} ^{l Josh. xxi. 43. (xxiii. 15.) Zech. i. 13. j w. acc.,}
^{John u. 9. Job xii. 11. 1 Kings xiv. 29 al.} ^{2 Cor. ix. 15} ^{al. Wisd.}
^{l = ch. ii. 4 reff.} ^{xvi. 25.} ^{vi. 17. ch. xi. 3.}

4. γεννηθέντας A f k m o. (simly elsw.)

almost all since have followed him), and (on the coupling by *τε* see below) have **tasted** (personally and consciously partaken of: see reff. 1 Pet. and Ps.: and on the general expression *γεύεσθαι τινος*, note on ch. ii. 9) of the heavenly gift (what is more especially meant? It is very variously given: Chrys. (*τρυτέστι, τῆς ἀφέσεως*), Ec. (*τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τῆς ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι, remission of sins*: and so Thl., Faber Stap., Erasm.(par.) ("jamque per baptismum condonatis peccatis"), Hammond, De Wette, al.: Schlichting ("animi cum pax et tranquillitas quæ oritur ex notitia plenissimæ remissionis omnium peccatorum, tum liquidissimum illud gaudium et spes immortalis vitæ"), Grot. ("id est, pacem conscientiæ"), Justiniani, *joy and peace in believing*: Primas., Estius (only as "probabilitatem habens"), Michaelis, *the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*: Owen, Calmet, Ernesti, *the Holy Spirit and His gifts*: Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, and many more, *Christ Himself*: Kuinoel, Heinrichs, al.: the religion of Christ,—the gospel: Pareus, *faith*: Klee, *regeneration* in general as distinguished from the special gifts of the Spirit in Baptism: Bleek and Tholuck, on account of the close coupling by *τε* to what has preceded, the *φῶς* itself conveyed in the *φωτισμός*. But I would rather, considering the emphatic position of *γευσταμένους*, take, as indeed do Lüne-mann and Ebrard virtually (and Delitzsch, referring to 2 Cor. ix. 15), *δωρεά* to have a perfectly general reference, q. d. 'that which was bestowed on them thereby.' This heavenly gift the persons supposed have **tasted for themselves**. The *τε*, in the style of this Epistle and St. Luke in the Acts, cannot be pressed so securely as in ordinary Greek and in the rest of the N. T.: and indeed on this last rendering is fully justified) and have been made (see note on ch. iv. 3, for a discussion of the passive sense of *ἐγενήθη*ν: which, however true here, must not be too much pressed, so as to emphasize the participle: see below) **partakers** (see on ref.) of the Holy Spirit (outwardly, the agency would be the laying on of hands after baptism: but obviously the emphatic word is *μετόχους*—have become *real sharers*—*eis ἐν πνεύμα ποτισθέντες*: so that the proper agent is He who only can bestow this participation,

viz. God), 5.] and have tasted (see above: *γευσ.* is not emphatic here, as before, but having once borne its emphatic meaning, carries it again, in its repetition. On the government, see below) the good word of God and the powers of the world to come (Bengel, al. wish to establish a distinction here between the senses of the accus. and gen. government by *γεύεσθαι*. "Alter partem denotat: nam gustum Christi, doni celestis, non exhaurimus in hac vita: alter plus dicit, quatenus verbi Dei prædicati gustus totus ad hanc vitam pertinet, quamquam eidem verbo futuri virtutes sæculi annectantur." But thus even Bengel's own account of the distinction halts on one foot; and moreover the distinction itself is untenable, witness *ὡς δὲ ἐγεύσατο τὸ ὕδωρ οἶνον γεγεννημένον*, ref. John: this being merely as it would appear a Hellenistic impropriety, not found in good Greek. (Another distinction is made by Delitzsch, h. l., from Kühner, § 526, Anm. 3, al.; that words of bodily partaking take a gen. in a partitive sense, but an acc. where the object partaken is either considered as a whole, or is designated materially, or as an accustomed means of nourishment. But this also fails in the above instance, however true in general.) Here, as Bleek, after Bohme, suggests, the acc. perhaps was adopted to avoid the ambiguity which would have arisen, in *καλοῦ γευσταμένους θεοῦ ῥήματος*, as to whether *καλοῦ* agreed with *θεοῦ* or with *ῥήματος*. But now, *what are the things spoken of?* What is *καλὸν θεοῦ ῥῆμα*? The epithet is frequently applied to the word of God: see reff.: and usually with reference to its quickening, comforting, strengthening power, as sent or spoken by God to men. And in consequence it has been taken here to signify the comforting portion of the gospel, its promises: so Thidrt., *τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν*: Est., Schlicht., Grot., Kuinoel, Thol., and many others. Others understand it more generally, as Chrys. (*τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐνταῦθα λέγει*), Thl. (*περὶ πάσης πνευματικῆς διδασκαλίας τοῦτό φησι*), Ec. (*τὴν περὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ διδασκαλίαν*), Primas., Faber Stapul., Corn. a-Lap., Bengel, al. This latter, or that modification of it which understands by *ῥῆμα θεοῦ* the wholesome and soul-preserving utterance of God in the gospel,

m Matt. xii. 32. Eph. i. 21 only. Isa. ix. 6 AN³⁴. see ch. ii. 5 constr., ib. xxii. 4. Wisd. i. 9. xiii. 2. n here only. = Ezek. xiv. 13. xv. 8. xviii. 24. xx. 27, all with παράπτωμα; ABCDEK LFN a b c d f g h k l m n o 17. 47

5. for *δυναμ. τε μ. αἰωνος*, *occidente jam aeo* Tert(readg as some conjecture *δύναμις* *ἐστὶ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος* or *δύνατος αἰῶνος*).

6. *παραπεσόντος* (*mechanical repetn*) D¹[*-gr*].

seems to me better than the meaning taken by Bleek, who thinks *ῥῆμα* to be a personified attribute of God, as *λόγος τοῦ θ.* ch. iv. 12, and the gospel, with its comforting message, an emanation from it, on which the soul feeds. Certainly the passage which he cites from Philo is much to the point: *ζητήσαντες καὶ τὸ τρέφον ἐστὶ τὴν ψυχὴν . . . ἐβρον μαθόντες ῥῆμα θεοῦ καὶ λόγον θεοῦ, ἀπ' οὗ πᾶσαι παιδεῖαι καὶ σοφαὶ βέουσιν ἀέντως*, De Profug. § 25, vol. i. p. 566, said of the Israelites in the wilderness. See also Allegor. iii. § 60 f. p. 121 f., where the manna is said to be designated by the *ῥῆμα θεοῦ* and *λόγος θεοῦ*, with reference to Exod. xvi. 16, and to Deut. viii. 3. It certainly is not improbable that in using the expression *τὸ καλὸν γευσάμενος θεοῦ ῥῆμα*, the Writer may have had in view this latter text, *ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος*: but the supposed personification does not seem to suit the context.

Then it is a far more debated question, what is meant by *δυνάμεις μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*. Some have said, those *powerful foretastes of glory* which belong indeed to the future state in their fulness, but are vouchsafed to believers here: so Schlichting, interpreting *γεύσασθαι* of this foretaste; so Primas., Seb. Schmidt, al. But most Commentators, and rightly, take *αἰὼν μέλλον* as equivalent to *οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα* ch. ii. 5 (where see note), and as designating the Christian times, agreeably to that name of Christ in ref. Isa., *πατήρ τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος*. Then the *δυνάμεις* of this 'world to come' will be as in ch. ii. 4, where we have *ποικίλαι δυνάμεις* enumerated with *σημείοις τε καὶ τέρασιν* and *πνεύματος ἁγίου μερισμοῖς*, as God's testimonies to the gospel. Thus they would mean the *χαρίσματα*, given by the Spirit in measure to all who believed, "distributing severally to every man as He will." We need not necessarily limit these to external miraculous powers, or even *προφητεία* and the like: but surely may include in them spiritual powers bestowed in virtue of the indwelling Spirit to arm the Christian for his conflict with sin, the world, and the devil.

The ancients were very uncertain in their exegesis of the words: Chrys., *τίνας λέγει δυνάμεις; ἢ τὸ θαύματα ἐπιτελεῖν, ἢ τὸν ἄρραβωνα τοῦ πνεύ-*

ματος. And some way on, he says, *εἰπὼν δὲ Καλ. γευσ. θεοῦ β. δυνάμ. τε αἰῶνος μέλλ., οὐκ ἀποκαλύπτει αὐτό, ἀλλ' αἰνίττεται, καὶ μονοουχὶ ταῦτα λέγει*: ὅτι τὸ *ζῆν ὡς ἀγγέλους, τὸ μηδενὸς δεῖσθαι τῶν ἐνταῦθα, τὸ εἰδέναι ὅτι τῆς τῶν μελλόντων αἰῶνων ἀπολαύσεως πρό- ξενος ἡμῖν ἡ υἱοθεσία γίνεται, τὸ εἰς τὰ ἄδυστα ἐκεῖνα εἰσελθεῖν προσδοκᾶν, διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστὶ ταῦτα μαθεῖν. τί ἐστὶ, δυνάμεις τε τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος; ἡ ζωὴ ἡ αἰώνιος, ἡ ἀγγελικὴ διαγωγὴ. τούτων ἤδη τὸν ἄρραβωνα ἐλάβομεν διὰ τῆς πλίστεως παρὰ τοῦ πνεύματος. Thdr̄t., *δυνάμεις δὲ μ. αἰ. τὸ βάπτισμα προσήγορεσε κ. τὴν χάριν τοῦ πνεύματος*: διὰ τούτων γὰρ *δυνατὸν τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων τυχεῖν ἀγαθῶν*. Photius, *ἀντὶ τοῦ, ὃ δύναται ὁ μέλλων αἰὼν ἐκμαθόντας, by catechesis, for so he interprets γευσάμενος*).*

6.] and have fallen away (the classical usage of *παράπιπτο* is very different, as will be seen from the following examples: Herod. viii. 87, *κατὰ τύχην παραπεσούσα νηὺς*, i. e. impinging, coming into collision: Plato, Phileb. p. 14 C, *τὸν νῦν δὲ παραπεσόντα (λόγον)*, "eum sermonem qui nobis se obtulit." Legg. iii. p. 686, *ἔδοξε μοι θαυμαστον κτῆμα παραπεσεῖν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν*, "Græcis accidisse." We first find trace of our present meaning in Xenophon, Hell. i. 6. 4, *διαθρούντων . . . ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι μέγιστα παραπίπτοιεν ἐν τῷ διαλλάττειν τοὺς ναυαρχοὺς κ.τ.λ.* Polyb. uses it frequently in this sense, but commonly with a gen. of that from which: so iii. 54. 5, *πάν τὸ παραπεσὼν τῆς ὁδοῦ*: xii. 7. 2, *παράπιπτον τῆς ἀληθείας*: viii. 13. 8, *τοῦ καθήκοντος*: and xviii. 19. 6 absolutely, *τοῖς ὅλοις πράγμασιν ἄγνωσιν ἔφη καὶ παραπίπτειν αὐτόν*. In the LXX it occurs often (reff.) in the ethical sense, and the cognate noun *παράπτωμα* often in the N. T. It is used here, as *ἐκουσίας ἁμαρτάνειν*, ch. x. 26, and *ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ ζῶντος*, ch. iii. 12,—see also ch. x. 29, and *παραρῶμεν* ch. ii. 1,—as pointing out the sin of apostasy from Christ: and the case supposed is very similar to that of the Galatians, to whom St. Paul says, *κατηργήθητε ἀπὸ [τοῦ] χριστοῦ οἵτινες ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε, τῆς χάριτος ἐξεπέσατε*, Gal. v. 4; and ib. iii. 3, *ἐναρξάμενοι πνεύματι νῦν σαρκὶ ἐπιτελείσθε*; The fear was (see Prolegg. § iv. 1) lest these Hebrew converts should cast away their

πάλιν ° ἀνακαινίζειν ρ εἰς μετάνοιαν, ° ἀνασταυρῶντας ° here only.

al. τῆς ἐχθρας . . . πάλιν ἀνακακαινισμένης, Isocr. Areop. 3, al. in Bleek. (Paul, ἀνακαινώσας, 2 Cor. iv. 16. Col. iii. 10. νουσις, Rom. xii. 2. Tit. iii. 5.) ρ = Eph. ii. 22. q here only τ. = (see note).

confidence in Christ, and take up again that system of types and shadows which He came to fulfil and abrogate: and nearly connected with this peril was their small progress in the doctrine of Christ. While speaking therefore of that, and exhorting them to be advancing towards maturity, he puts in this solemn caution against the fearful result to which their backwardness might lead, again (πάλιν does not belong to παραπεσόντας, but to ἀνακαινίζειν: the usual place of πάλιν, and the unvarying place in this Epistle, being before the verb to which it belongs) to renew (them) to repentance (there is no pleonasm, as Grotius thought, in πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν. For the ἀνακαινίζειν would be the regenerating in any case, and the πάλιν ἀνακ., the renewal of it. Even in the first case, man ἀνακαινίζεται: in the second case, πάλιν ἀνακαινίζεται. As to the word, it is found, after Isocr. as in reff., in Appian, Lucian, Josephus (Antt. ix. 8. 2, βασιλέα Ἰώασον ὁρμή τις ἔλαβε τὸν ναὺν ἀνακαινίσαι τοῦ θεοῦ), Philo (Legat. ad Cai. § 11, vol. ii. p. 558, ἀνισότητα, τὴν ἀδικίας ἀρχήν, ἀνεκαίνισεν ἰσότητι, ἥτις ἐστὶ πηγή δικαιοσύνης), and freq. in LXX. Observe St. Paul's usage in reff. The usage of the word, as Bleek remarks, is without reference to any previous existence of the state into which the renewal takes place: e. g. we cannot say here that the perfect state of man before the fall was in the Writer's mind. The verb is active, and implies a subject. This by some is made to be the foregoing accusatives, and ἐαυτοὺς is supplied after ἀνακαινίζειν: so Origen cites it (in Joann. tom. xx. 12, vol. iv. p. 322, ἀνακαινίζειν ἐαυτὸν in some mss., ἀνακαινιστὸν ποιεῖν ἐαυτὸν in others): so vulg. ("renovari"), and Erasmus, Vatabl., al. But it is far better, as in the translation, and usually, to make the subject indefinite: "it is impossible to" &c. "Instead of εἰς μετάνοιαν, one would expect ἐν μετανόια or διὰ μετανόιας, inasmuch as ἀνακαινίζεσθαι in full measure can only be brought about by μετάνοια, and must therefore be preceded by it. But on the other side, μετάνοια itself, the change of disposition, may be considered as the result of the renewal of the man having taken place: and so it is here: to renew to μετάνοια, i. e. so to form anew, that entire change of disposition precedes." Bleek. On the very general ancient reference of this to renewal of baptism, see below. It is really marvellous, that

such a note as this of Dr. Burton's could have been written in England in the present century: "ἀνακαινίζειν, once more to make them new creatures by baptism, εἰς μετάνοιαν, upon their repentance. Even if they repent, there is no power to readmit them by baptism", crucifying as they do ("seeing they crucify" as E. V. well. The ratiocinative force is given by the omission of the article before the participle, as the demonstrative would be by its insertion. Some ancient Commentators, especially those who refer the foregoing clause to the repetition of baptism, join these participles closely to the verb ἀνακαινίζειν, as expegetical of it; as indicating, that is, what such a πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετ. would be: that it would amount to a new crucifying and putting to shame the Son of God: and they refer to St. Paul's declaration, that in baptism is symbolized the crucifixion of the old man with Christ (Rom. vi. 3 ff.), and understand it thus, that if baptism be repeated, Christ also would appear to be crucified anew. So Chrys., Thdr., Eulogius (Phot. Bibl. 280, ed. Bekk. p. 538 a), Phot. (in Eccl.), Eccl. (δ τοῖνον, φησίν, οἰόμενος εἶναι δεύτερον βάπτισμα, ὅσον τὸ κατ' αὐτόν, ἔνωθεν σταυροῦ τὸν κύριον. τί γὰρ ἕτερον ποιεῖ δ δεύτερον αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος συσταυροῦσθαι νομίζω, ἢ ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸν ἡγεῖται δεύτερον ἐσταυρῶσθαι, δι' ὧν ποιεῖ; τὸ δὲ δεύτερον σταυρῶν, φησὶ, τὸν χριστόν, τὸ ὅσον ἦκεν εἰς αὐτόν, οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν ἢ παραδειγματίζει αὐτόν καὶ κατασχῶναι. ἅπαξ γὰρ σταυρωθεὶς, ἀθάνατός ἐστι λοιπόν. δ δὲ ἀνασταυρῶν, ψεύδος τοῦτο ποιεῖ, ὅπερ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῷ φέρεῖ ὡς ψευσαμένῳ τὸ ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν μόνον), Schol. Matthiæ, Thl., and similarly Faber Stapulensis, Erasm. (par.), Clarius. And so Calvin takes the connexion, even though he does not understand the foregoing of the repetition of baptism: that it is impossible that they should again be renewed to repentance, and their fall from Christ be forgiven them, for that thus God would be again crucifying His Son and putting Him to shame. This Beza also mentions as an alternative (giving it indeed his approval, "quam sententiam si amplectamur, uti sane probabilis et commoda mihi videtur, tum pro 'ut qui rursus crucifigant,' scribendum erit, 'rursus crucifigendo, et ad ignominiam exponendo'). "But besides that which Seb. Schmidt adduces against the Greek Commentators, that they

r dat., = Gal. ^{vi} 14. ^s ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ^s παραδειγματίζοντας. ABCDK
 s here and. LFN
 Matt. i. 19 v. r. only. Num. xxv. 4. Jer. xiii. 22. Ezek. xxiii. 17 only. a b c d
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

παραδειγματίζοντες D.

wrongly assume *Christ* to be crucified in baptism, whereas it is only our old man that is crucified,—the whole construction is, grammatically speaking, very unnatural; and only tolerable, if the men spoken of, whose renewal is said to be impossible, were not the object but the subject, if, that is, instead of ἀνακαίνιζεν we had a passive, or it could be taken intransitively. And since this cannot be done, it is only possible, grammatically, to take the participles as a close specification of the foregoing object, an emphatic setting forth of the grievous offence of which they have become guilty by their apostasy, and on account of which it has become impossible to renew them again to repentance." Bleek) afresh (it has been questioned by Lambert Bos, Exercitt., whether ἀνασταυροῦν can bear this meaning. He, and others who have taken his view, adduce multitudes of instances of the use of the word in the simple sense of 'to crucify,' the ἀνά being merely 'up,' as in ἀνακρεμάω, ἀναρτῶ, ἀνασκολοπίζω, &c. So in Herod. vi. 30, τὸ μὲν αὐτοῦ σῶμα . . . ἀνεσταύρωσαν, and thus in Thucyd., Xen., Polyb., also in Plato, Plut., Diod. Sic., Ælian, Herodian, Galen, Lucian, Josephus. But it has been well answered by Bleek, and others, 1. that ἀνά in composition is not unfrequently found with the double meaning of *again*, or *back*, and also *up*: as e.g. in ἀναβλέπω, which signifies both *to look up*, and *to recover sight*; so of ἀναβαίνω, ἀνάγω, ἀναδύομαι, ἀναθέω, ἀνατρέχω, ἀνακαθίζω, ἀνακομίζω, ἀναπέμψω, ἀναπλέω, &c.: 2. considering, a. that the classical writers never had any occasion for the idea of re-crucifying, and, β. that our Writer could have used the word, however to be rendered, with no other idea here, it is very probable that the reiterative force of ἀνά is the right one to be adopted: 3. the consensus of the Greek interpreters is of great weight, in a question simply affecting the meaning of a Greek compound. Chrys., ἄνωθεν πάλιν σταυροῦντας: Thdr̄t., Ἐκ., ἄνωθεν, φησί, σταυροῦντας: Phot., ἐπὶ δευτέραν σταύρωσιν κ. δεύτερον πάθος καλοῦντας αὐτόν: Thl. and Schol. Matth., ἄνωθεν σταυροῦντας: ἅπαξ γὰρ ἐσταυρώθη κ.τ.λ.: Syr., "denuo crucifigunt:" vulg., "*rursum crucifigentes*:" D-lat., "*re-crucientes*:" Tert., "*refigentes cruci*." Jerome's testimony also is remarkable: "Pro *rursus crucifigentes* melius unum verbum compositum in Græco est ἀνασταυροῦντες,

quod nos interpretari possumus *re-crucifigentes*") to themselves (ἑαυτοῖς is not, as some of the Fathers, e.g. Ἐκ., Thl., ὅσον τὸ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς,—nor *by their means*, as Schulz: but is that kind of 'dativus commodi' which approaches very nearly to mere reference, though there never is, properly speaking, a dative of mere reference. So in ref. Gal., δι' οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται καὶ γὰρ κόσμῳ. Christ was their possession by faith: this their possession they took, and re-crucified to themselves: deprived themselves of all benefit from Him, just as did the unbelieving Jews who nailed Him to the tree. Vatablus's "*in suorum perniciem*," approved by Lünemann, is too strong. The 'dativus incommodi' is only in fact a fine irony on the 'dativus commodi,' and its edge must not be turned by too rough use. Bengel's characteristic antithesis, "ἑαυτοῖς, *ἰδί*, facit antitheton ad παραδειγματίζοντας, ostentantes," is in this case more fanciful than real) the Son of God (for solemnity, to shew the magnitude of the offence), and putting (Him) to open shame (so in ref. Matt.: in ref. Num., the word is used of the actual hanging up on a tree: "Take all the heads of the people, καὶ παραδειγματίσιν αὐτοὺς τῷ κυρίῳ κατέναντι τοῦ ἡλίου." See other examples in Bleek. Here the word continues the action of the former participle: they crucify Him anew, and as at his former crucifixion, put Him to shame before all: as Bleek strikingly says, they tear Him out of the recesses of their hearts where He had fixed his abode, and exhibit Him to the open scoffs and reproach of the world, as something powerless and common: cf. ch. x. 29, τὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης κοινὸν ἡγασάμενος ἐν ᾧ ἡγάσθη, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας). It would be quite beyond the limits of mere annotation, to give any satisfactory analysis of the history of interpretation of this passage, and of the conflicts which have sprung up around it. Such accounts will be found admirably given in several of the Commentators, among whom I would especially mention Bleek and Tholuck; and for the English reader, Owen, who treats it at great length and very perspicuously. I will only mention the most notable points, and set down a few landmarks of the exegesis. 1. The passage was used by the Montanists and the Novatians, in ancient times, to justify the irrevocable exclusion from the Church, of those who had lapsed.

7 ἡ γὰρ ἡ ^τπιοῦσα τὸν ^εἐπ' αὐτῆς ἐρχόμενον πολλὰκις [†]Dent. xi. 11. ἡ γὰρ πῖ-
 ρουσα τὸ ὕδωρ, Herod. iii. 117. so iv. 198. u gen., Mark iv. 26. Rev. iii. 10 al. fr.

7. αὐτὴν B³ 213-92. rec πολλ. bef ἐρχομ. with ACKL rel vulg [arm] Epiphⁱ, [Chrⁱ, Euthal-ms Cyrⁱ, Thdrt Damasc Orig-int,]: bef τὸν b: txt BD[P]Σ m (syrr copt) Chrⁱ.

Tertullian, de Pudicitia, § 20, vol. ii. p. 1021, cites it as the testimony of Barnabas, and adds, "Hoc qui ab apostolis didicit et cum apostolis docuit, nunquam mœcho et fornicatori secundam pœnitentiam promissam ab apostolis norat." See other testimonies in Bleek i. § 53, and h. l. But, 2. in the Catholic Church this view was ever resisted, and the Fathers found in the passage simply a prohibition against the repetition of baptism. So Athanasius expressly, Ep. 4, ad Serap. § 13, vol. i. (ii. Migne) p. 563, οὐκ ἐκκλησίον ἐστὶ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων τὴν μετάνοιαν, ἀλλὰ δεικνύον, ἐν εἶναι τὸ τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας βάπτισμα καὶ μὴ δεῦτερον. And so all the ancients who have noticed the passage, and some of the moderns: see above on φωτίζω. 3. In later times, the great combat over our passage has been between the Calvinistic and the Arminian expositors. To favour their peculiar views of indefectibility, the former have endeavoured to weaken the force of the participial clauses as implying any real participation in the spiritual life. So Calvin himself ("Hoc (the elect only being truly regenerate) obstare nego quominus reprobos etiam gustu gratiæ suæ adspersat, irradiet eorum mentes aliquibus lucis suæ scintillis, afficiat eos bonitatis suæ sensu, verbumque suum utrumque animis eorum insculpat"), Beza ("Aliud est vere credere . . . aliud vero gustum aliquem habere . . ."): so Owen ("The persons here intended are not true and sincere believers: . . . for, 1) in their full and large description there is no mention of faith or believing," &c.), and recently Tait, Exposition of Epistle to the Hebrews. But all this is clearly wrong, and contrary to the plainest sense of the terms here used. The Writer even heaps clause upon clause, to shew that no such shallow tasting, no "primoribus tantum labris gustasse" is intended: and the whole contextual argument is against the view, for it is the very fact of these persons having veritably entered the spiritual life, which makes it impossible to renew them afresh if they fall away. If they have never entered it, if they are unregenerate, what possible logic is it, or even common sense at all, to say, that their shallow taste and partial apprehension makes it impossible to renew them: what again to say, that it is impossible πάλιν ἀνακαινίζειν persons in whose case no ἀνακαινισμός has ever taken

place? If they have never believed, never been regenerated, how can it be more difficult to renew them to repentance, than the heathen, or any unconverted persons? One landmark of exegesis then must be, to hold fast the simple plain sense of the passage, and recognize the fact that the persons are truly the partakers of the spiritual life—regenerate by the Holy Spirit. *Elect* of course they are not, or they could not fall away, by the very force of the term: but this is one among many passages where in the Scripture, as ever from the teaching of the Church, we learn that '*elect*' and '*regenerate*' are not convertible terms. All elect are regenerate: but all regenerate are not elect. The regenerate may fall away, the elect never can. 4. Again, the word ἀδύνατον has been weakened down to "*difficile*" by the ancient Latin version in D, and thus explained by a-Lapide, Le Clerc, Limborch, Pyle, and many others. The readers of this commentary will not need reminding, that no such sense can be for a moment tolerated. And this is our second landmark of exegesis: ἀδύνατον stands *immoveable*. But let us see where, and how, it stands. It is the strongest possible case, which the Writer is putting. First there is *considerable advance in the spiritual life*, carefully and specifically indicated. Then there is *deliberate apostasy*: an enmity to Him whom they before loved, a going over to the ranks of His bitter enemies and revilers, and an exposing Him to shame in the sight of the world. Of such persons, such apostates from being such saints, the Writer simply says that it is impossible to bestow on them a fresh renewal to repentance. There remaineth *no more* sacrifice for sin than that one which they have gone through and rejected: they are in the state of crucifying the Son of God: the putting Him to shame is their enduring condition. How is it possible then to renew them to repentance? It is simply impossible, from the very nature of the case. The question is not, it seems to me, whether man's ministry or God's power is to be supplied as the agent, nor even whether the verb is active or passive: the impossibility lies merely within the limits of the hypothesis itself. Whether God, of His infinite mercy and almighty power, will ever, by judgments or the strong workings of His Spirit, reclaim the obdurate sinner, so that even

Acte xiv. 17. ὕετόν, καὶ τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὐθετον ἐκείνους δι' οὗς ABCDK
xxiii. 2. LPN
James v. 18. a b c d
Rev. xi. 6 only. Job v. 10. w = here only γῆς τῆς πάντα τικτούσης, Philo, Opif. Mund. § 45, vol
i. p. 31. ἡ γῆ . . . τίκτουσα ποίαν, Eur Cyclop. 332 x here only. Exod. ix. 22, 25. x. 12, 15. f g h k l
y Luke ix. 62. xiv. 35 only. Ps xxxi. 6. Sus 15 [Theod.] only. m n o
17 47

he may look on Him whom he has pierced, is, thank Him, a question which neither this, nor any other passage of Scripture, precludes us from entertaining. There is no barring here of God's grace, but just as I have observed above, an axiomatic preclusion by the very hypothesis itself, of a renewal to repentance of those who have passed through, and rejected for themselves, God's appointed means of renewal. 5. Another dispute over our passage has been, whether the *sin against the Holy Ghost* is in any way brought in here. Certainly we may say that the fall here spoken of cannot be identical with that sin: for as Bleek has well remarked, that sin may be predicated of persons altogether outside the Christian Church, as were those with reference to whom our Lord uttered His awful saying on it. It is true, the language used in the parallel place, ch. x. 29, does approach that sin, where he says, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας: but it is also clear that the impossibility here spoken of cannot depend on the fact of such sin having been committed, by the very construction of the participles, ἀνασταυρούντας and παραδειγματίζοντας, which themselves render the reason for that impossibility. 7, 8.] *Illustration of the last position*, by a contrast between profitable and unprofitable land. For land which has drunk in ("γῆ, indefinite: ἡ πιούσα, defined as to the kind of γῆ meant. So Gal. ii. 20; iii. 21; iv. 27: Xen. Hell. i. 10. 1, ἀπορέμενται χεῖρ ἡ δεξιὰ, 'a hand, namely, the right.'" Delitzsch) the rain frequently coming on it (so far, is the *subject* of both sides of the hypothesis: not and the word γῆ only. This is necessitated by the omission of the article at ἐκφέρουσα. The E. V., "But that which beareth thorns" &c., would require ἡ δὲ ἐκφέρουσα. Besides which, the E. V. has neglected the aorist part. here, in rendering, "the earth which drinketh in." The drinking in the rain is an act prior to both the hypotheses: the participles which convey the hypothesis itself being present.

The verb πίνειν is not uncommonly used of land receiving rain, both in LXX (ref.), and classical writers: as, besides Herod. in reff., Anacreon xix. 1, ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει: Virg. Ecl. iii. 111, "sat prata biberunt:" Georg. iv. 32. Here it implies not only that the earth has received the rain, but that it has *taken it in*, sucked it in, "being no impenetrable rocky soil,

from which the rain runs off without sinking in. And thus it is an appropriate figure for men who have really taken into themselves the word of God, and experienced its power" (Bl.), and so furnishes an explanation of vv. 4, 5, as well as being explained by them. In the interpretation, *υετός* must not be too strictly confined to "teaching," as Chrys., Thl., &c., but taken as widely as the participial clauses before extend, as importing all spiritual influences whatever. Notice ἐπ' αὐτῆς, not ἐν αὐτῇ, as we should expect of the falling rain: the gen. being used to indicate that the rain lies and abides over it, not running off, nor merely falling towards, but covering, ready to be sucked in) and (καὶ serves, after the general clause, γῆ . . . υετόν, common to both alternatives, to introduce the first of them. We should more naturally expect τίκτουσα μὲν to answer to ἐκφέρουσα δέ brings forth (see reff. and Wetst.) plants (βοτάνη, from βόσκω, properly fodder, provender, for man or beast: generally used for grass, or corn, or any kind of green herb: so in reff. Bl. quotes from an Hexaplar transl. of Hab. iii. 17 (LXX, τὰ πεδία οὐ ποιήσει βρώσιν), ἡ δὲ γῆ μὴ ἐκθάλη βοτάνη) fit (εὐθετος, a word peculiar to St. Luke elsewhere in N. T., is found in the later classics in this sense of 'aptus,' convenient. So Diod. Sic. ii. 57, πηγὰς . . . εἰς λουτρὰ κ. κόπων ἀφαίρεσιν εὐθέτους: Dion. Hal. i. p. 10, χώρα εἰς νομάς εὐθετος: Polyb. xxvi. 5, 6, πρὸς πᾶσαν σωματικὴν χρεῖαν . . . εὐθετος) for those (it is a question whether ἐκείνους depends on εὐθετος or on τίκτουσα. It will be seen that in the instances above quoted εὐθετος is followed by εἰς or πρὸς and *not by a dative*. But the construction with a dative is not altogether unprecedented: e.g. besides Luke ix. 62, Nicolaus in Stob. Florileg. xiv. 7, οἶμαι δ' ἐμαυτὸν εὐθετον τῷ πράγματι, παίδες, γεγονέναι: and the dative, whether after one or the other, is a datus commodi, not equivalent, if taken after εὐθετον, to πρὸς ἐκείνους, but to πρὸς βρώσιν ἐκείνους. To the sense, it is quite indifferent which connexion we take. The sentence is perhaps better balanced by joining ἐκείνους with τίκτουσα, τίκτουσα βοτάνην εὐθετον | ἐκείνους δι' οὗς καὶ γεωργεῖται flowing more evenly than τίκτουσα βοτάνην | εὐθετον ἐκείνους δι' οὗς καὶ γεωργεῖται. The absolute use of εὐθετον need make no difficulty: cf. ref. Ps., προσεύξεται πρὸς σε πᾶς ὁστος ἐν καιρῷ

^z καὶ ^a γεωργεῖται, ^b μεταλαμβάνει ^c εὐλογίας ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. ^z = ch. vii. 28.
⁸ ^d ἐκφέρουσα δὲ ^{ef} ἀκάνθας καὶ ^g τριβόλους, ^h ἀδόκιμος καὶ ^a here only.
ⁱ κατάρτας ^j ἐγγύς, ^ης τὸ ^k τέλος ^l εἰς ^{lm} καὺσιν. ⁹ ⁿ Πειπέσι- ¹ Chron. xxvii. 28.
^b ch. xii. 10. Acts ii. 46. xxiv. 25. xxvii. 33, 34. 2 Tim. ii. 6 only. LXX only in Apoc. Wisd. xvi. 9 & ^c = ch. xii. 17. 1 Pet. iii. 9. Gen. xlix. 25.
^d = Matt. (Mark viii 23. Luke xv 22. Acts v. 6, &c. 1 Tim. vi. 7) only. Gen. i. 12. Cant ii. 13. Hag. i. 11.
^e Matt. vi. 16 al. Gen. iii. 18. Hos. x. 8. f as above (e). Matt. xlii. 7 &c. || xxvii. 29. Luke vi. 44. John xix. 2 only. g as above (e) and Prov. xxii. 5 (2 Kings xii. 31) only. h Rom. i. 28. 1 Cor. ix. 27. 2 Cor. xiii. 5, 6, 7. 2 Tim. iii. 8. Tit. i. 16 only. Prov. xxv. 4. Isa. i. 22 only.
ⁱ Gal. iii 10, 13 bis. James iii. 10 2 Pet. ii. 14 only. Gen. xxvii. 12, 13. j ch. viii. 13. ἀμύχανον
καὶ κατάρτας ἐγγύς, Aristid. Orat. in Rom. 212 (Bleek). k = Rom. vi. 21. 2 Cor. xi. 15. Phil.
iii. 19. 1 Pet. iv. 17. Wisd. iii. 9. see James v. 11. l Isa. xl. 16. xlii. 16. m here only.
n Rom. xv. 14. plur., ch. v. 11 reff.

om και (bef γεωργ.) D¹ c d latt [Syr copt æth arm Orig-int₂].

om του D¹ d

εὐθέτω: Diod. Sic. v. 37, κατασκευάζουσιν εὐθετον τὴν πρὸς τὰς ἐργασίας πραγματεῖαν: also ref. Susan.), on whose account (the E. V. following the vulg. ("a quibus"), and Luther, Beza ("per quos"), Calv. ("quorum opera"), Erasmus (par.), al. render ungrammatically, "by whom," δι' ὧν or ὑφ' ὧν. It is a curious sign of the scholarship of Owen's days, that he says, "did with an accusative case is not unfrequently put for the genitive . . . unquestionable instances of this may be given, and amongst them that of Demosth. Olynth. i. is eminent: καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν τρόπον δι' ὧν μέγας γέγονεν ἀσθενὴς ὧν τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς Φίλιππος:" as if this were not a strictly normal use of διὰ with the accusative. Tert. and the old Latin version in D, have it right, "propter quos:" and Ec. says, γεωργεῖται δὲ δηλονότι εἰς σωτηρίαν κ. κέρδος αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν καρποφορούντων. On the sense, see below) also (this καὶ is common in cases where some special reference of an already patent fact is adduced: so in ref., τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν ἀρχιερεὺς: q. d. 'another consideration is' &c. Schlichting, al. have mistaken its sense, and regarded it as introducing γεωργεῖται as an additional particular over and above the πικρὴν τὸν ὑετόν: "Ait autem et colitur, ut ad imbrum irrigationem etiam terræ istius diligentem accedere culturam ostendat") it is tilled (who are ἐκείνοι δι' οὓς καὶ γεωργεῖται, in the interpretation? Thl. mentions two references: 1. to the men themselves: καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἐκείνοι οἱ καρποφοροῦντες τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀπολαύσουσι ταύτης: 2. to their teachers: καὶ γὰρ καὶ δι' αὐτοὺς γεωργεῖται ἡ ἀρίστη πολιτεία, ὡς καὶ αὐτῶν μετεχόντων τῆς τῶν μαθητῶν ἀρετῆς. But both these fall short of the mark: and there can be no doubt that if, as is probable, the features of the parable are to be traced in the interpretation, we must understand GOD as the owner of the land which is tilled, and the tillers are the teachers and preachers of the gospel. So 1 Cor. iii. 9, θεοῦ γεάρ-

γων . . . ἔστω), partakes of (the verb is often used without any necessary reference to others also being sharers: see reff.) blessing (Schlichting's remark is good: that the Writer has not so much the figure in mind, as the thing figured, viz. the men to whom, already having, more is given: and he refers to John xv. 2, πᾶν τὸ καρπὸν φέρων, καθαίρει αὐτὸ ἵνα καρπὸν πλείονα φέρῃ) from GOD (ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ may be joined either with εὐλογίας or with μεταλαμβάνει. It is no objection to the former construction that it is not τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ: the insertion of the art. would in fact encumber the sentence. And this is the connexion which seems to me the more probable; it has a share in εὐλογία ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ. So also Delitzsch: Bleek and Lünemann support the other): but if it bear (Chrys., Ec., Thl., and some of the moderns, a-Lapide, Grot., al., have drawn a distinction between ἐκφέρουσα and τίκτουσα: βρα πῶς ἐπὶ τῶν ἀκανθῶν οὐκ εἶπε τίκτουσα ἀκάνθας, οὐδὲ χρησίμω τούτῳ δυνάμει ἐχρήσατο, ἀλλὰ τί; ἐκφέρουσα ἀκάνθας, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις ἐκβράσσουσα, ἐκβάλλουσα. But it has been observed by Elsner, Raphel, Wetst., al. that ἐκφέρειν is a general word for to bring forth fruit: e. g. Herod. i. 193, ἔστι δὲ χωρέων αὕτη ἀπασέων μακρῷ ἀρίστη . . . Δήμητρος καρπὸν ἐκφέρειν. And see reff. LXX and other examples in Bleek and Wetst.) thorns and thistles (see reff.), is accounted worthless ("república," "rejectionanea," tried and found wanting. It occurs in the N. T. elsewhere only in St. Paul, 7 times: see reff. Being thus rejected, it gets no share of God's blessing) and nigh unto cursing (see reff.: and compare Acts ix. 38; xxvii. 8, for the dative usage of ἐγγύς. There appears here to be an allusion to Gen. iii. 17, 18, —ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου . . . ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀνατελεῖ σοι. Chrys. has noticed that in ἐγγύς there is a softening of the severity of the declaration: βαβαί, πόσῃν χειρὶ παραμυθίαν δ λόγους. κατάρτας μὲν εἶπεν ἐγγύς, οὐ

ο Heb., here only. Paul, Rom. xii. 19, & fr. James (w. ἀδελφ.) i. 16, 19, n. 5. 1 Pet. ii. 11 al7. 1 John ii. 7 al9. Jude 3, 17, 20. p = ch. i. 4 reff. q = here only. Ezek. i. 15, 19. ἀσεβείας ἐχόμενα, Elian. Frag. (Elsner.) ἀρετῆς ἐχόμενα Philo de Agric. § 22, vol. i. p. 316. see Luke xiii. 33. Acts xiii. 44 al.

ABCDK
L^{FN}
a b c d
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

9. for αγαπ., ἀδελφοί N¹ [syrr].
[P]N b f l n o 17 [47].

rec κρειττονα, with D¹K [rel]: txt ABCD³L

κατάρα δ δὲ μηδέπω εἰς κατάραν ἐμπεσὼν ἀλλ' ἐγγύς γενόμενος καὶ μακρὰν γενέσθαι δυνήσεται), of which the end is unto burning. There is considerable doubt both as to the connexion, and as to the interpretation of the sense when obtained. To what does ἡς belong? to γῆς, or to κατάρας? The latter is taken by (not Erasmi. (par.), as so cited by Bleek: for it runs, "exsecrationi divinae: ejus exitus huc tendit, non ut demetatur, sed ut exuratur:" where the passives make it almost necessary to apply "ejus" not to the curse, but to the land), Camerarius, Bleek, al.: the end, result, of which curse is that it tends to burning. But it does not seem to me that this would have been thus expressed. κατάρας holds a very subordinate predicated place: and it is hardly likely that it should be taken up again and made the subject of a relative: especially in the presence of such phrases as reff. 2 Cor., Phil., and 1 Pet., in all of which the gen. aft. τέλος is of the finished, not of the finishing. I would therefore, with Chrys. (δῆλόν ἐστι ἐὰν μέχρι τέλους οὕτως ἐπιμείνη, τοῦτο (τοῦτο;) πέισεται), Thl. (οὐκ εἶπεν ἡ κατακαυθήσεται, ἀλλ' ἡς τὸ τέλ. εἰς κ., τοῦτέστιν, ἐὰν κ.τ.λ. as Chrys.), Luth., Bengel, and most Commentators (including Delitzsch), refer ἡς to γῆς. But then, with what view will this ultimate burning take place? Some have said, with a salutary end, as in Virg. Georg. i. 84—93 ("Sæpe etiam steriles incendere profuit agros, Atque levem stipulam crepitantibus urere flammis: Sive inde occultas vires et pabula terræ Pinguia concipiunt, sive illis omne per ignem Excoquit vitium atque exsudat inutilis humor." See also Plin. H.N. xviii. 39 (73)). Strange to say, this meaning is adopted, not by Roman-Catholic Commentators, but by such as Schlichting, Stuart (apparently: "to have all its worthless productions consumed"), Dr. Bloomfield, al.: not seeing, except Schlichting, who attempts to repudiate it ("nam quod terra sterilis per incendium non corrumpatur sed corrigatur, hoc in similitudine hac non attenditur"), that the inevitable conclusion from such an acceptation would be, the existence of purgatorial fire. The reference clearly is, as the whole context and the words ἡς τέλος εἰς shew, not to purifying, but to consuming fire: as in ch. x. 26, 27, where the same ultimate fear is described as issuing

in purōs ζῆλος ἐσθλὴν μέλλοντος τοὺς ὑπεναντίους. So in Deut. xxix. 22, 23, the curse of the apostate land is described as consisting in "brimstone, and salt, and burning; that it is not sown, nor beareth, nor any grass groweth therein, like the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah," &c. And this destruction by burning is quite according to N. T. analogy: e. g. John xv. 6: Matt. iii. 10, 12; vii. 19; xiii. 30, 40 ff.

εἰς καὶ οὖν is said by Kuin., Ebrard, al. to be a Hebraism for καὶ οὖν. But this has been satisfactorily disproved by Winer, Gramm. § 29. 3 Remark. Chrys., continuing the same strain as above on κατάρας ἐγγύς, beautifully concludes, ὥστε, ἐὰν ἐκτέμνωμεν κ. κατακαύσωμεν τὰς ἀκάνθας, δυνήσόμεθα τῶν μυρίων ἀπολαῦσαι ἀγαθῶν, κ. γενέσθαι δόκιμοι, κ. εὐλογίας μετασχεῖν. And so Eccl., Thl., Primas. The stronger Calvinistic interpreters regard ἐγγύς as betokening the near approach of the judgment; as in ἡγγικεν ἡ βασ. τῶν οὐρ.; and some refer the whole to the destruction of Jerusalem: so Bengel: "Strictura prophetica, per paucis annis ante combustam urbem Hierosolymorum. Perditissimi Judæorum erant, qui in urbe, et circum eam, fidei repugnabant." 9—20.] Encouragement to perseverance: and first (9—12), from God's faithfulness: see summary at ch. v. 11. καθανάμενος τοῖνον αὐτῶν ἰκανῶς κ. φοβήσας κ. πληῆζας, θεραπεύει πάλιν, ὥστε μὴ πλέον καταβαλεῖν, κ. ὑπτίους ἐργάσασθαι: τὸν γὰρ νωθρὸν δὲ πληττῶν νωθρότερον ἐργάζεται. οὕτε οὖν πάντη κολακεύει ὥστε μὴ ἐπάραι, οὕτε πάντη πληττει, ὥστε μὴ ὑπτιωτέρους ποιῆσαι: ἀλλ' ὀλίγον ἐμβαλὼν τὸ πληκτικόν, πολὺ τὸ θεραπευτικὸν προσφέρει διὰ τῶν ἐπαγομένων, ὥστε δὲ βούλεται κατορθῶσαι. Chrys.

9.] But we are persuaded (stronger than πεποιθήμεν, which would express only a subjective confidence, whereas πεπίσμεθα gives the result of actual conviction by proof. Notice the almost verbal correspondence of reff. Rom.) concerning you, beloved ("Apposite eos sic vocat (see reff.) ne putarent eum aliquo ipsorum odio laborare, sed ut scirent eum amore Christiano erga ipsos flagrare: qui amor facit ut semper meliora ominemur iis quos amamus, et si quid severius dicimus, animo corrigendi, non nocendi cupido, dicamus." Schlichting), the things which

μενα σωτηρίας, εἰ καὶ οὕτως λαλοῦμεν. ¹⁰ οὐ γὰρ ἄδικος ἔστι θεὸς ἑπιλαθέσθαι τοῦ ἔργου ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ἀγάπης τῆς ἐνεδείξασθε εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, διακονήσαντες

|| Mk. Phil. iii. 14. James i. 24 only. inf., as ch. v. 5 reff. s = 1 Thess. v. 13. 1 Pet. i. 12, 18 al. fr. 6. Ps. ix. 12, 18 al. fr. 17. Rev. xxii. 12. t attr., Matt. xxiv. 50. Mark vii. 13. Acts i. 1. ch. x. 1 al. fr. Gen. xxii. 2. Winer, § 21. 1 u = Rom. ix. 22 al. Heb. here (bis) only. elsw. Paul⁹ only. Gen. i. 16, 17. v (see note.) Rom. v. 8. 2 Cor. ii. 4, 8 al. fr. w || Rom. xv. 25 al. + xi. 5

10. rec ins του κοπου bef της αγ. (gloss from 1 Thess i. 3), with D³K[L] rel copt Chr₂ [Thdr̄t Damasc Ec] : om ABCD¹[P] 17(appy) [47 m¹-marg] latt syrr [basim] æth arm Chr₁ [Euthal-ms] Antch₁ Thl Jer₁. for ης, ην B².

are better (the better course as regards your moral state: or, the better fate, as regards your ultimate end. So Chrys., drawing the same distinction, *ἦτοι περὶ πολιτείας* (ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶ ὑμεῖς τοιοῦτοι ἀκαθάρτοι, added by Thl.) *ἢ περὶ ἀντιδόσεως* (ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὶ κατὰρας ἐγγύς, οὐτε πρὸς καίσιν, ἀλλὰ τις ἄλλη ἀντιμισθία ὑμῖν ἀπόκειται, added by Thl.) ταῦτά φησιν. The latter is most probably the reference, seeing that what follows rests on God's ultimate faithfulness and justice in the day of retribution. The former is of course involved in it, as conditioning it.

The art. is used, because it is not merely 'better things,' of some sort, that he is persuaded, but, of two opposite courses, that one which is the more excellent, and (things) *akin* to salvation (the formula *ἐχέσθαι τινας*, 'to be next to,' 'bordering on,' has occasioned the participle *ἐχόμενος* to be used in the sense of *akin to, partaking of the nature of*. This use is frequent in Herodotus, e.g. v. 49, τοῖσι οὐτε χρυσοῦ ἐχόμενον ἔστιν οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀργύρου: i. 120, τὰ τῶν θυνειράτων ἐχόμενα: cf. also ii. 77; iii. 25, 66; viii. 142. So that Augustine's, Erasmus's, and Beza's rendering, "*saluti adhærentia*," is better than vulg., "*viciniora salutis*," or D-lat., "*proximiora salutis*." There may certainly be a reminiscence, in the expression, of *κατὰρας ἐγγύς* above, as Schlichting, "*saluti non maledictioni vicina*:" but it seems hardly probable, for as Bleek remarks, had this been meant, the Writer would, considering his love for *παρονομασία*, have used some more cognate expression. On *σωτηρία*, in the highest sense, *eternal salvation*, see note, ch. i. 14), if even we do thus speak (εἰ καὶ differs from καὶ εἰ, in that the force of the εἰ extends over the whole of the addition or climax expressed by the καὶ, 'if even': whereas in καὶ εἰ, the hypothesis itself is included in the climax, 'even if.' See Hartung, *Partikellehre* i. 139 f. The *present* enlarges the speaking, so that it refers not merely to what has just been said, but to a habit of thus speaking: βέλτιον γὰρ ὑμᾶς ῥήμασι φοβῆσαι, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀλγήσῃτε. Chrys.).

10.] For God is not unjust, (so as) to forget (first, of the construction, *ἄδικος ἐπιλαθέσθαι*. Cf. οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενεθῆναι ἀρχιερέα, ch. v. 5) it is exepetetic, and designates the act whereby or wherein the quality just predicated would be shewn. The aor. *ἐπιλαθέσθαι* must not be rendered "ut oblitus sit," "so that He should have forgotten," as Seb. Schmidt: neither can we say with Kühner, § 445. 2, that there are infinitives in which all relation of time is lost, and the aor.=the pres.: but the distinction seems to be as in other cases where aorists and presents appear to be convertibly put, that whenever the act is one admitting of being treated as a momentary one, or of being grasped as a whole, the aor. is used: when, on the other hand, habit, or endurance is indicated, the *present*. This is strikingly shewn in one of Kühner's own examples: Xen. Cyr. v. 1. 2, καλέσας δὲ Κύρος Ἀράσπην Μῆδον, τοῦτον ἐκέλευσε διαφυλάξαι αὐτῷ τὴν τε γυναῖκα κ. τὴν σκηνήν—here is the whole act: as we say 'to keep safe,' and αὐτῷ binds the office as one solemn duty on Araspes; but below, ib. 3, we have, ταύτην οὖν ἐκέλευσε δὲ Κύρος διαφυλάσσειν τὸν Ἀράσπην, ἕως ἂν αὐτὸς λάβῃ, where by ἕως ἂν, the duration of time is introduced, and the habitual present rendered necessary. Here, the *whole forgetfulness* would be one act of oblivion, which the aor. expresses. There are many places in the O. T. where forgetfulness on the part of God is thus denied: cf. Ps. ix. 12, 18; x. 12: Amos viii. 7: or deprecated, cf. 1 Sam. i. 11: Ps. xiii. 1; xlii. 9; xliii. 24; lxix. 19, 23: Isa. xlix. 14 ff.: Lam. v. 20 al.) your work (i. e. your whole Christian life of active obedience: so *ἔργον* absolutely in the passage 1 Cor. iii. 13—15; so besides reff., in Gal. vi. 4, τὸ δὲ ἔργον αὐτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος. See this *work* somewhat specified in ch. x. 32—34. It is a general term, including the labours of love mentioned below) and the love (the expressions nearly resemble those in 1 Thess. i. 3, from which the τοῦ κόπου of the rec. seems to have come) which ye shewed (ἐνδείκνυμαι (see reff.) is used in classical

x = Rom. xii. 13. 2 Cor. ix. 12. y = Matt. xiii. 17. Luke. xv. 16. al. Gen. xxxi. 30. z = Rom. xii. 8, 11. 2 Cor. vii. 12 al. 1 Thess. i. 5. ch. x. 22 only t. ch. iii. 14 reff. a = Acts iii. 10 ch. v. 14. ix. 13 c. ver. 18 ch. iii. 6 vii. 19. x. 23. d = Rev. ii. 26 see

τοῖς ^x ἁγίοις καὶ ^w διακονοῦντες. ¹¹ ^y ἐπιθυμοῦμεν δὲ ^{ABCDK} ἕκαστον ὑμῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ^{LPN} ἐνδείκνυμαι ^a σπουδὴν ^{abed} πρὸς ^{fg h k l} τὴν ^{m n o} πληροφορίαν τῆς ^p ἐλπίδος ^d ἄχρι τέλους, ¹² ἵνα ^{17. 47} μὴ

for διακονοῦντες, διακονοντες D¹; et audimus D-lat.

Greek in this same sense, of exhibiting a quality or attribute of character: Aristoph. Plut. 785, ἐνδεικνύμενος εὐνοίαν: Plut. Cicero, p. 877, πᾶσαν ἐνδεικνύμενοι φιλοφροσύνην. See more examples in Bleek: and note on Eph. ii. 7. Here, as there, the dynamic middle gives the personal reference: but not here, as there, conscious and predetermined) towards His name (ἥς ἐνεδ. φησιν οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν θεόν τοῦτο γὰρ ἔστιν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐλεγε' διὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ πάντα πεποιθήκατε. δ τοῖνυν τσαυτῆς παρ' ὑμῶν ἀπολαύων σπουδῆς κ. ἀγάπης, οὐ καταφρονήσει ποτὲ ὑμῶν οὐδὲ ἐπιλήσεται. Chrys. and similarly Ec. and Thl., Erasmus, Calv., Luther, Justiniani, Seb. Schmidt, De W., al. And this seems better than with D-lat. and the vulg. ("in nomine ejus or ipsius"), and most Commentators, to suppose εἰς τὸ ὄν. αὐτ. a Hebraism for ἐν, or ἐπὶ, τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτ.: see Matt. x. 41, 42; xviii. 20. The ἅγιοι were those who were called by His name, so that beneficence towards them was in fact shewn towards His name. αὐτοῦ refers to God, as the antecedent expressed above: not to Christ, as Ernesti, Stuart (alt.), al. in having ministered (probably, see ref. and 2 Cor. viii. 4, 19, 20; ix. 1: Acts xi. 29, if not exclusively, yet principally, in eleemosynary bestowals. It may hence perhaps be surmised that these Hebrews did not live in Judæa: see Prolegg. § ii. 15) to the saints, and still ministering (ὅρα δὲ πῶς θεραπεύει αὐτούς: οὐ γὰρ εἶπε διακονοῦντες καὶ ἔσται, ἀλλὰ προσέθηκε καὶ διακονοῦντες, τουτέστι, καὶ ἔτι αὐτὸ ποιοῦντες. Thl. There is a fine touch here of that delicate compliment, which is also characteristic of St. Paul. "Necdum hæc pietas in vobis cessavit, licet forte remiserit," as Schlichting: but the Writer leaves the defect to be understood and states the excellency at its utmost. On the Christian doctrine of reward, as declared in this passage, see note in Delitzsch, p. 242). 11.] But (the δέ carries a slight reproof, contrasting your need of exhortation to constancy with your past and partially remaining present practice) we earnestly desire (οὐκ εἶπε: θέλω, θερ. ἦν διδασκαλικῆς αὐθεντίας, ἀλλ' ὁ πατρικῆς ἦν φιλοστοργίας κ. πλέον τοῦ θέλει, ἐπιθυμούμεθα μορονουχὶ λέγων

σύγγνωτε κἂν φορτικόν τι φθεγξόμεθα. Chrys.: and Thl., οὐ γὰρ μέχρι βήματος τοῦτο βούλομαι, ἀλλ' ἡ ψυχὴ μου καίεται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) that every one of you (πολλὰ ἡ φιλοστοργία: κ. μεγάλων κ. μικρῶν ὁμοίως κηδεταί, καὶ πάντας οἶδε, κ. οὐδένα παρορᾷ, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν περὶ ἕκαστον κηδεμονίαν ἐπιδείκνυται, κ. τὴν ἰσοτιμίαν πρὸς πάντας: ὅθεν καὶ μάλλον ἔπειθε δέεσθαι τὸ φορτικὸν τῶν βημάτων. Chrys.) do shew (see above) the same diligence (τὴν αὐτήν, not as Peirce and Sykes, the same which some have already shewn: nor, the same as ye have already shewn, as Chrys. (οἶος ἥς πρότερον, τοιοῦτον εἶναι κ. νῦν κ. εἰς τὸ μέλλον), Ec., Thdrt., Thl., Grot., Limb., al., which would imply that the Writer was satisfied with their state hitherto, and only desired its continuance: an inference at variance with the facts of the Epistle: but, the same, with a view to the πληροφ. τῆς ἐλπ. ἄχρι τέλους, as they had already shewn with regard to the necessities of the saints. So Bengel, Cramer, Böhme, Bleek, Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch (doubtfully, al.) with regard to (the employment which this diligence is to find: the object with reference to which it is to energize) the full assurance (so, taking πληροφορία subjectively as in the other places of the N. T. (reff.), Erasmus, Vatabl., Calvin, Beza, Estius, Jac. Cappell., Schlicht., Calov., Wolf, Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünem., Delitzsch,—and many others. And so in fact Thl.: ἵνα πλήρη κ. τελείαν τὴν ἐλπίδα ἐνδείξῃσθε κ. μὴ σκυλῇτε. But Corn. a-Lap., Grot., Schulz, De W., Bleek, al., take the word objectively, the full formation, in the sense, to be diligent, evermore to form hope more completely within you, so that you be not moved, but steadfast, until the great object of hope appear. This latter no doubt is excellent sense, but N. T. usage must prevail) of your hope until the end (cf. ch. iii. 14. The words ἄχρι τέλους belong to the whole sentence, not to the verb nor to πληρ. τῆς ἐλπίδος only. 'The end' is the coming of the Lord, looked for as close at hand, see note as above): 12.] that ye become not ("be not" misses the fine delicacy of the Writer: as Chrys., ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε, ἀκμὴν γένησθε. καὶ μὴν ἀνιστορεῖ ἔλεγεν, ἐπεὶ νωθροὶ γεγόνατε ταῖς ἀκοαῖς. ἀλλ' ὅρα

ε νωθοὶ γέννησθε, ¹ μιμηταὶ δὲ τῶν διὰ πίστεως καὶ ε μακροθυμίας ^h κληρονομοῦντων τὰς ⁱ ἐπαγγελίας. ¹³ τῷ γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ ^k ἐπαγγειλάμενος ὁ θεός, ἐπεὶ ^l κατ' οὐδενὸς ^m εἶχεν μείζονος ⁿ ὁμόσοι, ⁿ ὥμοσεν ¹ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ¹⁴ λέγων ^o Εἰ μὴν ^s

10. iv. 2. Isa. lvii. 15. h ch. i. 4, 14 see ver. 17. ch. xi. 9.
6. xi. 13, 17, 33. Rom. ix. 4. xv. 8 2 Cor. i. 20. vii. 1. Gal. iii. 6.
5 al. fr. abs., Heb. only, ch. x. 23. xi. 11. xii. 26. Sur. xx. 23.
16. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 13. m = Luke vii. 42. xii. 4. Acts iv. 14. (xxv. 26.) Prov. iii. 27.
n w. κατά. here bis and ver 16 only. Gen. xxxi. 53. Isa. xli. 23. Amos vi. 8 al. Philo (see note) al. (in Bleek)
later authors. o GEN. xxii. 17. Num. xiv. 23, 35. Job i. 11.

12. aft δια ins της D¹ 108.

μακροθυμοντας D¹ [-gr].

14. rec η μὴν (see note), with K rel [Chr., Euthalt-mss Cyr., Thdr̄t Thl_hl. Ec], ἡμῶν L¹ o: ei μη CD² L², nisi latt Ambr₁ [Primas]: txt ABD¹ [P] & 17 [47¹] Did₁ Damas.

πῶς ἐκεῖ μέχρι τῆς ἀκοῆς τὴν νωθρότητα ἔστησεν. ἐνταῦθά τε καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο φθέγγεται, ἀλλ' ἑτερόν τι αἰνίσσεται· ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ εἰπεῖν, μὴ ἐναπομείνητε τῇ βραθυμίᾳ, μὴ νωθοὶ γέννησθε, εἶπε. πάλιν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν μέλλοντα ἐξάγει καιρὸν τὸν ἀνεύθυνον, εἰπὼν, ἵνα μὴ νωθοὶ γέννησθε· ἐκείνου γὰρ τοῦ μήπω παρόντος οὐκ ἂν εἴημεν ὑπεύθυνοι. ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὸ παρὸν παρακαλοῦμενος σπουδάζειν, ὡς βραθυμῶν, ἴσως καὶ ὀκνηρότερος ἔσται· ὁ δὲ εἰς τὸ μέλλον, οὐχ οὕτως sluggish (see on ref. Lünemann observes that this μὴ νωθ. γέννησθε is in no contradiction to νωθ. γεγόνате there, the one being of sluggishness in hearing, the other in Christian practice. See Chrys. above), but (this again is a δέ bringing in a strong contrast — 'nay, but rather:' passing to another subject altogether, as it were. See on ch. ii. 6) imitators (a favourite word with St. Paul, see ref.: Xen. Mem. i. 6. 3, οἱ διδασκαλοὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς μιμητὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀποδεικνύουσι. Herodian vi. 8. 5, ὡς μὴ μαθητὰς εἶναι μόνον, ἀλλὰ (ζηλωτὰς καὶ μιμητὰς τῆς ἐκείνου ἀνδρείας) of them who through faith and endurance (see ref. Col., also ver. 15: James v. 7, 8. Both the noun and the verb belong to later Greek. They form a contrast to δξύθυμος, -ῶ, earlier and classical words. Here, that constant and patient waiting is implied, without which faith would be made void: of which it is said, "It is good that a man should both hope and wait for the salvation of the Lord." But there is no Hendiadys: faith is one thing, endurance another, superadded upon it) inherit the promises (what is meant by κληρονομοῦντων τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, and who are indicated by the expression? The two questions are very closely connected together. First observe that the participle is not κληρονομησάντων, but present: said not of any one act by which these persons entered on the inheritance of the promises, but of either, 1. a state now going on, 'who are inheriting,' or, 2. in mere predication, 'who are inheritors of.' That the first cannot be

meant, is clear: for in ch. xi. where he enumerates the examples of faith and patience, he says, οἱτοὶ πάντες . . . οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. This same consideration will prevent the reference very commonly here supposed, to Abraham and the patriarchs. Taking then (2), we may regard the participle as ὁ πεπράζων and the like, used without reference to time, but as indicative of office, or standing, or privilege. Thus the reference of the words will be perfectly general: not, *who have inherited*, nor *who shall inherit*, nor *who are inheriting*, but '*who are inheritors of*,' *who inherit*, in all times and under all circumstances. Of these, Abraham is chosen as the most illustrious example.)

13—20.] The encouragement to perseverance is further confirmed by *God's express oath made to Abraham, the first inheritor of the promise.*

13.] For ("His verbis non reddit rationem cur imitari debeant eos, qui per fidem et longanimitatem divinarum promissionum hæredes sunt facti, sed cur mentionem faciat talium. Poterat enim aliquis quærere, an tales aliqui sint, et quanam sint? his ergo verbis in exemplum istius rei adducit patrem omnium credentium Abrahamum, qui et in fide fuit constantissimus, et istius fidei fructum tulit maximum." Schlichting) *God when He promised* (not, as De W., Lün., al., *having promised*: for in matter of fact the oath preceded the statement of the promise, cf. ver. 14 below: but the aor. participle, as so often, is contemporaneous with the aor. verb, as in ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, &c. Bleek well remarks, that ἐπαγγειλάμενος is to be taken not only as "made a promise," but in the Messianic sense, "*gave the promise*," as τὰς ἐπαγγελίας above, and ἡ ἐπαγγελία vv. 15, 17 al., αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι ch. vii. 6 al.: Rom. ix. 4: Gal. iii. 16) *to Abraham*, since He could (ἔχειν with an infin., 'to have the power, or the means, or the opportunity, to . . .') is good Greek, e.g. οὐκ ἔχω εἰπεῖν, common in Herod. See ref.) *swear* by (the classical construction of ὅρῃμι is with an accus. of the person

p = Acts iii. 26. Gal. iii. 9. Eph. v. 3 al. Gen. xxiv. 1. q repet. as in cit., Acts vii. 34. (from Exod. iii. 7) al. v. 12 al. r = Acts vi. 1, 7. vii. 17 al. Exod. i Matt. xviii. 26, 29. Luke xviii. 7. i Cor xiii. 4. 1 Thess. v. 14. James v. 7 (bis), 8. 2 Pet. iii. 9 only. Prov. xix. 11. u ch. xi. 33 (there also v. 34.) Rom. xi. 7 bis James v. 2 only. Gen. xxxix. 2. Prov. xii. 27 only. v Gal. ii. 24. Col. ii. 23 al. Winer, § 63 u. 2. e. w ver. 13 reff. 17. 47

15 ^p εὐλογῶν ^q εὐλογῆσω σε καὶ ^r πληθύνων ^q πληθυνῶ σε· ABCDK LPN
 16 καὶ ^s οὕτως ^t μακροθυμήσας ^u ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. a b c d
 17 ἀνθρωποι ^v μὲν γὰρ ^w κατὰ τοῦ μείζονος ^w ὁμνύουσιν, f g h k l
 18. 47

16. om μεν ABD'N[P 47 syr arm Euthal-ms] Cyr: ins CD³KL rel Chr Thdrt Damasc.

sworn by, *ὁμνυμι τοὺς θεούς*: but *κατά* with a gen. is found when a thing is used as binding the oath, as *ὁμνυμι κατ' ἐξολείας*, Demosth. p. 553. 17 al.; *καθ' ἱερῶν*, p. 1806. 21 al. And this construction, applied to *persons*, appears to have arisen from that other. See Bleek's note) none (masc.) greater, swore by *Himself* (a singularly coincident passage occurs, of the same promise, in Philo, Legg. Allegor. iii. 72, vol. i. p. 127: *εὖ καὶ τῷ ὄρκῳ βεβαιώσας τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, καὶ ὄρκῳ θεοπρεπεῖ. ὁρᾷς γὰρ ὅτι, οὐ καθ' ἐτέρου ὁμνύει θεός, οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ κρείττον, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅς ἐστι πάντων ἄριστος*), 14.] saying, *Surely* (in reff., the editions vary between *εἰ μὴν* and *ἡ μὴν*, but the greater mss. have *εἰ μὴν*: in fact, *εἰ* and *ἡ* are constantly interchanged by the copyists. The expression occurs in formulae jurandi in several places in the LXX (as e. g. Ezek. xxxiii. 27, *ζῶ ἐγώ, εἰ μὴν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ἡρημαίαις μαχαίραις πεσοῦνται*: see also ib. xxxiv. 8; xxxv. 6; xxxvi. 5; xxxviii. 19), so that it could not be an unmeaning expression to the Hellenistic ear. Bleek thinks it came from the Hebraistic formula *εἰ μή*, which has sometimes been written and edited for it) blessing I will bless (thus frequently the LXX, for the Heb. idiomatic conjunction of the absolute infinitive with the finite verb: but sometimes they have it where the Heb. has no such conjunction, as in 1 Kings ii. 25: and something like it is found even in Greek writers, as e. g. Herod. v. 95, *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει*: Xen. Cyr. viii. 4. 9, *ὑπακούων σχολῇ ὑπήκουσα*: Lucian, Parasit. 43, *φεύγων . . . κατέφυγε* (none of which however are quite analogous, the second verb in all being coupled with some additional predicate, as in *φεύγων ἐκφεύγει*—'flying, he escapes, gets clear off'). See Winer, § 45. 8, edn. 6. At first the participle seems to have had a certain emphasis: but afterwards this was lost, and the expression became a mere formula) thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee (the LXX has for *σε, τὸ σπέρμα σου*. This the Writer alters, not from a wish to abbreviate (Jac. Cappell.) nor because he quoted from memory (Abresch), nor because he was unwilling to introduce Abraham's

bodily descendants, but wished to direct his readers' thoughts to his spiritual seed (Böhme, Bisping, al.), but, as Bleek, De W., Lünem., al., because his concern here was with Abraham alone, and his spiritual example: or perhaps, as Delitzsch, seeing that *πληθ.* *σε* could only be understood of posterity, because he wished to concentrate the promise as much as possible): 15.] and thus (*οὕτως* belongs to *ἐπέτυχεν*, not to *μακροθυμήσας*, as Tholuck, and Hofm. Enst. p. 311, for then some particular instance or kind of patience would be most naturally pointed out. It then signifies, *when he had received this promise*—being in this state of dependence on the divine promise: see below, and reff.) having endured with patience (viz. in his waiting so long for God's promise to be fulfilled—in having, when it was partially fulfilled, again shewn noble endurance in the will of God by offering up Isaac), he obtained the promise (i. e. not as Bleek, he had made to him the promise above related: this would nearly stultify the sentence, which proceeds on the faithfulness of God, confirming his promise with an oath by Himself, and the faith and endurance of Abraham, waiting for that promise to be fulfilled: but as Lün., he *obtained, got fulfilled to him*, the promise, the thing promised, to wit, the birth of Isaac, as the commencement of the fulfilment—as much of it as he could see. And thus Abraham became a *κληρονόμος τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν*. That there is here no inconsistency with ch. xi. 39, see shewn there. *ἐπιτυχάνω* is always used of the actual getting in possession: *ὁλκάδος ἀναγομένης ἐπέτυχον*, Thuc. iii. 3: *εἰ ἀγαθὸν ὤνητοῦ ἐπιτύχοιμι*, Xen. Ec. 2. 3: *ἵππου ἐπιτυχὼν ἀγαθοῦ*, ib. 12. 20: al. in Bleek. And the above is the explanation, I believe, of every expositor ancient and modern, except Schulz and Bleek. Ebrard indeed varies thus far, as to understand *ἐπέτυχεν* of Abraham's final and heavenly enjoyment of the fulfilment of the Messianic promises: but I believe the aorist will be generally considered to preclude this). 16–20.] *Security of this promise*, as being part of God's great promise, which He has fulfilled in Christ. These verses are transitional,

καὶ πάσης αὐτοῖς * ἀντιλογίας ὃ πέρασ εἰς ἡ βεβαίωσιν ὁ
 ὅρκος. 17 ἐν ᾧ ὁ περισσότερον ὁ βουλόμενος ὁ θεὸς ἔπι-
 δεῖξαι τοῖς ὁ κληρονόμοις τῆς ὁ ἐπαγγελίας τὸ ὁ ἀμετάθετον

λογίαν ἀνίστατο πολλοί. y sing., here only. Nah. iii. 9. Ps. cxviii. 96. (plur. Matt. xii. 42.) L. Rom. x. 18 only. πέρασ ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις ἐστὶ τοῦ βίου ὁ θάνατος. Dem. p. 258. 19. z Phil. i. 7 only. Lev. xxi. 23. Wisd. vi. 18 only. see ch. ii. 2, 3. a here bis. Matt. v. 33. xiv. 7. 9 Mk. xxi. 72. Luke i. 73. Acts ii. 30. James v. 12 only. Gen. xxvi. 3. b adv., Mark vii. 36. 1 Cor. xv. 10. ch. vii. 15. c of God, James i. 18 reff. d = Acts xviii. 25 f. (Isa. xxxvii. 26.) e ch. i. 2 reff. f so ch. xi. 9, 39. g here (bis) only. 3 Macc. v. 1, 12. Polyb. ii. 32. 5, θεωροῦντες ἀμετάθετον ὄσαν τὴν ἐπιβολὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων. and al. constr., Xenoph. Fragm. Ep. i. 2, τὸ ἀμετάκλαστον σου τῆς γνώμης.

ἀντιλ. bef αὐτοῖς D¹⁻³ [syrr].

17. for ω, τω D¹. περισσότερως B, primum D-lat, abundantius vulg. ο θεος
 bef βουλομενος D F-lat. επιδειξασθαι A 47. 115 Thl.

and lead us to the consideration of the Melchisedek-priesthood of our Lord in the next chapter. 16. For [indeed] (see

var. readd. This μὲν solitarium or ellipticum is common with γάρ, in the sense of the German *nam* or *freilich*, and our 'of a truth,' 'verily:' so Eurip. Med. 698, *ἐγγυγνώστὰ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σε λυπεῖσθαι, γίναι*: Xen. Mem. iii. 10. 1, *εἰσελθὼν μὲν γὰρ ποτε πρὸς Παρβάσιον*. See the elliptic μὲν well discussed in Hartung, *Partikellehre* ii. 411 ff. *men* (emphatic) swear (Bleek observes that it is a mistake to call the form *δμνύουσιν* Hellenistic (ὁλλύασιν, *δμνάσιν*, Ἀττικῶς ὁλλύουσιν, *δμνύουσιν*, Ἑλληνικῶς. Moeris), for we have it in Xen. Mem. iv. 4. 16 (*πανταχοῦ δμνύουσι τὸν ὅρκον τούτου*) and Demosth. p. 622. 22) by the greater (one) (τοῦ μέζονος) is undoubtedly masculine: it could not be predicated of anything neuter, that it was *greater than the men* who swear. And by the expression here, generally taken, must be meant God Himself: that greater One, who is above all men. And so Primas., Grot., Bengel, al.), and *an* (the in the case supposed: the art. is generic: cf. Matt. xiii. 3, ὁ σπείρων: John xii. 24, ὁ κόκκος) oath is to them *an end* (see reff. and more examples in Bleek) of all *gainsaying* (E. V. with very many others, "*strife*," which is a legitimate meaning of ἀντιλογία (cf. Exod. xviii. 16: Deut. xix. 17; xxi. 5: 2 Kings xv. 4: Prov. xviii. 18: Xen. Hell. vi. 3. 20, *εἰρήνην τῶν ἄλλων πεποιημένων, πρὸς δὲ Θεβαίων μόνους ἀντιλογίας οὖσης*), but not borne out here by the context, seeing that there is no allusion to any instance in which God and men were at strife. And besides, in the only places where ἀντιλογία occurs in the N. T. (see reff.) it has the meaning '*gainsaying*:' e.g. ch. vii. 7, *χωρὶς πάσης ἀντιλογίας*, without possibility of *gainsaying*. So that it is best to take this meaning here, and understand that an oath puts an end to all *gainsaying* by confirming the matter *one way*, in which all par-

ties consent), for confirmation (the E. V. with Beza, Erasmus., al., ungrammatically joins these words with ὁ ὅρκος,—"*an oath for confirmation*." It is obvious to every one, that they can only be joined, and that closely, with πέρασ. The only reason why in the translation I have separated them from it, is for fear of introducing, in English, the ambiguity, 'for confirmation of all *gainsaying*.' Calvin's remark on this verse is pertinent: "*Præterea hic locus docet aliquem inter Christianos jurisjurandi usum esse legitimum. Quod observandum est contra homines fanaticos qui regulam sancte jurandi, quam Deus lege sua præscripsit, libenter abrogarent. Nam Apostolus certe hic de ratione jurandi tanquam de re pia et Deo probata disserit. Porro non dicit olim fuisse in usu, sed adhuc vigere pronuntiat*"). 17.] In which behalf (nearly equivalent to 'wherefore.' This seems the best rendering, and not, with some, to take ἐν ᾧ, as agreeing with ὅρκω "*in which*," or "*by which oath*:" cf. Thl. (alt.), Primas., al. It belongs, not exclusively to *ἐμεσίτευσεν*, nor to *βουλόμενος*, but to the whole sentence, as Delitzsch) God, *willing* ("βουλόμενος . . . βουλῆς, conjugata. Summa hic exprimitur benig-nitas," Bengel) to shew more abundantly ("quam sine juramento factum videretur," Beng. The word can hardly mean as Thl., *ἐκ περιουσίας*,—Beza, "amplius etiam quam necesse esset." The Commentators cite a very apposite passage of Philo, de Abr. § 46, vol. ii. p. 39: *θεὸς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὃς τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν πίστewς ἀγάμενος τὸν ἄνδρα πιστὴν ἀντιδίδωσιν αὐτῷ, τὴν δι' ὅρκου βεβαίωσιν ὧν ὑπέσχετο δωρεῶν, οὐκ ἔτι μόνον ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ θεός, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς φίλος γνωρίμῳ διαλεγόμενος. φησὶ γάρ "κατ' ἐμαντοῦ ὥμωσα," παρ' ᾧ ὁ λόγος ὅρκος ἐστίν, ἕνεκα τοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκλί-nως κ. παλῶς ἔτι μάλλον ἢ πρότερον ἐρηρεῖσθαι*) to the heirs of the promise (from ch. xi. 9, Isaac and Jacob were *συγκληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῆς αὐτῆς* with Abraham. But there is no need

h Luke vii. 30. τῆς ^h βουλῆς αὐτοῦ ¹ ἐμεσίτευσεν ^a ὄρκω, ¹⁸ ἵνα διὰ ^j δύο ABCDK
Acts ii. 23. ^k πραγμάτων ^ε ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ¹ ἀδύνατον ^m ψεύσασθαι LPN
Eph. i. 11. ^ε ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ¹ ἀδύνατον ^m ψεύσασθαι a b c d
Isa. xli. 10. ^ε ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ¹ ἀδύνατον ^m ψεύσασθαι f g h k l
i here only t. ^ε ἀμεταθέτων, ἐν οἷς ¹ ἀδύνατον ^m ψεύσασθαι m n o
intr. Jos. Antt. vii. 8, 5, ^ε ἀμεσίτευσε πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, but commonly trans. see Bleek. (της, ch. viii. 6.) j gen., Matt. xxvii.
16 xx 24 Luke xii. 6 Phil. i. 23 al. Gen. xxxi. 33 k so ch. x. 1 xi. 1. i ver. 4 reff.
m Rom. ix. 1 al. Ps. lxxxviii. 35. n sec 2 Cor. x. 10 al. o = (see note) Acts xiii. 15. Rom. xii.
8. ch. xii. 5 xiii. 22 1 Macc. x. 24. p Acts xiv. 6 only. Gen. xix. 20. Zech. ii. 11

18. for δια, μετα D¹[-gr]. ins τον bef θεον AC[P]¹N¹ 17 Eus, Cyr, Did, Chr,
Thdrt, Chron; : om BDKLN³ rel Eus, Cyr-jer, Phot, [Euthal-ms Thdrt, Damasc Thl].

to confine the title to them: as Ec. (Chrys.), ἤθε δὲ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς. ἡμεῖς γὰρ οἱ κληρονόμοι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, οἱ κατ' ἐπαγγελίαν σπέρμα ὄντες τῷ Ἀβραάμ· εἰ δὲ σπέρμα, καὶ κληρονόμοι) the unchangeableness (see reff. Beware of supposing the words equivalent to τὴν βουλήν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀμετάθετον. It was not "His unchangeable counsel" that He would shew, but the fact that His counsel was unchangeable) of His counsel, interposed (μεσίτευω, like μεσίτης, belongs to later Greek: and in its usage it is generally transitive. Thus Diod. Sic. xix. 71, μεσιτεύσαντος τὰς συνθήκας Ἀμίκλον: Polyb. ix. 34. 3, μεσιτεύσαι τὴν διάλυσιν ἐννοικῶς, and other examples in Bleek: and thus some have rendered it here: ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκω τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν, Ec.: scil., τὴν βουλήν, Böhme: Thdrt. Eran. Dial. i. vol. iii. p. 34, δὲ γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀπαγορεύων ὁμνῶναι, τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς αὐτοῦ, καθὰ φησι καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἐμεσίτευσεν ὄρκω. But it is also found with an intransitive sense, as in reff.; and thus we may best interpret it here: God came in as a middle person between Himself and Abraham. Men swear by God, as greater than themselves. So God becomes for men, when swearing, the third and higher person concerned, the Mediator between them: cf. Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 7, ταῦτα δὲ ὁμνούντες ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὃν ὑπισχυοῦντο ποιούμενοι. And thus when He Himself swears, having no greater to swear by, He swears by Himself, so making Himself as it were a third person between the parties to the oath: so, in the intransitive sense, μεσιτεύων. It is strange that Bleek quotes the E. V. as having here "interposed himself by an oath," whereas it has "confirmed it by an oath," taking the transitive sense. We may note, that this word ἐμεσίτευσεν has led the Greek expositors, Chrys., Ec., Thl., to fancy that the Son was the person swearing and sworn by. Thus Ec.: καλῶς δὲ ἔχει ἡ ἐννοια τῆς ἐμπνεύσεως, ἵνα οὕτως ἡ δὲ θεὸς τουτέστιν ὁ λόγος, ἐπιδειξάι βουλόμενος τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῶν τῷ πατρὶ δοξάντων, ἐμεσίτευσε τῷ πατρὶ κ. τῷ Ἀβραάμ ὄρκω, τουτέστι μεσίτης ἐν τῷ

ὄρκω γέγονε· δι' αὐτοῦ γὰρ ὡς λόγον ὤμνουν δὲ θεός) with an oath (dat. of the instrument: it was by means of the oath that He exercised the office of μεσίτης),

18.] that by means of two (δύο is here undeclinable, but not, as Delitzsch states, always in N. T. We have δύο in ch. x. 28: Matt. vi. 24; xxii. 40: Acts xii. 6 al.) unchangeable things (ποῖον καὶ ποῖον; τοῦ τε εἰπεῖν καὶ ὑποσχεῖσθαι, τοῦ τε ὄρκον προσθεῖναι τῇ ὑπόσχεσει. Chrys., Thl.: δύο πράγματα τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸν ὄρκον εἴρηκε. καὶ μόνω γὰρ λόγῳ χρώμενος ὁ θεὸς πληροῖ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν πολλῷ δὲ μᾶλλον ὄρκον συνάπτων τῷ λόγῳ, Thdrt. Similarly Ec., Schol. Matth., Primas., Erasm., Calov., Beza, Schlichting, and almost all recent expositors. Primasius mentions an idea that one is the promise accompanied by the oath, the other the completion of the promise. Stuart thinks that the two oaths are meant, that to Abraham, and that to Christ by which He is constituted a priest after the order of Melchisedek, and refers to Storr as agreeing in substance with him. But this cannot be the meaning. For the Writer is not *recounting* God's promises made by oath, on which our Christian hope is founded: for thus he might say not *two* but many (e.g. "The Lord hath sworn unto David and will not repent: Of the fruit of thy body will I set upon thy seat"): but he is impressing on us the strength of that *method of assurance* which God has been pleased to give us, in that He has not only promised (in both cases in question) but also confirmed it by an oath, in which ("quæ quum adsint," as Böhme in Bl.: bei denen: much as ἐν φ above [as the material of the lie, if it were possible]) it is impossible for God ever (this force is given by the aor. which distributes the proposition into separate incidents) to lie (in each and either of them, it is out of all question that falsehood should be suspected in Him. The stress is on ψεύσασθαι, not on θεόν) we may have strong encouragement (see below), who have fled for refuge to lay hold on the hope set before us (so (except "consolation" for "encouragement") E. V. and in my opi-

^a κρατῆσαι τῆς ¹ προκειμένης ^s ἐλπίδος· ¹⁹ ἦν ὡς ^t ἄγκυραν ^q ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ^u ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ ^{uv} βεβαίαν, καὶ εἰσερχο-

only Num. iv. 7. see exx. in Bl. & Wetst.
xxvii. 29, 30, 40 only +.

u Wisd. vii. 23. Cebet. Tab. 9. 31 al. in Bl.

s = Gal. v 5. Col i. 5. Tit. ii. 13.

ref. ² Cor. viii. 12. ch. xii. 1, 2. Jude 7 ^t Acts v ch. ii. 2 reff.

19. εχωμεν D.

ασφαλην ACD¹[P]: txt BD²KLN rel.

nion rightly. The construction, and with it the meaning of *παράκλησις*, is much controverted. The above view is that of Primas., Erasm., Beza, Schlicht., Grot., Wolf, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, De Wette, Ebrard, Bisping, Tholuck, Delitzsch, and many others. On the other hand Ec. (οἱ καταφυγόντες εἰς αὐτὸν φησι. κρατῆσαι ἰσχυρὰν παράκλησιν ἔχωμεν εἰς τὸ κρατῆσαι τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος), Thl. (παράκλησιν παραίνεσιν μεγάλην κ. προτροπήν. ποῦ δὲ ἔχομεν τὴν προτροπήν; εἰς τὸ κρατῆσαι κ.τ.λ.), (Chrys. gives no exposition), Camerarius, Camero, Seb. Schmidt, Heinrichs, Bleek, Lünem., Conybeare, Stuart, al. make *κρατῆσαι* dependent on *παράκλησιν*, which they render "*exhortation*," "*encouragement*." This necessitates making *καταφυγόντες* absolute, "*we who have fled for refuge*:" but from what, or to what? There is nothing in the context here, which could lead to this absolute use of such an expression. But if it be joined with *εἰς τὸ κρατῆσαι*, the idea of flying to an asylum is at once given, and the figure easily and naturally introduced. Besides which, had *παράκλησις*, meaning 'exhortation' or 'encouragement,' been followed by a verb, '*to hold fast*,' this could hardly have been expressed by an aorist: being an abiding condition, it must be *present*. Whereas now, we have fled to refuge in order to lay hold of—the whole Christian state in one act, which justifies the aorist. As regards the separate words, *παράκλησις* need not mean "*consolation*," but may here also be taken in the same sense as in the other two passages of our Epistle (reff.), viz. '*encouragement*' or 'exhortation,' without an infinitive following. Of these, the former is that which best bears *absolute* use in English, and I have therefore adopted it. *καταφεύγω* (see reff. and Jer. xxvii. (l.) 5: Ps. cxlii. 9) is generally used in the sense of *flying for refuge*: so Herod. ii. 113, of Paris, when shipwrecked in Egypt, and a suppliant in the temple of Hercules: vi. 75, of the Argives who had fled for sanctuary to the temple of Argos. See especially Raphael's note here. For *κρατεῖν*, see on ref.: where observe the present, giving the sense '*hold fast*.' τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος is not an easy expression. The verb *προκεῖσθαι* is often used of a prize proposed

for a contest,—*πρό* giving the sense of *coram*, as in 'propono' so Herod. ix. 101, ὥς σφί καὶ αἱ νῆσοι καὶ ὁ Ἑλλησπόντος ἔθελα προέκειτο, and in numerous examples in Bl. from Xen., Polyb., Ælian, Jos., Philo. So in ch. xii. 2, τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς. Hence it seems most natural to take *ἐλπίς* here objectively, or very nearly so;—hope, as embodying the thing hoped for. And especially is this so, when we compare Col. i. 5, τὴν ἐλπίδα τὴν ἀποκειμένην ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and Titus ii. 13, προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα. Those who take *κρατῆσαι* for "*to hold fast*," are obliged here to regard τῆς προκειμένης ἐλπίδος as equivalent to τῆς ἐλπίδος τῶν προκειμένων: so Bleek: which is very forced: or, as Lünem., to regard *ἐλπίς* itself as a subjective quality made objective, which, as a privilege or a possession, is ready for and proposed to us in the Christian covenant. Calvin gives a curious explanation: "In vocabulo spei est metonymia: effectus enim pro causa accipitur: nam ego promissionem intelligo cui spes nostra ininititur": 19.] which (viz. the hope: in its subjective resting on objective grounds now to be set forth: not the *παράκλησις*, as Grot., Seb. Schmidt, al.) *we have* (not, "*we hold fast*," as Bretschn., Wahl, al., = *κατέχομεν*: this is forbidden by the unemphatic position of the word, as well as by the context) *as an anchor of our soul* (the similitude is a very common one in Greek and Roman writers; and on coins and medals, where hope is represented by an anchor. See Wetst. A saying is attributed to Socrates, οὗτε ναὶν ἐξ ἐνὸς ἀγκυρίου οὕτε βιον ἐκ μᾶς ἐλπίδος ὀρμιστέον: see Kypke. Suicer gives some interesting remarks from the Fathers on the similitude) *safe and firm* (the adjectives belong to *ἄγκυραν*, not to *ἐλπίδα*. οὐχ ἁπλῶς δὲ εἶπεν ἄγκυραν, ἀλλὰ, ἀσφαλῆ τε κ. βεβαίαν. ἔστι γὰρ ἄγκυρα μὴ φυλάττουσα τὸ σκάφος ἀσάλευτον, ἢ ὅταν σαθρά, ἢ ὅταν ἐλαφροτέρα. Thl.) and entering into the part within the veil (first, to what is *εἰσερχομένην* to be referred? to *ἄγκυραν*, or to (ἦν) *ἐλπίδα*? The former is the more obvious construction: and has been accepted by Beza, Estius ("Sicut ancora navalis non in aquis hæret, sed terram intrat sub aquis latentem, eique infigitur: ita ancora animæ spes nostra non satis habet in vestibulum

w Acts xvi. 24 **μένην** εἰς τὸ ^{wx} ἐσώτερον τοῦ ^{xy} καταπετάσματος, ^{20 z} ὅπου ABCDK
LPN
a b c d
f g h k l
m n o
17, 47
only.
x Lev. xvi. 2, 12, 15. Exod. xxvi. 33.
y ch. ix. 3 x 20. Matt xxvi. 51 || only. = Exod. xxvi. 31—35. Lev. xxi. 23 al z = Matt. viii. 19 Luke ix. 57 John viii. 21, 22 al. Ruth i. 16. a here only. Num. xiii. 21. Isa. xxviii. 4. Wisd. xii. 8 only.
b ch. v. 6 reff.

20. *aft* *ιησ.* *ins* *χριστος* D¹.

pervenisse, id est non est contenta bonis terrenis et visibilibus: sed penetrat usque ad ea, quæ sunt intra velum, videlicet in ipsa sancta sanctorum: id est, Deum ipsum et cælestia bona apprehendit, atque in iis figitur"), Schlichting, Limborsch, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. This is said by Bleek to be too artificial, and he, with Abresch, Storr, Bohme, Kuinoel, al., takes *hope* as that which enters within the veil, simply, the figure being dropped. He refers for this to the Greek expositors also: but Chrys. says, ἄγκυραν δὲ οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἶπεν, ἀλλ' ἀσφαλῆ τε καὶ βεβαίαν· ἵνα δηλώσῃ τὸ ἀσφυδὲς τῶν αὐτῇ ἐπερειδομένων εἰς σωτηρίαν διὸ ἐπάγει, εἰσερχ. εἰς τὸ ἐσώτ. τοῦ καταπετ. τί ἐστὶ τοῦτο; ἀντὶ τοῦ δικνουμένην εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν: by which he clearly seems to refer it to the anchor. Thl. says beautifully on the other side, αἴτη γὰρ (ἡ ἐλπίς) εἰσελθούσα ἐνδον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς ἡδὴ εἶναι ἐν τοῖς ἐπηγγελμένοις, κἂν ἐτι κάτω ὦμεν, κἂν μὴπω ἐλάβωμεν· τοσαύτην ἔχει τὴν ἰσχύιν ἡ ἐλπίς, ὥστε τοὺς ἐπιγελοὺς οὐρανίους ποιεῖν. And similarly Ec. But I must say that I prefer the other, being as it seems to me the simpler view. "Two figures are here not so much mixed, as wonderfully combined. The Writer might have compared the world to a sea, the soul to a ship, the future yet hidden glory to the concealed bottom of the deep, the far off terra firma, stretching away under the water and covered by it. Or, he might have compared the present earthly life with the forecourt, and the future blessedness with the heavenly sanctuary which is concealed from us by a veil. But he has combined both these. The Soul clings, as one in fear of shipwreck, to an anchor, and sees not whither the cable of the anchor runs,—where it is fastened: but she knows that it is fastened behind the veil which hides the future glory, and that she, if she only holds on to the anchor, shall in her time be drawn in where it is, into the holiest place, by the hand of the Deliverer." Ebrard. This is very beautiful, and in the main, simple and natural: only going off into fancy at the end, which is not required for the interpretation. The word **καταπετάσμα** is, as far as Bleek knows, Alexandrine: the classical form being *πα-*

πέτασμα. See reff. It was the name for the second veil or curtain (ch. ix. 3), which shut in the holy of holies; the first or outer one being called *κάλυμμα*, Philo, Vita Mos. iii. 9, vol. ii. p. 150, ἐν δὲ τῷ μεθορίῳ τῶν τεττάρων κ. πέντε κίωνων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ κυρίως εἰπέων πρόναον, ἐργόμενον διὸς ὑφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἐνδον ὃν καλεῖται καταπέτασμα, τὸ δ' ἐκτὸς προσαγορεύεται κάλυμμα. See further on ch. ix. 3. For the whole expression, see reff.), **20.**] where (ὅπου is found in places where ὅποι ought rightly to stand, as in our own common phrase, 'Where are you going?' It is in fact a constructio prægnans, become a familiar idiom. So Xen. Ages. vi. 6, ἄδελος γιγνόμενος, ὅπου τε εἴη καὶ ὅπου ἴοι. See also reff.) as *forerunner* (not "*the forerunner*" as E. V.: the omission of the art. necessarily places **πρόδρομος** in the situation of predicate) on our behalf (it is disputed whether **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν** is to be joined with **πρόδρομος** or with **εἰσῆλθεν**. Ec. and Thl. adopt the former: Thl. explaining very fully: οὐκ ἠρκέσθη δὲ εἰπὼν πρόδρομος, ἀλλὰ προσέθηκε καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, εἰς πλείω πίστωσιν, ὥσανεὶ τοῦτο λέγων· οὐκ αὐτὸς ἐδεῖτο τοῦ ἐκείσε εἰλεῖν· τίως γάρ, θεὸς ὢν; ἀλλ' ὥσπερ σάρκα δι' ἡμᾶς ἔλαβεν, οὕτω καὶ δι' ἡμᾶς εἰσῆλθεν ἐσώτερον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἵνα ἡμῖν ἀνοίξῃ τὴν ὁδόν. ὥστε ἀναγκαίως εἰσελευσόμεθα καὶ αὐτοί. ἢ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἵνα ἐντυγχάνῃ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῷ πατρὶ, ὥς καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰσῆει εἰς τὸ ἅγιον ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ, ἐξιλασκόμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ. And so Thdr̄t., referring to John xiv. 1 f. And similarly many moderns also. But Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. prefer joining **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν** with the verb, as more simple. One objection to this they do not seem to have seen: the emphatic position which it gives to **ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν**, a position certainly uncalled for here. Besides which, the predicate **πρόδρομος** standing alone is bald and unexpected, whereas **πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν** fully justifies itself. And the subsequent words, **κατὰ τὴν τάξιν** M. ἀρχιερεὺς γεν. εἰς τ. αἰ., are no confirmation of the other view, as Del. maintains. The Lord's entrance is *sacerdotal*, whether He is *forerunner* for us, or has *entered for us*. **ὑπὲρ** is not pleonastic, as Ec.: but He is forerunner on our behalf, as representing, and introducing, us, who

Μελχισεδέκ ἀρχιερεὺς γενόμενος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. VII. ^c GEN. xiv. 18. xxxiii. 18. (see note).
 1 Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ Μελχισεδέκ βασιλεὺς ^c Σαλήμ, ἱερεὺς τοῦ John iii. 23. Judith iv. 4.

are to come after. *πρόδρομος* is a good classical word, signifying ordinarily the *scouts* who were *sent before* an army, Herod. i. 60; iv. 121-2; and see many examples in Bleek: but also *any others sent before*, reff.; and Herod. ix. 14, ἦλθε ἀγγελὴν πρόδρομος. It is a figure analogous, in its propriety, to ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων, πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, in theirs. And it is one full of comfort to us: as Thl., ὁ γὰρ πρόδρομος, τινῶν ἐστὶν ἀκολουθούντων πρόδρομος· καὶ οὐδὲ πάνυ πολὺ τὸ μέσον τοῦ προδρόμου καὶ τῶν ἐπομένων, ὥστερ οὐδὲ Ἰωάννου καὶ χριστοῦ. μὴ τοίνυν ἀσχάλλετε. ὁσονοῦπα εἰσελευσόμεθα θ̅που ὁ πρόδρομος ἡμῶν entered Jesus, having become (see on ch. ii. 17) a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek (the stress is on the words κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδέκ, which on that account are taken out of their order (see ch. v. 10) and put first. And this is so, because it is this particular point to which the Writer wishes to return in what follows. He assumes for the present ἀρχ. γεν. εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα as conceded, and takes up the mysterious point which he left at ch. v. 10, for elucidation. And thus ends the digression which began there).

CHAP. VII. 1—X. 18.] THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEK, SET FORTH IN ITS DISTINCTION FROM THE LEVITICAL PRIESTHOOD:—THE NEW COVENANT BROUGHT IN BY CHRIST, IN ITS DISTINCTION FROM THE OLD:—AND THE FULL PROPITIATION WROUGHT BY HIM, IN DISTINCTION FROM THE PROPITIATORY SACRIFICES FORMERLY OFFERED. And herein,

VII. 1—10.] *The priesthood of Melchisedek: its nature, as eternal (1—3); as superior to the Levitical (4—10).*

1—3.] This forms grammatically but one sentence, μένει being the only verb, and the adjectives ἀπάτω &c. being only epithets, not predicates. This has been mistaken by Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, al., who supply ἐστὶ τοῦ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ and the following clauses. The epithetal clauses themselves however have some distinction from one another. As far as Ἀβραάμ, they are merely axiomatic, or historical, referring to matters of fact: after that they are predicator, introduced and taken for granted by the Writer. For this Melchisedek, King of Salem (סֶלֶם מֶלֶךְ, Gen. xiv. 18. It is doubtful whether this Salem is a short form of *Jerusalem*, or some other place. Epiphan. Hær. lv. 2,

vol. i. p. 469, says, περὶ ἧς ἄλλος ἄλλως ἐξέδωκε καὶ ἄλλος ἄλλως· οἱ μὲν γὰρ λέγουσιν αὐτὴν τὴν νῦν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καλουμένην,—ἄλλοι δὲ ἔφασαν ἄλλην τινὰ Σαλήμ εἶναι ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ Σικίμων καταντικρὺς τῆς νυνὶ Νεαπόλεως καλουμένης. Josephus, Antt. i. 10. 2, understands it of Jerusalem: ὁ τῆς Σόλυμα πόλεως βασιλεὺς M. . . . τὴν μέντοι Σόλυμα ὑστερον ἐκάλεσαν Ἱεροσόλυμα. So also the Targumists and most of the Fathers, from Theophilus ad Autolicum ii. 31, p. 372, and Greek expositors (e. g. Ec., οἶσθαι δὲ χρὴ ὅτι καὶ Σαλήμ ἐκείνης ἐτόγχανε βασιλεὺς, ἥτις ἐστὶν Ἱερουσαλὴμ): and most modern Commentators: among them being Grot., Drusius, Michaelis, Kuinoel, Gesenius, Hitzig on Isa. i. 1, Von Raumer, Winer (Realw.), Lünemann, Delitzsch, al. But many others, as Primasius, Jac. Cappell., Whitby, Cellarius, Reland, Rosenmüller, Bleek, Ewald, al., contend that Jerusalem cannot be meant, because Jebus, and not Salem, was its old name, and Salem for Jerusalem occurs only in Ps. lxxvi. 2, a song of late date (entitled in the LXX, who however render the word by εἰρήνην, φθὴ πρὸς τὸν Ἀσσύριον), and there as a poetical form, for the rhythm's sake. A prose writer of the primitive date of Genesis would not be likely to use such a form. They therefore suppose that this Salem was that mentioned John iii. 23 as near to Ænon, where John baptized: probably also in Gen. xxxiii. 18, where LXX, vulg., and E. V. all recognize πῶν as the name of a place, though the Targumists, Josephus, al. regard it as an adjective. The same place seems to be mentioned in Judith iv. 4, τὸν αἰῶνα Σαλήμ. And for this view, there is very ancient and weighty authority. Jerome, Ep. 73 (126), ad Evagr., vol. i. p. 445, says that he had learned “ex eruditissimis gentis illius, Salem non, ut Josephus et nostri omnes arbitrantur, esse Hierusalem nomen . . . sed oppidum juxta Scythopolim, quod usque hodie appellatur Salem.” And he goes on to say, “et ostenditur ibi palatium Melchisedek ex magnitudine ruinarum veteris operis ostendens magnitudinem.” And Bleek, from whom this notice is mainly taken, argues with some probability that the Writer of our Epistle can hardly have thought of Jerusalem as indicated by Salem, or he would have pressed, not merely the etymology of the name, but all those sacerdotal associations which belonged to the holy city. Similarly Philo, Legg.

d Mark v. 7 ll. Acts xvi. 17 only 1 c Ps. lxxviii. 55. 56. see Acts vii. 48. Job xxxi. 28 al e ver 10 Luke ix. 37 xxii. 10. Acts x. 25. xx 22 only. Num. xxiii. 16. f here only Gen. xiv. 17 Deut. xxviii. 25 Josh. x. 20. Judith xv. 7 only. Gen. xiv. 19 h iv. 4, 8, 9 only. Gen. xiv. 20. Gen. xxviii. 22 al g = Luke ii. 34. vv. 6, 7 ch xi. 20, 21 2 Cor. i. 13. 1 Cor. vii. 17 2 Cor. x. 13. 1 Pet. xiii. 14. Sir. xiv. 20 k John i. (30 v. r.) 43. ix. 7 only. Ezra iv. 7 only. 1 see Zech. ix. 9. Jer. xxxii. 5. m Rom. xiv. 17.

α θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὃς εὖ συναντήσας Ἀβραὰμ ὑποστρέ-
 φοντι ἀπὸ τῆς ἑκοπῆς τῶν βασιλέων καὶ ἐβλογγήσας αὐτόν,
 ὃ καὶ ἡ δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων ἐμέρισε· Ἀβραάμ, πρῶτον
 μὲν ἐρμηνευόμενος βασιλεὺς δικαιοσύνης, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ

ABCDK
 LPN
 a b c d
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

CHAP. VII. 1. elz om 2nd του: ins A B (Tischdf expr) CDKL[P]N rel Clem, Eus,
 [ed Gaisfā]. rec (for os) o, with C¹L[P] rel [Euthal-ms]: txt ABC³DKN 17.

at end ins kai (αβρααμ) ευλογηθεις υπ αυτου D¹ o. (o has αβρ. below: D¹ omits it there.)

2. for ε, ο D¹. εμερ. bef απο π. N [47 Chr₁ (and ms₁) Thdr̄t(not h. l.)]. om

απο D¹ latt. παντος B. om δε και D-lat: om δε c d [Thdr̄t]: om και K

vulg-mss F-lat [coopt arm].

Alleg. iii. 25, vol. i. p. 102 (βασιλέα τε τῆς εἰρήνης, Σαλήμ, τοῦτο γὰρ εἰρηνεύεται), though elsewhere (De Somn. ii. 38, p. 691) he urges the sanctity of Jerusalem, and its etymological significance as *ἑρασις εἰρήνης*. And this latter view seems to me the more probable. As to the further question, whether Σαλήμ is here, or by Philo, meant as the name of a place at all, see on ver. 2), priest of God the most high (so Genesis i. c., יְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ). The appellation, here and in the O. T., belongs to the true and only God: cf. Gen. xiv. 19, 22, where in this same history both Melchisedek and Abraham speak of "the most high God, possessor of heaven and earth." Philo, in explaining this same office, Legg. Alleg. iii. § 26, p. 103, says, θεοῦ γὰρ ὑψίστου ἐστὶν ἱερεὺς, οὐχ ὅτι ἐστὶ τις ἄλλος οὐχ ὑψίστος· ὁ γὰρ θεός, εἰς ὃν, "ἐν τῷ ὀρατῷ ἄνα ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς κάτω, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ πλὴν αὐτοῦ." ἀλλὰ τῷ μὴ ταπεινῶς κ. χαμαιζήλως, ὑπερμεγέθως δὲ κ. ὑπεράλως κ. ὑψηλῶς νοεῖν περὶ θεοῦ, ἐμφασιν τοῦ ὑψίστου κινεῖ. From the above passages it will appear, that the fact of the Phœnicians in their polytheism having had one god called יְיָ, Ἐλίων, or ὑψίστος, see Bl., De Wette: Philo Byblius in Euseb. Præpar. Ev. i. 10, p. 36, cannot be any further apposite here, than in so far as that one may have been the true God, whose worship still lingered up and down in heathen countries. The union of the kingly and priestly offices in one belonged to the simplicity of patriarchal times, and is found in Abraham himself, who offers sacrifice: cf. Gen. xv. and xxii. Bleek cites Serv. ad Æn. iii. 80, "Sane majorum hæc erat consuetudo, ut rex etiam esset sacerdos vel pontifex:" and Arist. Pol. iii. 14, says of the heroic age, στρατηγὸς ἦν κ. δικαστὴς ὁ βασιλεὺς κ. τῶν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς κύριος. Remember the prophetic announcement Zech. vi. 13, so familiar to every Christian. Our beloved Saviour, as the πατὴρ μέλ-

λοντος αἰῶνος, restores again that first blessed family relation, which sin had disturbed, who met (ὁ συναντ. would be by far the simpler construction, and in ὅς συν. we must assume an anacoluthon. It is curious to find, even in De Wette, such a remark as this: "ὅς, Lachm. after ADE 2 minuscc., requires no notice, as it mars the construction") Abraham (it was, as the narrative in Gen. literally stands, the king of Sodom, who ἐξῆλθεν εἰς συνάντησιν to Abraham: but Melchisedek is mentioned in the same sentence as having brought forth bread and wine, and must be included in the category of those who came out to meet him also) returning from the defeat of the kings (all this from the LXX, which only differs in having, κοπῆς τοῦ Χοδολλογομόρ καὶ τῶν βασ. τῶν μετ' αὐτοῦ. κοπή in this sense is Hellenistic, as also is κόπτειν used of 'defeating,' 'cutting up' in war. See Palm and Rost's Lex.) and blessed him (Gen. ver. 19: see the argument below, vv. 6, 7), to whom also Abraham apportioned a tenth of all (Gen.: καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ Ἀβραὰμ (om. Ἀβρ. A) δεκάτην ἀπὸ πάντων: "of all," viz. the booty which he had taken from the kings: so Jos. Antt. i. 10. 2, τὴν δεκάτην τῆς λείας: and ver. 4 below. In the narrative, the whole has the solemnity of a formal act; of sacerdotal blessing on the part of Melchisedek, and recognition of him as High Priest of God on the part of Abraham. And so the Jews: the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan, as cited in Bleek, and Philo, de Abr. § 40, vol. ii. p. 34, ὁ μέγας ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ . . . τὰ ἐπιπνίκια ἔθνε. The custom of setting apart the tenth to divine uses, was heathen as well as Jewish: see numerous examples in Wetstein. So far (see the summary above) is purely historical: now follow the inductions from the history: as Chrys., θεὸς τὴν διήγησιν πᾶσαν ἐν συντόμῳ μυστικῶς αὐτὴν ἐθεώρηκε καὶ πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὀνόματος),

βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, ὃ ἐστὶν ⁿ βασιλεὺς ^m εἰρήνης, ³ ὁ ἀπάτωρ n cf. Isa. ix.
5 A.
o here only +
see note.

first indeed being interpreted (i. e. as E. V., "*being by interpretation*:" his name bearing this meaning when translated into Greek) king of righteousness (ἡγεμὼν δικαιοσύνης). So also Josephus, Antt. i. 10. 2, Μελχισεδέκης, σημαίνει δὲ τοῦτο βασιλεὺς δικαίος. And again, B. J. vi. 10, ὁ δὲ πρῶτος κτίσας (Ἱεροσόλυμα) ἦν Χαναανῶν δυνάστης, ὁ τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ κληθεὶς βασιλεὺς δικαίος· ἦν γὰρ τοιοῦτος. And Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii. 25, vol. i. p. 103. Bleek remarks, that βασιλ. δικαιοσύνης not only comes nearer to the Semitic form, but is no doubt purposely chosen, inasmuch as Melchisedek is a prophetic symbol of Him who is not only righteous, but the fount and ground of all righteousness before God. Zech. ix. 9: Isa. ix. 7: Jer. xxxiii. 5, 6: Dan. ix. 24: Mal. iv. 2: 1 Cor. i. 30), and next also ('being,' not '*being interpreted*,' must be supplied. This is plain from the position of ἐρμηνευόμενος after πρῶτον, and from βασ. Σαλήμ representing a matter of fact, and the interpretation following) King of Salem, which is, King of peace (it has been much disputed, whether Σαλήμ is regarded by the Writer as the name of a town at all, and is not rather a portion of the personal appellation of Melchisedek. This latter has been held by Bleek, after Böhme, and Pet. Cunæus de Rep. Hebræorum, iii. 3, mainly from the consideration that no distinction here is made between the two expressions, 'King of righteousness,' and 'King of peace.' But, as Bl. himself confesses, we may well imagine that the Writer may wish to point out as a remarkable fact, that the city over which Melchisedek reigned, as well as his own name, was of typical significance; and in that case, does not ἐπεὶτα δὲ καὶ draw sufficient distinction between his personal appellation and that of his city? As regards the word itself, it appears that εἰρήνη is the adjective, peaceful, belonging to the substantive εἰρήνη, peace. But Philo takes it as here, Legg. Alleg. iii. 25, vol. i. pp. 102 f., καὶ Μελχισεδέκ βασιλεὺς τε τῆς εἰρήνης, Σαλήμ, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται, ἱερεὺς ἑαυτοῦ πεποίηκεν ὁ θεὸς . . . καλεῖσθαι οὐδὲ μὲν τύραννος ἄρχων πολέμου, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἡγεμὼν εἰρήνης, Σαλήμ. 'Peace' is here used in that pregnant and blessed sense in which Christ is said to be "Prince of peace," Isa. ix. 6: see also Rom. v. 1: Eph. ii. 14, 15, 17: Col. i. 20: οὗτος γὰρ ἡμᾶς δικαίους ἐποίησε, καὶ εἰρηνοποίησε τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Chrys. It is peace as the fruit of righteousness, cf. Isa. xxxii. 17: notice the order here, πρῶτον . . . βασ. δικαιοσύνης, ἐπεὶτα δὲ καὶ εἰρήνης. "Righteousness and peace," says Delitzsch, "form in O. T. prophecy, the characteristic of the times of the Messiah"), without father, without mother, without genealogy (it is very difficult to assign the true meaning to these predicates. The latter of them seems indeed to represent a simple matter of fact: viz. that Melchisedek *has not in Genesis any genealogy recorded*, by which his descent is shewn (see below). But as to the two former, it cannot well be denied that, while they also may bear a similar sense, viz. that no father and mother of his are recorded in the sacred narrative, it is very possible on the other hand to feel that the Writer would hardly have introduced them so solemnly, hardly have followed them up by such a clause as μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ὥς τέλος ἔχων, unless he had coupled with them far higher ideas than the former supposition implies. I confess this feeling to be present in my own mind:—indeed I feel, that such solemn words as μήτε ἀρχὴν κ.τ.λ. seem to me to decide against that other supposition. So far I think all is clear: but when we come to enquire, *what* high and mysterious eminence is here allotted to Melchisedek, I own I have no data whereon to decide: nor, I think, is a decision required of us. The Writer assigns to him this mysterious and insulated position, simply as a type of Christ: and this type he is merely by virtue of negations, as far as these epithets are concerned: in what he was *not*, he surpasses earthly priests, and represents Christ: what he *was*, is not in the record. I would regard the epithets then as designedly used in this mysterious way, and meant to represent to us, that Melchisedek was a person differing from common men. It remains to give, 1. an account of each word used: 2. a summary of the opinions respecting the passage. 1. ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ occur in two senses: α. of those who *have lost father or mother*: so Pollux, Onomast. iii. 2. 4: see Herod. iv. 154: Soph. Trach. 300: Eur. Orest. 304: Herc. Fur. 114 f. This clearly has no place here. β. Of those who, with whatever meaning, can be said *not to have had father or mother*: whether it be meant *literally*, as where Plato, Symp. 8, calls the heavenly Aphrodite ἀμήτωρ, Οὐρανοῦ θυγάτηρ: so Δίας ἀμάτορος Παλλὰδος, Eur. Phœn. 676: and in Pollux,

ο ἀμήτωρ ο ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχην ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς

ABCDK
LPN
a b c d
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

δ μὴ ἔχων μητέρα ἀμήτωρ, ὥσπερ ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ, καὶ ἀπάτωρ δ μὴ ἔχων πατέρα, ὥς Ἡφαίστος (according to a legend that he was the son of Juno alone): see many other examples in Bleek:—or *improperly*, one whose father or mother is unknown, or ignoble—so Ion, Eur. Ion 850, is said to be ἀμήτωρ, ἀναρίθμητος, as being supposed to be the son of a humble slave: and in Horace's "viros nullis majoribus ortos," Sat. i. 6. 10: Cic. de Orat. ii. 64, "quibus nec mater nec pater, tanta confidentia estis?" (Bl. observes that neither the "patre nullo" of Livy iv. 3, nor the ὡς ἀμήτωρ ἀπάτωρ τε γεγώς of Ion 109 can be adduced here, because in the former case there was a myth according to which the word might be literally used of Servius Tullius, and in the latter the ὡς deprives the words of their true meaning. Delitzsch has quoted ἀμήτωρ as used of Sarah by Philo, de Ebriet. 14, vol. i. 365 f.: Quis Rer. Div. Hær. 12, p. 481, "quoniam ejus mater in sacris literis non memoratur" (Mangey): but this is not correct, for in both places Philo states the reason to be a mystical one, because she was related to Abraham by the father's, not by the mother's side.) ἀγενεαλόγητος occurs only here in all Greek literature. It can only mean, "without genealogy." But this has been variously understood. Corn. a-Lapide says, "Per genealogiam accipe prosapiam non tam parentum quam filiorum Melchisedech: nam de patre et matre ejus jam dixerat." "Dicet aliquis," says Estius, "Quorsum addidit, 'sine genealogia,' cum jam dixisset 'sine patre, sine matre:' quæ pars genealogiam satis videbatur exclusisse. Responderi potest, ea parte removeri genus, a quo Melchisedech descendit, id est, majores, non autem genus cujus ipse princeps fuit, id est, posterus ac nepotes. Proinde hujus generis gratia additum esse: 'sine genealogia.' Nam utroque modo genus accipi constat, etiam apud Græcos, ut et generationem apud Hebræos. Unde est illud Gen. v., 'Hic est liber generationis Adam,' et cap. x., 'Hæ generationes filiorum Noë,' et cap. xi., 'Hæ generationes Tharæ,' cum posterus eorum vellet recensere. Sic quidem Hieronymus hanc partem intellexit, quando eam interpretatur, *sine nuptiis*, lib. i. contra Jovinianum. Per nuptias enim genus in posteris propagatur. Unde et Martyr Ignatius in Epistola ad Philadelphios Melchisedech recenset inter sanctos qui cœlibem vitam duxerunt." But this, which would be at the best but a doubtful deduction from the use of "generatio," is precluded by ver. 6,

in which δ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν clearly shews that it was ancestry, and not posterity, which was in the view of the Writer. 2. In giving a summary of the exegesis of the passage, I have made free use of the abundant materials at hand in the commentary of Bleek. The circumstance that Melchisedek is here stated to be ἀφωμοιωμένος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, has led many of the older expositors to regard these epithets as belonging to Melchisedek only in so far as he is a type of the Son of God, and as properly true of Him alone, not of Melchisedek, or only in an improper sense, and a subordinate manner. So Ec., δ γὰρ τύπος οὐ κατὰ πάντα ἴσος ἐστὶ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ: Schol. Matth., ἀεὶ γὰρ ἡ εἰκὼν ἀμυδροτέρα τοῦ πρωτοτύπου πρὸς ἐμφέρειαν. Accordingly, they understand ἀπάτωρ of Christ in reference to his Humanity (ἀπάτωρ . . ὡς ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ μόνης γὰρ ἐτέχθη μητρός, τῆς παρθένου φημί. Thdrt.), ἀμήτωρ, in reference to his Divinity (ὡς θεός, ἐκ μόνου γὰρ γεγέννηται πατρός, id.), and so also ἀγενεαλόγητος (οὐ γὰρ χρῆζει γενεαλογίας δ ἐξ ἀγεννήτου γεγεννημένος πατρός, id.). And so Chrys., Ec., Thl., Marcus Eremita de Melchisedec, § 4 (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxxv. p. 1121), Cosmas Indicopleustes (de Mundo v. in Galland. Bibl. Patr. xi. p. 478), Lactantius, Inst. iv. 13, vol. i. p. 482: Ambros. de Fide iii. 11 (88), vol. ii. p. 513 al. And so Corn. a-Lap., Jac. Capell., Gerhard, Bisping, al. But, however the word ἀπάτωρ might perhaps be conceded to be not unnaturally applied to Christ in virtue of his Humanity, the words ἀμήτωρ and ἀγενεαλόγητος lie so far off any obvious application to his Divinity, that we may safely say this view could not well have been in the Writer's mind. See further reasons, on the words ἀφωμ. δὲ τῷ υἱ. τ. θεοῦ below, for applying these epithets to Melchisedek, and not to Christ. But *when they are so applied*, we are met by two widely divergent streams of opinion, partly hinted at in the explanation of the rendering given above. The one of these regards Melchisedek as a superhuman being: the other finds nothing in this description which need point him out as any thing beyond a man. Jerome (see Ep. ad Evagr., vol. i. p. 440 ff.) had received from Evagrius an anonymous work (which in all probability was the "Quæstiones in V. et N. Test.," by Hilarius the deacon), in which the "quæstio famosissima super Pontifice Melchisedec" was treated, and the writer tried to prove him "divinioris naturæ fuisse, nec de hominibus æstimā-

τέλος ἔχων, ᾧ ἀφωμοιούμενος δὲ τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, μένει ^{p here only + Epist. Jer. 5, 63, 71 only. (-σιον, Prol. Sir.)}

dum : et ad extremum ausus est dicere, *Spiritus Sanctum* occurrisse Abrahæ, et ipsum esse qui sub hominis figura visus sit." This strange opinion moved Jerome "revolvere veterum libros, ut videret quid singuli dicerent." And he found that Origen, in his 1st Hom. on Genesis (now lost), maintained him to have been an *angel*, as did Didymus the follower of Origen. Then he examined Hippolytus, Eusebius of Cæsarea, and Eus. of Emesa, Apollinarius, Eustathius of Antioch, and found that all these held him to have been a man of Canaan, King of Jerusalem, and endeavoured to prove it in different ways. He then mentions the opinion of the Jews, that Melchisedek was *Shem*, the eldest son of Noah; and gives their calculation that this may well have been, for Shem survived Abraham forty years. On this he pronounces no opinion. The view, that Melchisedek was the Holy Ghost, was also entertained by Hieracas the Egyptian, and by a branch of the Theodotian heretics, founded by a younger Theodotus (Epiphanius. Hær. iv. vol. i. pp. 468 ff. : Aug. de Hær. c. 34, vol. viii.), and called Melchisedekites: and Marcus Eremita (cir. 400), who wrote a treatise on M., mentions heretics who believed him to be *ὁ θεὸς λόγος, πρὶν σαρκωθῆναι ἢ ἐκ Μαρίας γεννηθῆναι*. This opinion Epiphanius, Hær. iv. 7, mentions as held by some within the Church: and Ambrose, from his remarks, De Mysteriis ch. 8 (46), vol. ii. p. 337: De Sacram. iv. 3 (12), p. 368 f.: De Abrahamo i. 3 (16), vol. i. p. 288, seems to have held this: though, De Fide as above, he expressly states him to have been merely a holy man, a type of Christ. This last view was ever the prevalent one in the Church. Cyr.-alex., Glaphyr. ii. vol. ii. pp. 46 ff., combats the two opinions that Melchisedek was a vision of the Holy Spirit, and that he was a great angel.

In later times the idea that he was the Son of God was revived by Molinæus (Vates, iv. 11 f.), by Cunaus (cited above), by Hottinger (De Decimis Judæorum, p. 15), Gaillard (M. Christus Unicus Rex Pacis, Ludg. Bat. 1686), and others. The theory that he was *Shem* has found many advocates: Lyra, Cajetan, Luther (on Gen. xv.), Melancthon, Chemnitz, Gerhard, Selden (De Decimis, § 1), al. Jurieu (Histoire Crit. i. 10) believes him to have been *Ham*; Hulse (M. una cum Parente e Tenebris emergens, Lugd. Bat. 1706) and Calmet (Dissert. ii. pp. 271 f.), to have been *Enoch* reappearing on

earth. Bleek refers, besides the above, for the general subject, to Deyling, Observ. Sacra p. ii. pp. 71—87 (edn. 3, Lips. 1733): Fabricii Cod. Pseudepig. O. T. pp. 311—314 (edn. 2, 1722): Calmet, Bibl. Biblioth. pt. iv., where many dissertations are mentioned. A theory which identified Melchisedek with *Job* is mentioned by Wolf, Curæ Phil. in loc., and has recently been revived by Mr. Galloway, in his work, Egypt's Record of Time), having neither beginning of days nor end of life (these words are again taken by most Commentators to mean, that of Melchisedek, neither beginning of days nor end of life are related in Scripture. Some, e. g. Beza (as a deduction from the other: "ævi ac proinde sacerdotii"), Camero, Schlicht., Wittich, al., take ἀρχὴν for the beginning of his sacerdotal life: others as Camero, Seb. Schmidt, Limborch, Schleusner, Kuinoel, take τέλος also for the end of his priestly life: "Nullus ante eum defunctus est sacerdotio cui ipse deinde successit . . . nullus commemoratur ei successisse in sacerdotio: qua in re typus fuit Christi," Camero. But however ζωῆς τέλος may be legitimately thus referred, seeing that his priesthood and his life would expire together, ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν can hardly be understood of any thing but his natural life, especially as following ἀπάτωρ, &c., and in the presence of the general biblical usage of αἱ ἡμέραι τινός as a man's lifetime. Accordingly most expositors take the words in this their natural sense and interpret them as above. So Chrys. on Ps. cx. § 8, vol. v. p. 277, οὕτε ἀρχὴν οὐδὲ ἡμερῶν φαίνεται ἔχων οὕτε ζωῆς τέλος ὁ Μ., οὐ τῷ μὴ ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὴ γενεαλογηθῆναι ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς . . . τῷ καθ' ὅλον μὴ εἶναι ἐπ' αὐτοῦ ἀρχὴν χρονικὴν μηδὲ τέλος: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σκία, τὸ δὲ ἀλήθεια. Similarly Thdr.: Eranistes, Dial. ii. vol. i. p. 88 f.: Cyr.-alex. Glaph. ii. p. 63: Primasius, who ends, "neque enim sub quo natus est Melchisedek legitur, neque quando mortuus est narratur, sed subito introducitur sicut et Elias." Again however no one, I think, can help feeling that such an interpretation is in fact no worthy acceptance of these solemn words of the sacred Writer. The expressions become incomparably more natural, as Bleek says, if the Writer really meant that M. had not, as mortal men, a definite beginning and end of his life. It really would seem to me almost childish, to say thus solemnly of any whose acts were related

q ch. x. 1, 12, 14 only + Symm Ps
 xlvii 14 = εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, LXX. Heliod Æth i p 25, φυγῇ με εἰς τὸ δ. ἐξημίωσαν. (Bl) (-κώς, Symm
 Ps. xxxvi. 3) r = here only (Heb here only. Paul, never Histor Books, freq.) s Gal. vi. 11 m n o
 11 only. Zech u. 2. t ch. iu. 3 x. 12

4 Ὡς ἔφωρεῖτε δὲ ὁ πηλίκος ὁ οὗτος, ABCDK
 LPN
 a b c d
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

4. πηλ., ηλικος D¹.

om οὗτος D¹[-gr] 672.

in the O. T., but whose birth and death were not related, that *they had neither beginning of days nor end of life*. Suppose e. g. such a thing were said of Hobab, father-in-law of Moses. Here again Delitzsch, who takes strongly the other view, quotes from Philo an expression respecting Cain which he supposes analogous: ὁ Καὶν οὐκ ἀποθανέσθαι, τὸ κακίας σύμβολον, ἦν αἰεὶ δεῖ ζῆν ἐν τῷ θνητῷ γένει παρ' ἀνθρώπων. But surely it is hardly legitimate to conclude that, because Philo means only thus much, the Writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews means no more), but (yea, rather) *likened to the Son of God* (ἀφομοίω (reff.) is a classical word. Plato, Rep. ii. 382 D, ἀφομοιοῦντες τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τὸ φεῦδες: al. in Bl. Aristot. Polit. i., τὰ εἶδη τῶν θεῶν ἑαυτοῖς ἀφομοιοῦνται οἱ ἄνθρωποι. This clause stands alone and pendent, like the preceding, and must not be taken with μένει ἱερὺς εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, as Syr. ("sed in similitudinem filii Dei manet sacerdos in æternum:" "but in the likeness of the Son of Aloha standeth his priesthood for ever." Etheridge's version), Schlichting ("assimilatus filio Dei, i. e. illic ubi comparatus est cum Christo. Non enim usquam Scriptura de Melchisedeco seorsim et expresse dixit, eum manere sacerdotem in perpetuum: sed tantum in comparatione cum Christo, in illis nempe verbis de Christo positis, Tu es Sacerdos" &c.). To this there are three objections: 1. it would be extremely unnatural to say that from a text where it is said that the Son of God is a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek, Melchisedek himself derives the character of remaining a priest for ever: 2. it would be but a poor way of proving the eternal priesthood of Christ, to shew that He is a priest after the order of one who only appeared to have, but really had not, such eternal priesthood: and 3. it is clearly not in respect of *priesthood* that the ἀφομοίωσις is here meant, but in respect of the foregoing predicates: for it is as to these only that the Son of God would be an archetype for Melchisedek, seeing that, in respect of priesthood, Melchisedek was chronologically prior to our Lord. So Thdrt., τούτου χάριν (in reference to the διδύως γέννησις and the ἀθάνατος φύσις of the Son of God) οὐ τὸν δεσπότην χριστὸν τῷ Μελχισεδέκ ἀφομοίωσεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Μ. τῷ χριστῷ ἐκείνος γὰρ τούτου τύπος, οὗτος δὲ τοῦ τύπου ἡ ἀλήθεια: ἐν μέντοι τῇ

ἱερουσύνῃ, οὐ Μελχισεδέκ μεμύηται τὸν δεσπότην χριστὸν, ἀλλ' ὁ δεσπότης χριστὸς ἱερὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Τέλος χρισεδέκ, in loc.: so also Eranistes, Dial. ii. vol. i. p. 88. These very words shew that the Writer does not regard Melchisedek as an *appearance* of the Son of God: and are so adduced by Epiphanius. Hær. iv. 7, p. 474: οὐ γὰρ τις ἑαυτῷ ὅμοιος γενήσεται ποτε. The sense is then that Melchisedek, in being ἀπῶτερ ἀμῆτωρ ἀγενεαλόγητος, μήτε ἀρχὴν ἡμερῶν μήτε ζωῆς ἔχων, personally, not typically, resembles the Son of God—in his personal attributes, as the Son of God subsequently in His incarnation, resembled *him* in His priesthood), *remaineth priest for ever* (εἰς τὸ διηνεκές = εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα above, ch. vi. 20: and see reff. The expression is one which must be interpreted in each case by the context in which it occurs. Thus Sylla and Cæsar were chosen dictators εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, "dictatores perpetui," that is, *for life*: Appian, B. C. i. p. 682. But that is no reason why here, where an eternal priesthood is in question, it should mean *for life*: indeed such meaning would be absurd, seeing that all were priests for life. In that case too, we should not have the present μένει. All kinds of ways have been devised to escape the plain assertion of these words. Most Commentators have had recourse to the same as before, viz. that *no end of his priesthood is related to us in Scripture*: so Ec., Thl., Cyr.-alex., Epiphani., and many moderns. Schlichting takes it, that as our Lord's High Priesthood, which is said to be eternal, will endure to that time when the high-priestly office will cease, so Melchisedek's priesthood is said to endure for ever, "quod et sacerdotium per longum aliquod temporis spatium egerit, et cum ipso veri Dei cultus et notitia inter homines illos extincta fuerit, ita ut sacerdotio, quod quidem vero Deo dicatum foret, nullus inter eos relictus esset locus. In æternum enim aliquod durare dicitur, quod et per longum tempus durat, et tamdiu duret quamdiu natura ipsius rei patitur. Sic David Deum se in æternum laudatum dixit," &c. Stier says, "He stands in Scripture as a type of an eternal priest:" but the question here is not of *type*, but of *fact*. Tholuck, "He remains, in so far as the type remains in the antitype, in so far as his priesthood remains in Christ," after Primas., Haymo, Thos. Aq.

ω καὶ ^u δεκάτην Ἀβραὰμ ἔδωκεν ἐκ τῶν Ἀκροθινίων ^{u ver. 2 reff.}
 ὁ ^w πατριάρχης. ⁵ καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευὲ τὴν ^{v here only.}
^{w Acts ii. 29.}
^{vii 8, 9 only.}
^{1 Chron. xxvii. 22}

om kai BD¹ fuld¹(with tol) Syr copt [Primas Quaest.]: ins ACD³KL[P]X rel [vulg
 (with am F-lat &c) arm] syr Chr, Cyr, [Euthal-ms] Thdrt Damasc Aug. ^{εδωκεν}
 bef αβρααμ Α in syr: om αβρ. c.

5. rec λευ, with AD²⁻³KL rel: txt BCD¹X.

But thus type and antitype are hopelessly confounded. Christ is to be proved to be a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek. Can we conceive then that the Writer, in setting forth what the order and attributes of Melchisedek are, should go back to Christ to find them? Again, to shew to what shifts interpreters have been reduced here, Jac. Cappellus, Pyle, Peirce, and Storr, actually understand *ὅς* before μένει, and construe, "made like to the Son of God, who abideth" &c. Every thing shews that which has been maintained all through this difficult passage, that the assertions are made, and this chief one is above all made, simply of Melchisedek, and they are, as matters of fact, inferred and laid down by the sacred Writer from the historic notices of him. What further inference lies from such dignity being here put on Melchisedek, is not, as I before said, for us to enquire: certainly, none which can in any way interfere with Christ's eternal and sole priesthood, can be correct. It is one of those things in which we must not be wise above that which is written, but must take simply and trustingly the plain sense of our Bibles on a deep and mysterious subject, and leave it for the day when all shall be clear, to give us full revelation on the matter. See on the whole, Bleek's long and interesting note, to which I must again acknowledge my obligations, and with which in the main I agree, against most expositors, and among them De Wette, Tholuck, Lunemann, Ebrard, and Delitzsch). 4—10.] See summary at ver.

1. *The Melchisedek priesthood greater than the Levitical, shewn by the fact that Melchisedek received tithes of Abraham and blessed him (4—8), and potentially, in Abraham, Levi (9, 10).* 4.] But observe (some take θεωρεῖτε indicative, but the imperative seems far better, both with regard to the sense of the verb, and the requirements of the context. The δέ also tends to sharpen up the verb. The distinction between θεωρῶ and ὁρᾶω, as behold and see, is, it is true, not always observed (see Luke xxiv. 39: John iv. 19: xii. 19: Acts xvii. 22), still less that laid down in Phavorinus, ὁρᾶω μὲν ἐπὶ σώματος, θεωρᾶω δὲ ἐπὶ ψυχῆς: but where the context plainly allows of the distinction, it ought to be borne in mind: so Demosth.

p. 19. 23, θεωρῶν καὶ σκοπῶν ἐδρίσκω: 93. 9, θεωρεῖτε γὰρ τὸ παρὸν πρῶτον ὃ γίνε-
 ται: Ceb. Tab. 38, σὺ τοίνυν οὕτω θεωρή-
 σον: and other examples in Bleek) how great ('quantus qualisque,' of what dignity and personal excellence) this man (was) (let it be noticed that the argument still puts forward the personal dignity of Melchisedek, in a way quite inconsistent with the commonly received interpretation of the predicates above), to whom Abraham paid tithes also (went so far as to pay tithes, the καὶ belonging to δεκάτην ἔδωκεν, and of these, rather to δεκάτην, separated as it is from its verb), from the best (of the spoil) (τὰ Ἀκροθίνια, neut. plur. from Ἀκροθίνιος,—literally that which comes from the top of an heap, and so the first-fruits, usually of spoils: Bl. quotes from the Schol. on Eur. Phœn. 213, Ἀκροθίνια κυρίως αἱ τῶν καρπῶν ἀπαρχαί, παρὰ τὸν θῖνα, ὃ ἔστι, τὸν σῶρον τῆς ἄλλω, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ λέγονται καὶ αἱ ἀπαρχαὶ τῆς λείας. So Herod. viii. 121, πρῶτα μὲν νῦν τοῖσι θεοῖσι ἐξέειλον Ἀκροθίνια ἔλλατε καὶ τριήρας τρεῖς Φοινίσσας, and 122, πέμψαντες δὲ Ἀκροθίνια οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐς Δελφοὺς. See many more examples in Wetst., Elsnor, and Kypke. And in consequence, some have pressed here the proper meaning, and understood, that Abraham gave to Melchisedek the tenth of that portion of the spoil which was already set apart for God. But, considering that these words merely take up δεκάτην ἀπὸ πέντων of ver. 2 and of Genesis, it is more natural to understand τὰ Ἀκροθίνια in a wider and less proper sense, of the booty itself, as indeed all booty brought away might be considered as the primitia, the choice part, in contradistinction to the more worthless portion which was left behind. This general sense does not indeed appear in classic Greek, nor elsewhere in Hellenistic: and when Hesych. and Phavorinus give as alternative meanings, σκίδα, and τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν πολέμων λάφυρα, it is probable that this passage was before them. So that Bleek, with Hammond and Grotius, would understand, after Thl., ἐκ τῶν Ἀκροθινίων, τούτέστιν ἐκ τῶν λαφύρων τῶν κρείττονων καὶ τιμιωτέρων. This he thinks is favoured by the ἐκ, which rather indicates that whereof the tithe consisted, than that of which (ἀπὸ) it was the tithe), the

^x Luke i. 9 only. Exod. xix. 9 al. (-γενέν, Luke i. 8. -γενμα, 2 Pet. i. 5, 9.) ^z Luke xix. 12. Rev. xvii. 12. see ch. v. 4. ^z John xiv 21 1 John iv 21. ^a Matt. xxiii 23 Luke xi. 42. xviii. 12 only. Gen xxviii 22. Deut. xiv. 22. constr. 1 Kings viii. 15 17 (δεκ., ver. 6.) ^b ch. ii. 14 reff. ^c ch. v 8 reff. ^d here only. Gen xxxv. 11. 2 Chron. vi. 9. ^e = Acts ii. 30. ver. 10 (Matt. iii 4 || Mk. Luke xii 35. Eph. vi. 14. 1 Pet. i. 13) only.

ABCDK
 LFN
 a b c d
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

rec αποδεκατον, with ACD² ³KL[P]N rel: txt BD¹.

om τουτεστιν B¹(ins B²).

patriarch (added at the end of the sentence to emphasize the title: 'and he, the illustrious patriarch: οὗχ ὁ τυχῶν ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ὁ Ἀβραάμ, ὁ τοσοῦτος, ὁ πατριάρχης· οὐκ ἀλόγως γὰρ τὸ πατριάρχης προσέθηκεν, ἀλλ' ἵν' ἐξάρη τὸ πρόσωπον. Thl. Tholuck has noticed the full rhythm of the word itself, as forming the foot called Ionicus a minore, with which, and the Pæon tertius, orators love to end their sentences. "The word πατριάρχης is Hellenistic: formed from ἀρχή and πατριά, the last in the Hellenistic sense denoting single families and lines of descent, the minor subdivisions of races. It is often found in the LXX version of the Chronicles for the heads of these families. Later however it was used to signify also the head and originator of a race; in Acts vii. 8, 9, it is used of the twelve sons of Jacob, as heads of the tribes; in 4 Macc. vii. 19, of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; in Acts ii. 29, of David." Bleek). 5.]

Continuation of ver. 4, setting forth the reason of the πηλίκος. And ('et quidem: the E. V. "and verily," is rather too strong) they of the sons of Levi who receive the priesthood (or, and perhaps more properly, 'they of the sons of Levi, when they receive the priesthood: in either case meaning the family of Aaron, not as Wolf, al., the whole tribe of Levi, which indeed was appointed by God to receive tithes, see Num. xviii. 20: the words οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λ. will not admit of this interpretation. The Writer speaks of the custom, whereby not all the Levites, but the priests only, received tithes. λαμβάνοντες, as frequently, 'capessentes,' taking as of course and right: Xen. Cyr. i. 5. 2, ὁ δὲ Κναζάρης . . . τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔλαβε τῶν Μήδων. ἱερατεῖαν, the office of priest: mostly a late word, Dion. Hal., al.: but also found in Aristot. Pol. vii. 8, τὴν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπιμέλειαν, ἣν καλοῦσιν ἱερατεῖαν. In vv. 11, 12, 24, ἱερωσύνη is used in the same sense. If any distinction is to be made between the two words, it would rather seem to be the opposite of that laid down by Schulz and others: ἱερατεῖα seems more to denote the service of the priest, ἱερωσύνη the office and power. So in Aristot. above: so Herod.

iii. 142, ἱερωσύνην . . . αἰρεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τε ἔμολε καὶ τοῖσι ἀπ' ἐμεῦ αἰεὶ γινόμενοις, τοῦ Διὸς τ. Ἐλευθερίου,—and Demosth. p. 1313. 20, προεκήριθεν ἐν τοῖς εὐγενεστάτοις κληροῦσθαι τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῇ Ἑρακλεῖ) have commandment to take tithes of (δεκατεύω is the Greek form, -δω the Hellenistic. See reff.) the people according to the law (the words κατὰ τὸν νόμον have been joined by Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, al., to τὸν λαόν: "the (people according to law):" i. e. either God's people, who were under the law, or those who according to the law were the λαός, in distinction from the priests and Levites, as οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ λαός, Exod. xix. 24. But, though an article after λαόν would not be, as commonly supposed, absolutely required in such a construction (witness οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν χριστῷ, τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα, and the like), yet it is difficult to imagine the construction without it here. Bleek would refer the words to ἐντολὴν ἔχουσιν, justifying it by ch. ix. 19, λαληθείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑπὸ Μωυσέως, where however it is far better to join it with λαληθείσης. If it there belonged to πάσης ἐντολῆς, we should certainly expect either τῆς, or τῶν, κατὰ τὸν νόμον. The commandment referred to, on the ordinary construction of the first words of the verse would be Num. xviii. 20—32. But it seems more natural to understand those first words as I have given them in the alternative there, and then κατὰ τὸν νόμον falls into its place easily: 'Those of the sons of Levi, when they are invested with the priesthood, receive commandment to tithe the people according to the law.' On the ways in which the right of tithe was understood at different times, and how it became at length attached to the priesthood only, see Bleek's note), that is, their brethren, though come out of the loins of Abraham (the formula ἐξέρχεσθαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφ. φοι to spring from, as an ancestor, is only Hellenistic, arising from the rendering by the LXX of the Heb. יצא from נֶפֶשׁ, as in reff. Compare ἐκ τῶν πλευρῶν σου, 3 Kings viii. 19; ἐκ τῶν μηρῶν αὐτοῦ, Gen. xlii. 26. The meaning is very difficult to assign. Certainly it cannot be as Bleek, after

Ἀβραάμ· ὁ δὲ μὴ [†]γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν [§]δεδεκά- ^fhere only.
 τωκεν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τὸν ^hἔχοντα τὰς ^{hi}ἐπαγγελίας ^kεὐλό- ^{1 Chron. xv. 1.}
 γηκεν. ⁷χωρὶς δὲ πάσης ^mἀντιλογίας ⁿτὸ ὅ ἐλαττον ὑπὸ ^{Herod. ii. 146.}
 τοῦ ^pκρείττονος ^kεὐλογεῖται. ⁸καὶ ὧδε μὲν ^qδεκάτας ἀπο- ^{iii. 75 al.}
 θνήσκοντες ἄνθρωποι [†]λαμβάνουσιν· ἐκεῖ δέ, ^sμαρτυροῦ- ^{(-γία, 1 Tim.}
^h2 Cor. vii. 1. ⁿ plur., ch. vi. 12 reff. ^k ver. 1. ¹ ch. iv. 15 reff. ^m = ch.
^{vi. 16.} ⁿ neut., 1 Cor. i. 27, 28. ^{Gal. iii. 22 al.} ^o John ii. 10 ^{Rom. ix. 12} (from Gen.
^{xv. 23) only.} ^{adv., 1 Tim. v. 9 only} ^p ch. i. 4 reff. ^q ver. 2 reff. ^r = Matt.
^{xvii. 24. xxi. 34. Exod. xxx. 16.} ^s ver. 17. ch. xi. 2, 4, 5, 39. ^{Rom. iii. 21.} ^{1 Tim. v. 10 al.}

6. rec ins τον bef αβρααμ, with AD²·3KL[P]N³ rel Chr Thdrt Damasc: om BCD¹N¹
 17. εὐλογησεν AC[P 47 Euthal-ms] Chr.,—ηγλ. AD¹.

Böhme, "Abrahamidas quidem, sed fratres tamen." for this quite reverses the *τουτέστιν* and *καίπερ*. I take this to be intended: by the first clause, *τουτέστιν τοὺς ἀδελφούς αὐτῶν*, that the Levitical tithe right was all within the limits of one race, a privilege 'de Abrahamide in Abrahamidem,' and therefore less to be wondered at, and involving less difference between man and man, than the tithe right of Melchisedek over Abraham, one of different race, and indeed over all his progeny with him. Then the second clause, *καίπερ ἐξεληλυθότας ἐκ τῆς οὐσφύς Ἀβρ.*, is inserted to shew the deep subjection of the ordinary Abrahamid to the Melchisedek priesthood, seeing that, notwithstanding his privilege of descent, he was subjected to his own priest, his brother, who in turn paid tithes in Abraham to Melchisedek).

6.] But (apodosis to μέν, ver. 5), **he whose pedigree is never** (see below) reckoned from them (contrast—οἱ ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Λευεί,—ὁ μὴ γενεαλογούμενος ἐξ αὐτῶν: also speaking for the connexion above advocated in ver. 5. The present part. gives the sense, 'who is not in the habit of having his genealogy made out' . . ., whose descent no one thinks of deducing. This is also indicated by the subjective μὴ. Had it been οὐ (as οἱ οὐκ ἡλεημένοι, 1 Pet. ii. 10) it would denote the mere matter of fact,—of whom no such genealogy exists.' This is better than with Winer, edn. 6, § 55. 5, to regard the μὴ as only a stronger form of negation. The verb is good Greek: the Egyptian priests in Herodotus, Ἐκαταίῳ γενεολογήσαντι ἑαυτὸν . . . ἀντεγενεολόγησαν κ.τ.λ., ii. 143, see also ib. 146; and in Xen. Symp. iv. 51, we have γενεαλογούσι τὴν συγγένειαν. ἐξ αὐτῶν, viz. τῶν υἱῶν Λευεί: not as Epiphan. Hæc. lxvii. 7, p. 716, a-Lapide, al., τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ, nor as Grot., from *Levi and Abraham*: and it means 'from them,' i. e. their line of descent) **hath taken tithes of Abraham** (not *took*, aor. The sentence is cast into this form, because of the *enduring nature* of the office and priesthood of Melchisedek,

which is given by the perfect tense. Doubtless the perfect might be used without any such reference, meaning, 'as the fact now stands:' indicating, as Winer, § 40. 4, that the fact endures in its significance: see below, ver. 9: but considering the connexion here, I prefer supposing it to have been intended) **and hath blessed the possessor of the promises** (Klee would urge the present sense of the participle; "*him who now possesses the promises*," but there seems to be no necessity for this. I should rather take ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐπαγ. for a quasi-official designation of Abraham (see on ch. vi. 12) as the *possessor* of the promises. As to the sense, Ec. has well expressed it: ἐξῆρε τὸν Ἀβραάμ, ἵνα πλεῖον ἐξάγῃ τὸν Μελχισεδέκ): 7.] **and** (our English 'and' is the nearest to this use of δέ, which is a faint 'but,' introducing merely a new proposition. Were it not in the middle of a sentence, 'now' after a period would best give its sense) **without all controversy** (πάντες δὲ κοινῶς καὶ ἀναντιρρήτως οἶδαμεν. Thl. See on ch. vi. 16), the less is blessed by the better (the neuters here serve entirely to generalize, as in τὸ κατέχον οἶδατε, 2 Thess. ii. 6, taken up by ὁ κατέχων, ver. 7: see reff.; and Winer, § 27. 5. So Thuc. iii. 11, τὰ κράτιστα ἐπὶ τοὺς ὑποδεεστέρους ξυνηπύχον: Xen. Anab. vii. 3. 11. On κρείττων, see note, ch. i. 4. It is obvious that the axiom here laid down only holds good where the blessing is a solemn and official one, as of a father, or a priest: as was the case here. In such cases the blesser stands in the place of God, and as so standing is of superior dignity). 8.] *Second item of superiority*, in that M.'s is an *enduring*, the Levitical a *transitory* priesthood. **And here indeed** (ὧδε, 'ut res nunc se habent:' the Levitical priesthood being still in existence in the Writer's time: οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὧδε, *τουτέστιν*, ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαμβάνοντες δεκάτας. Thl.) **men who die** (ἀποθν. first for emphasis as bringing out the point of the argument: but there is also a secondary emphasis on ἀνθρωποι: *men*, who *die*. Otherwise it

t here only.
Sur xlv. 5
only. (see
note).
u ver. 8 reff.
v ver. 1 reff.
w ch vii. 4
only.
x Luke i. 45
only.
(Exod. xxix. 26. Jer. ii. 2.) see ch ii. 10 reff. and note.

μενος ὅτι ζῇ. ⁹ καὶ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, δι' Ἀβραὰμ καὶ ABCDK
Λευεὶς ὁ ^α δεκάτας ^β λαμβάνων ^γ δεδεκάτωται. ¹⁰ ἔτι γὰρ ἐν L^{PN}
a b c d
τῇ ^α ὁσφύϊ τοῦ πατρὸς ἦν ὅτε ^ν συνήνητησεν αὐτῷ Μελχι- f g h k l
m n o
17. 47
σεδέκ. ¹¹ ^ω εἰ ^μ μὲν ^ω οὖν ^α τελείωσις διὰ τῆς Λευευιτικῆς

9. for εἰπεῖν, εἰπεν C¹ D¹ [-gr]. (δ^ι, so BD¹ N c m [47].) rec (for λευεῖς) Λευι, with C³ DKL[P] N¹ rel [vulg copt] : λευεῖς A : txt BC¹ N³ [basin].

10. [αὐτον P.] rec ins o bef μελχισεδεκ, with AC³ D³ KL[P] rel [Chr-montf Euthal-ms Thdr̄t Damasc] : om BC¹ D¹ N [47 Chr-ms].

11. for εἰ, η CL[P]. rec λευευιτικ., with ACKL[P] rel : txt BDN.

need not have been expressed : see below) receive tithes (plur. as we also use the word, signifying the different sorts of tenths taken of different things) : but there (ἐκεῖ δέ, τοῦτέστιν ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μελχισεδεκ πράγματι, Thl.), one of whom it is testified (ἄνθρωπος is not again expressed, nor is it to be supplied. The mysterious character of Melchisedek is still before the Writer. It is hardly needful to say that *Christ* cannot be meant, as Justiniani, Jac. Cappellus, Hein-sius, and Pyle have imagined. This passive sense of μαρτυροῦμαι (reff.) is unknown in classical Greek. The testimony meant is certainly that of *scripture*; probably, that in Ps. cx. 4, where an eternal priesthood, and therefore duration, is predicated of Melchisedek. So Thdr̄t., Bleek, al. It cannot well be, as Calv., Est., Drusus, Grot., Wolf, Bengel, Bisping, al., the mere negative fact of his death not being recorded, which would not amount to a testimony that he lives : and it is improbable that in so express a word as μαρτυρούμενος the Writer should, as Böhme, al. imagine, intend to combine both the positive testimony and the inference from the omission) that he liveth (this clearly cannot be interpreted of the *priesthood* of Melchisedek enduring, as (Ec. : ἡ ἀπλοῦστερον δέξαι τὸ ἐιρημένον, ὅτι ὁ τρόπος τῆς ἱερωσύνης τῶν μὲν Λευιτῶν, ἀπονήσκει καὶ γὰρ ἐπάσματο, τῆς ἀληθείας φανεῖται· ὁ δὲ τοῦ Μελχισεδεκ ζῇ : ζῇ γάρ : for what is here said is eminently personal, and that Melchisedek himself is meant, is shewn by the historical reference to the fact of his receiving tithes of Abraham. As Bleek well remarks, if ἀπονήσκοντες applies personally to the sons of Levi, ζῇ must also apply personally to Melchisedek). 9.] The Jew might reply, that it was nothing to him, if Abraham paid tithes to Melchisedek : for Abr. was no priest, and therefore paid tithes naturally to a priest : the Writer therefore proceeds to a *third proof*, shewing that *in Abraham even Levi himself*, the patriarch of the Jewish priesthood, paid tithes. So

Chrys., Thdr̄t. And so to speak (τὸ δέ, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ἡ τοῦτο σημαίνει, ὅτι καὶ ἐν συντόμῳ εἰπεῖν, ἡ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἴν' οὕτως εἰπω· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τόλμημα ἐδόκει τὸ εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὁ Λευὶ μὴπω εἰς γένεσιν παραχθὲς ἐδεκατῶθη παρὰ τοῦ Μελχισεδεκ, ἐκόλασε τοῦτο. Thl. The former of these meanings, 'in a word,' is taken by Camerarius, Jac. Cappellus, Erasmus Schmid, Elsner; the latter by vulg. ("ut ita dictum sit"), Erasm., Luther, Beza, Schlichting, Grot., and most Commentators. Bleek has gone into both these meanings, and proved by many examples that either is legitimate. Both in fact run into one. The phrase is used when any thing is about to be said that is unexpected, or somewhat strained, not likely to be universally recognized, at least in the general way in which it is asserted. So sometimes it is used for 'roughly,' 'improperly'—Plato, Legg. ii. 656 E, μυριοστὸν ἔτος . . . οὐχ ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν μυριοστὸν, ἀλλ' ὄντως. So that it may be here regarded as introducing and softening a strong saying : as Thl. above) by means of Abraham (Ἀβρ. is genitive, not accusative, as Aug. de Genesi ad lit. x. 19 (34), vol. iii. pt. ii., "propter Abraham," and Phot. (διὰ τὸν δεκατῶντα Ἀβραάμ)) Levi also, who receiveth tithes (who is the head and representative of the tithe-taking tribe. Indeed the name here is almost a collective one, the personal reference being taken up in the next clause), hath been taken tithes of (on the perfect, see above, ver. 6) : 10.] for he was yet in the loins of his father (i. e. his forefather, Abraham : for Isaac was not yet born, much less Jacob. But we need not hence understand τοῦ πατρὸς to mean "the patriarch," as, strange to say, Bleek does. On the expression cf. ver. 5) when Melchisedek met him (on the questions, for the most part unprofitable (cf. ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν), which have been raised on this proof, see Bleek, Ebrard, and Owen. It may fairly be replied to one of them, whether *Christ* also did not pay tithe in Abraham, that He never was in the loins of an earthly father).

11—25.] Further proofs of the perfec-

^γ ἱερωσύνης ἦν, ὁ λαὸς γὰρ ^ζ ἐπ' αὐτῆς ^α νεομοθέτηται, ^δ αὐτὴ ^ε ἐπὶ ^β χρεῖα κατὰ τὴν ^ς τάξιν Μελαχισεδέκ ἕτερον ^δ ἀν-
z = here only Exod xxxiv 27. (see note)
James iv 12 -θεσία, Rom iv 4)
d = Acts iii. 22, 26 al. Rom xi. 12, from Isa xi. 10.
α ch viii 6 (also pass.) only. Ps. xlii. 8 al. (-θετης, ε-δρ v 38 al. Exdr v 38 al. c ch. v. 6 reff.

om ην B. rec (for αὐτης) αὐτη, with D³KL rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc (Ec) : αὐτην k o
 [Euthal-ms] : txt ABCD¹[P]N in 17 Cyr., rec νεομοθετησθ, with D³KL rel [Chr
 Thdrt Damasc] : txt ABCD¹[P]N 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Cyr., aft τις ins γαρ D¹[gr].

tion of Christ's priesthood, as compared with the Levitical: (11—14) in that He sprang from a tribe not recognized as a priestly one by the law, thus setting aside the law: (15—19) in that He was constituted priest not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life, thus impugning the former commandment as weak and unprofitable: (20—22) in that He was made with an oath, they without one: (23, 24) in that they by reason of their transitoriness were many, He, one and unchangeable.

11.] If again (this seems the nearest English expression to εἰ μὴ οὐν. It takes up the reasoning, not from the point immediately preceding, but from the main line of argument, of which what has just preceded has been merely a co-ordinate illustration. So that it is not necessary to say here, as some have attempted to do, from what point in the preceding chapters the reasoning is resumed. The main line of thought is again referred to, dependently on the promise of Ps. cx. 4, as made to our Lord and verified in Him) perfection (in the widest sense: the bringing of man to his highest state, viz. that of salvation and sanctification: see on ver. 19, οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν δ νόμος. Commentators have too much limited it: Grot. understands *perfection of priesthood* ("quod in genere sacerdotii perfectissimum est"): Primasius and Beza, *moral perfection*: Estius, Schlichting, al., *perfect remission of sins*. But manifestly these two latter are included in the idea, which is a far more extensive one than either) were (ἦν may be rendered either by the imperf. subj. or pluperf. subj. The former, 'if perfection were,' would imply 'it is not': the latter, 'if perfection had been,' would imply, 'it was not.' The difficulty of deciding here arises from the apodosis being given in an elliptic form, viz. in that of a question in which the verb is left out) by means of (could be brought about by the instrumentality of) the Levitical priesthood (on ἱερωσύνη, see note, ver. 5),—for upon it (i. e. τῆς Δευτικῆς ἱερωσύνης: not as, reading ἐπ' αὐτῇ, many Commentators, τελειώσει, for the sake of obtaining perfection. Three meanings are legitimate for ἐπ' αὐτῆς. 1. Concerning it, it being

the objective basis or substratum of the νεομοθέτησις: as in οὐ λέγει . . . ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, Gal. iii. 16: σημεία δ ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων, John vi. 2. This is taken by Schlichting, Grot., Bleek. So 'disserere' or 'scribere superse.' 2. In its time, as ἐπ' Ὀλυμπιάδος, ἐπ' ἀρχοντος. 3. On its ground, it being the subjective basis or substratum of the νεομοθέτησις: it being presupposed, and the law-giving proceeding on it as ex concessio. This is taken with slight variations, by De Wette, Lünemann, Ebrard, al. And this seems most agreeable to the sense. For (1) would seem hardly to account for the insertion of the parenthesis at all: that the law was enacted concerning the priesthood, would certainly be no reason for here introducing it: still less would the form of the parenthesis thus be accounted for, δ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς νεομ., see below: and (2) again, being a mere notice of date, would not account for the occurrence of the parenthesis. But if we consider the priesthood as the basis on which the law was constructed, so that not the priests only, but the people also (cf. the same παντὶ τῷ λαῷ, πάντα τὸν λαόν, in ch. ix. 19) were involved in the question of the dignity and finality of the priesthood, then a sufficient reason seems to be gained for inserting the parenthesis: q. d. not only they, but the whole system of which the priesthood was the basis and centre) the people (emphatic: not ἐπ' αὐτῆς γὰρ δ λαός, but δ λαὸς γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῆς: see above) hath received the law (the verb νεομοθετεῖν is common both in classical and Hellenistic Greek. It is used sometimes with a dative of the person, so Xen. Apol. 15, περὶ Λυκούργου τοῦ Λακεδαιμονίου νεομοθετήσαντος, — sometimes with an accus. of the thing, so Xen. Rep. Laced. v. 1, ἀ μὲν οὖν ἐκάστη ἡλικία ἐνεομοθέτησεν δ Λυκούργος. The use of the passive hence is obvious: and although not justified by Greek usage, finds a parallel in such expressions as πιστευομαί τι, εὐαγγελίζομαι, &c.: see Winer, § 39. 1, edn. 6. The LXX use the word rather differently, for to teach: e. g. Ps. xxiv. 8, νεομοθετήσει ἀμαρτάνοντας ἐν δδῷ,—ver. 12, νεομοθετήσει αὐτῶν ἐν δδῷ: Ps. cxviii. 33, νεομοθετήσόν με κύριε τὴν ὁδὸν τῶν δικαιοματίων σου. The perfect is used, as indicating

e ch. iii. 15. ix. 12 f μετατιθεμένης γὰρ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἡ ἐξ ἡ ἀνάγκης καὶ νόμου ἰ μεταθέσεις γίνονται. 13 k ἐφ' ὃν γὰρ λέγεται ταῦτα φυλῆς ἐτέρας ἰ μετέσχηκεν, m ἂφ' ἧς οὐδεὶς ἰ προσέσχηκεν νόμους, Plato, Minos, p. 316 c. Xen Mem iv 4 14. Philen. 14 ch. xi. 5. xi. 27 only t. 2 Macc. xi. 24 only y. h 2 Cor ix 7 only κατ' ἀν. k = Mark ix. 12, 13 Rom iv. 9. 1 ch. ii. 14 i eff. m = John i. 46. xi. i. xix. 38. n intr., 1 Tim. iii. 8. iv. 13. οἱ προσχόντες (τοῖς ναυτικοῖς), Thuc. i. 15. f ver 11. g h k l 17. 47

[for ου, μη P.]

12. om και νομου B.

13. λεγει D1. for προσεσχηκεν, προσεσχεν AC 17: μετεσκε [P] k: μετεσχηκεν a o: txt BDKLN rel [Chr, Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc].

the fact that the people was still remaining and observing the law),—**what further need (was there)** (what need *after that*,—any longer, that being so: so Sext. Empir. cited by Wetst.: εἰ δὲ ἀπαξ ἐξ ὑποθέσεως λαμβάνεται τινα, καὶ ἐστὶ πιστά, τίς ἐτι χρεία ἀποδεικνύναι αὐτά;) **that a different priest (ἔτερον, more than ἄλλον—not only another, but of a different kind) should arise (Herod. iii. 66, Σιέριδιν . . βασιλέα ἀνεστῶτα. See reff. There is no idea in it of suddenness or unexpectedness, as Böhme (not Tholuck in his last edn.)), after the order of Melchisedek, and that he (the priest that should arise) is said to be not after the order of Aaron (there have been various views as to the construction. Some, as Faber Stap., Luther, al., take the whole as one sentence only, thus: τίς ἐτι χρεία λέγεσθαι κατὰ τ. τάξ. M. ἔτ. ἀνίστ. ἱερέα, κ. οὐ κατὰ τ. τάξ. Ἀαρ., “what further need was there for it to be said that another priest should arise, after Melchisedek’s, and not after Aaron’s order?” But thus we should have expected ἀνίστ. to be future (this perhaps is not decisive, but notwithstanding Tholuck’s protest against Bleek, I cannot help still believing it would have been so): besides that the transposition of the infinitives is very harsh (Tholuck tries to justify this by ὅσα . . . ποσούτω τὸ τί χρὴ ποιεῖν συμβουλεύσαι χαλεπώτερον εἶναι, Demosth. p. 66. But the case is not parallel, inasmuch as there is no ambiguity in it). Besides which, ἔτερα can hardly have any other meaning than that in ver. 15, not = ἄλλος, but implying diversity of nature and order: in which case it cannot be the subject to λέγεσθαι, which has κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρὼν for its predicate, thus nullifying the ἔτερον. So that we must either take λέγεσθαι impersonal, ‘that it is said,’ or, which is preferable, supply as above, ‘that he (the coming priest) is said.’ οὐ would more naturally be μή, in a sentence expressing necessity, which of itself involves a judgment, see Hartung, Partikell. ii. 125. But in such cases οὐ may stand where the**

denial is carried in the particle itself, which seems to bring out a negative expression as set over against a positive one: e. g. Aristoph. Eccles. 581, ἀλλ’ οὐ μέλλειν ἀλλ’ ἄπτεσθαι καὶ δὴ χρὴ τὰς διανοίας: Thuc. i. 51, ὑποτίθησαντες ἀπ’ Ἀθηναίων εἶναι οὐχ ὅσας ἑώρων ἀλλὰ πλείους. So here the οὐ must be closely joined with κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Ἀαρ., not with λέγεσθαι: or we must with Bleek suppose that χρεία ἦν or ἡδύνατο is to be supplied with οὐ)? 12.] For if the priesthood is changed (better thus than E. V., “the priesthood being changed,” which gives the reader the idea of μετατιθείσης), there takes place of necessity a change of the law (not ‘of law,’ which would be decidedly wrong, and would require τοῦ νόμου, as in a general sentence, implying ‘the law’ of the particular case in view; νόμου, anarthrous, means that law, which had already begun to be used as a proper name, the well-known law of Moses) also (viz. of that law, which, as above, is legislated upon the ground of that priesthood: not, as Beza, Grot., al., of the law of the priesthood only, nor as Calvin, a-Lapide, Jac. Cappell., Böhme, Kuinoel, al., of the ceremonial law only. Chrys. says rightly: εἰ δὲ ἔτερον δεῖ ἱερέα εἶναι, μᾶλλον δὲ ἑτέραν ἱερωσύνην, ἀνάγκη καὶ νόμον ἔτερον εἶναι· τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς τοὺς λέγοντας· τί ἔδει καινῆς διαθήκης: The connexion is with the parenthetical in ver. 11, which was inserted to prepare the way for our verse. Bleek, De Wette, al. deny the reference to the parenthetical clause in ver. 11, and regard our verse as preparing the way for what follows: “It lays down the ground, why not without urgent cause a change of the priesthood took place” (De W.), that cause being that the law itself was to be abrogated. The Writer as yet expresses himself mildly and cautiously: the μεταθέσεις here in fact amounts to the ἀθέτησις in ver. 18, but is not yet so expressed). 13.] Confirmation of the position that a change is made in the law, by another fact indicative of a change in the priesthood. For He with reference to

τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ¹⁴ ὁ πρόδῃλον γὰρ ὅτι ἐξ Ἰούδα¹ ἀνατέ-
 τалкен ὁ² Κύριος ἡμῶν,³ εἰς ἣν φυλὴν περὶ ἱερέων οὐδὲν
 Μωυσῆς ἐλάλησεν.¹⁵ καὶ⁴ περισσότερον ἔτι⁵ κατὰδῃλον
 ἐστίν,⁶ εἰ⁷ κατὰ τὴν⁸ ὁμοιότητα Μελχισεδὲκ⁹ ἀνίσταται

i. 19. Gen. xix. 25 al. see Zech. iii. 9
 v. 32. 1 Pet. i. 11 only. q see ch. ii. 3 am. 20
 i. 4 14. u = Matt. vii. 11. John vii. 23. x. 35. r = Acts ii. 25. Eph
 w ch. iv. 15 only. Gen. i. 11, 12. x as above (w). Wisd. xiv. 19 only. v = Gal. iv. 28. Lam. i. 12.
 only. J. 17. Matt. xvi. 16. xi. 2. James i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 17. xiv. 30. y ver. 11.

14. rec ουδ. π. ιερωσυνης, with D³KL rel syrr [æth Chr-montf, Thdrt Damasc]: π.
 ιερωσ. ουδεν [C³]D²: txt ABC¹D¹[P]X³ 17 arm[: ουδ. π. ιερων 47 vulg(and F¹-lat)
 corptt] Chr-mss, Cyr.¹—μωυσης bef ουδεν X¹.
 15. om την B.

whom (cf. reff.: and *ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πᾶν εἰπεῖν*, Plato, Legg. ii. p. 667 b) these things (viz. the promise in Ps. cx.: not, these which I am now saying) are said, is member of (*hath taken part in*: the perfect implying the enduring of His humanity) a different tribe (from that of Levi, which has been already sufficiently indicated in the preceding context), of which (sprung from which, coming from which, see reff.) no one hath (ever, to this day) given attention (applied himself, see ch. ii. 1, note; and reff. So Demosth. p. 10. 25, τῷ πολέμῳ προσείχεν: Xen. Mem. iv. 1. 2, ταχὺ μανθάνειν οἷς προσείχον: Polyæn. p. 415, ταῖς γεωργίαις προσείχον) to the altar (i. e. as a general and normal practice, had any thing to do with the service of the priesthood).

14.] *Proof of ver. 13.* For it is plain to all (πρόδῃλον, of that which lies before men's eyes, plain and undoubted. τὸ πρόδῃλον, ὡς ἀναντιρρήτον τέδεικε, Thdrt. Jos. B. J. ii. 3. 1, πρόδῃλον ἦν τὸ ἔθνος οὐκ ἠρεμήσεν: and other examples in Wetst. and Bleek) that our Lord (this is the only place in Scripture where Christ is called by this appellation, now so familiar to us, without the addition of either His personal or official name. 2 Pet. iii. 15, τὴν μακροθυμίαν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, is hardly an exception: see there) hath arisen (some have thought that this word, which, as an intransitive verb, is generally used of the heavenly bodies, has reference to our Lord's rising as a Sun of righteousness: so Mal. iv. 2, ἀνατελεῖ ὁ ἥλιος δικαιοσύνης: Isa. lx. 1, ἥκει σου τὸ φῶς κ. ἡ δόξα κυρίου ἐπὶ σε ἀνατέταλκε: Num. xxiv. 17, ἀνατελεῖ ἄστρον ἐξ Ἰακώβ, to which Thl. thinks there is allusion here: σειμὴ ἡ λέξις τὸ ἀνατέταλκε, καὶ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Βαλαὰμ προφητείας ληφθεῖσα καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Μαλαχίου κ.τ.λ. which is quite legitimate, and a very beautiful thought, to regard these sublime ideas as having been in the Writer's mind, while at the same time we confess, that the word is used of the springing or rising up of other things, e. g. of water, Herod. iv. 52: and

especially of the sprouting of plants—Jos. Antt. i. 1, εὐθὺς φυτὰ τε καὶ σπέρματα γῆθεν ἀνέτειλεν: and see reff. And in this sense probably is ἀνατολή given as the rendering of *נֶחֱמֶשׁ*, "Branch," Zech. iii. 1; vi. 12, though the two ideas, of the Sun, and of a branch, came to be mingled together, as in Luke i. 78) out of Judah (this word may be the name, either of the tribe, or of the patriarch. From Gen. xlix. 9, 10, it would appear to be the personal name: but preceded and followed as it is here by *φυλῆς ἑτέρας*, and *εἰς ἣν φυλὴν*, it would rather seem to be that of the tribe), with reference to (*εἰς* nearly as *ἐπὶ* above; that which is said with reference to any one, being regarded as tending towards, and finding its issue in him: for its usage, see reff.) which tribe Moses said nothing concerning priests (i. e. nothing to imply that any priest should be or be consecrated out of it: πάντα γὰρ τὰ τῆς ιερωσύνης εἰς τὴν Λευϊτικὴν ἀνέθηκε φυλὴν. Thl.).

15—17.] *Another proof that the law is changed* (set aside): *for our Lord could not be of the law* (= Levitical priesthood), *seeing He is an eternal Priest.*

15.] And it (viz. the change of the law; the proposition of ver. 12.: so Eccl., οὐ μόνον ἔρθεν δῆλον ἐστίν, δτι ἐνηλλάγη ἡ τε λατρεία καὶ ἡ διαθήκη . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου περισσῶς δῆλον ἐστίν . . . καὶ ἐκ τούτου κατάδηλος ἐστίν ἡ τε ἐναλλαγή καὶ ἡ μετάθεσις τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης. Chrys. takes 'εἰ' to mean the distinction between the Levitical and the N. T. High Priesthood: τί ἐστι κατὰδῃλον; τὸ μέσον τῆς ιερωσύνης. Jac. Cappellus, and Bengel—"illud quod in ver. 11 assertur, nullam consummationem factam esse per sacerdotium Leviticum," and so Delitzsch. Primasius, Hammond, al., that the *priesthood* is altered: Ebrard strangely supplies, "that our Lord sprung from Judah:" indeed his whole comment on this verse is one of those curiosities of exegesis which unhappily abound in his otherwise valuable commentary. But the alteration of the *law* is the proposition here: and so Estius, Schlich-

, Matt xxv 15. ἱερεὺς ἕτερος, 16 ὃς οὐ ^z κατὰ ^a νόμον ἐντολῆς ^b σαρκίνης
 1 Tim i 8. ἡγέγονεν, ἀλλὰ ^z κατὰ δύναμιν ζωῆς ^c ἀκαταλύτου. 17 ^d μαρ-
 a Rom. vii. 21, 22. τυρεῖται γὰρ ^e ὅτι οὐ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα κατὰ τὴν ^f τάξιν
 b Rom. vii. 14. 1 Cor iii. 1. c here only +. Dion. Hal. x. 31, τὸ
 2 Cor iii 3 only 2 Chron xxxii. 8. Ezek xi, 19. xxxvi. 26 only d ver. 8. e = Gosspp passim Heb.,
 τῆς δημαρχίας ἀκατάλυτον ἐσθαι κράτος. f ch. v 6 reff.
 ch. x. 8. xi 18 Psa. cix. 4. i ch. v 6 reff.

16. rec σαρκίνης, with C-corr D³K rel Chr-montf, Thdrt [Thl Ec]: txt ABC¹D¹H (in title) L[P]N^a d f h l n 17 Dion, Chr-3-mss, Cyr[-p, Euthal-ms Damase]. (The title in H runs thus: ὅτι παύσεται ἡ τοῦ ἀρῶν ἱερωσύνη ἡ ἐπὶ γῆς οὐσα: ἵσταται δὲ ἡ οὐράνιος ἡ χριστοῦ ἐξ ἑτέρου γένους, οὐ κατὰ σάρκα, οὐ διὰ νόμου σαρκίνου.)

17. rec μαρτυρεῖ (for -ρεῖται), with CD³KL rel Thdrt [Damase Ec]: txt ABD¹[P]N 17 [syrr] copt Chr [Euthal-ms] Cyr, Thl. aft συ ins ei D³K[P] b o [lutt syrr copt æth (so v. 21 also)].

ting, Seb. Schmidt, Kuinoel, Tholuck, Bleek, Lunem., al.) is yet more abundantly (see for περισσότερον, on ch. ii. 1) manifest (κατάδηλος is another stronger form of δηλος, common in the classics (reff.), but found only here in LXX and N. T.), if (i. e. *siquidem*, seeing that: τὸ εἰ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὅτι νοήσεις, ἡγουν ἐπειδὴ, Ec.: “*si . . . rem dubitative loquitur, sed affirmative, quasi diceret . . . quia*” &c., Primasius, in Bleek. See reff. ὅτι could not well have been connected it with κατάδηλον, ‘it is evident, that’ (&c.) according to the similitude of (= κατὰ τὴν τάξιν before) Melchisedek ariseth a different priest (it is best to take ἱερεὺς ἕτερος as the subject, ἕτερος being a mere epithet: not, as Schulz (also in ver. 11), ἱερεὺς predicatively, “*another ariseth as priest*,” nor as some (?) mentioned by Lunem., to take ἱερεὺς and ἕτερος both predicatively, “*He ariseth as another priest*,” viz. our Lord). 16.] who (viz. ἱερεὺς ἕτερος. τίς; ὁ Μελχισεδέκ οὗτος; οὐ, ἀλλ’ ὁ χριστός. Chrys.: and so Ec. Thl. mentions both ways of taking it, and expounds both at some length) is appointed (hath become priest) not according to the law of a carnal commandment (i. e. not in accordance with, following out, the rule and order of an exterior ordinance founded on the present fleshly and decaying state of things. So Thdrt., σαρκινὴν γὰρ ἐντολὴν τοῦτο κέκληκεν, ὥς τοῦ νόμου διὰ τὸ θνητὸν τῶν ἀνθρώπων κελεύοντος, μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τελευτήν, τὸν ἐκείνου παῖδα τὴν ἱερωσύνην λαμβάνειν. And so most Commentators. But others take νόμος to mean strictly the law of Moses as a whole, and ἐντολῆς σαρκίνης as = a plural, and designating the character of those commandments of which the law was composed. So Syr., Chrys. (καλῶς αὐτόν—τὸν νόμον—ἐντολὴν ἐκάλεσε σαρκινὴν πάντα γὰρ ὅσα διαρίετο σαρκικὰ ἦν. τὸ γὰρ λέγειν, περίτεμε τὴν σάρκα, χρίσον τ. σάρκα, λούσον τ. σάρκα, καθάρισον τ. σάρκα,

περίκερον τ. σάρκα, ἐπίδησον τ. σάρκα, θρέψον τ. σάρκα, ἀργήσον τὴν σαρκί, ταῦτα, εἰπέ μοι, οὐχὶ σαρκικά; εἰ δὲ θέλεις μαθεῖν καὶ τίνα ἃ ἐπηγγέλλετο ἀγαθὰ, ἄκουε πολλῇ ζωῇ, φησί, τὴν σαρκί, γάλα κ. μέλι τὴν σαρκί, εἰρήνη τὴν σαρκί, τρυφή τὴν σαρκί. ἀπὸ τούτου τοῦ νόμου τὴν ἱερωσύνην ἔλαβεν ὁ Ἰαβάν ὁ μέντοι Μελχισεδέκ οὐχ οὕτω), Ec. (τί ἐστὶ, κατὰ νόμον ἐντ. σαρκ.; ὅτι ὁ νόμος τὰς ἐντολάς σαρκικὰς εἶχεν, οἷον περιτομήν, ἀργίαν, τόδε φαγείν κ. τόδε μὴ φαγείν, ὅπερ σαρκὸς ἦν κ. οὐ ψυχῆς καθάρσια; οὐ γέγονεν οὖν ἀρχιερεὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ τὰς σαρκικὰς ἐντολάς ἐντελλομένου). Other Commentators, who take νόμον as I have done above, yet understand σαρκίνης as a subjective epithet, a law which was in itself transitory: so Böhme, Kuinoel, al.), but according to the power of an indissoluble life (the two clauses closely correspond in rhythm, as is much the practice of the Writer. The power here spoken of does not, however, strictly correspond, in its relation to the priesthood spoken of, with ‘the law of a carnal commandment’ above. That was the rule, by and after which the priesthood was constituted: this, the vigour inherent in the glorious priesthood of Christ,—for it is of His enduring Melchisedek-priesthood in glory (see Delitzsch and Hofmann) that this is spoken—to endure for ever. Canero, Calovius, al., have thought δύναμις to be, Christ’s power to confer life on others: Carpzov, al., the enduring nature of the divine decree which constituted this priesthood: but both are shewn to be wrong by the next verse, in which the ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα is the point brought out). 17.] Proof of the last clause: κατασκευάζει πᾶς εἴπε τὸ ἀκατάλυτον ζωῆς, καὶ φησιν ὅτι ἡ γραφὴ λέγει αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα εἶναι ἱερέα. Thl. The stress of the citation is on εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. For he (the ἱερεὺς ἕτερος) is borne witness of that (just as in μαρτυρούμενος ὅτι ζῇ, ver. 8. Τὸ ὅτι belongs, not to the citation, but to the verb. If the rec. μαρ-

Μελχισεδέκ. ¹⁸ ἀθέτησις μὲν γὰρ γίνεται ^h προαγωγῆς ^g ἐντολῆς διὰ τὸ αὐτῆς ⁱ ἀσθενὲς καὶ ^k ἀνωφελές, ¹⁹ οὐδὲν γὰρ ¹ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος, ^m ἐπεισαγωγὴ δὲ ⁿ κρείττονος ^h ἐλπίδος, δι' ἧς ^p ἐγγίζομεν τῷ ^p θεῷ. ²⁰ Καὶ ^q καθ'

...ἐλπιδος d.
ABCDK
LPN
a b c f g
h k l m
n o
17. 47

¹ = Gal. iv. 9. consti., Rom. viii. 3.

¹⁰ Jeff and note.

¹¹ ἑτέρας ἐπεισαγωγῆς, Jos. Antt. xi. 6. 2.

⁶ reff.

^{cxi} viii. 14.

^k Tit. iii. 9 only.

^{προν} xxviii. 3.

^m here only.

^{see} Thud. viii. 92.

^{Ελ} ad. xix. 23.

^q ch. iii. 3. ix. 27.

^{Jer} ii. 8.

ⁿ ch. i. 4 reff.

^{Lev} x. 3.

^{Isa} xxix. 13.

^{lviii} 2.

^P s.

^g ch. ix. 26.

^{only} t.

^(τρεῖν) ch. x.

²⁵.

^h = 1 Tim. i.

¹⁸ t. 1st.

^{Matt} xxi.

⁹ al fr. Wisd.

^{xix} 11.

^o = ch. iii.

18. προαγωγῆς D¹[gr].

19. ἐπεισαγωγῆς D¹[gr].

ἐγγίζομεν A 31.

τρεῖ be taken, ὁ θεός must be supplied, as in ch. i. 6, and passim in this Epistle. And then also the *δ*-ti belongs to the verb) Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek. 18, 19.] These verses belong to the proof of 15—17, expanding the conclusion thence derived, and expressing it more decidedly than before in ver. 12.

For moreover (μὲν γάρ, at the same time that by the γάρ it carries on the reasoning, by the elliptic μὲν suggests some succeeding position as introduced by a δέ. So Eurip. Med. 698, ξυνγινώσκῃ μὲν γὰρ ἦν σε λυπεῖσθαι, γινώσκῃ—"certainly, I concede it, thy grief was pardonable, . . . (but . . .):" and in a sentence made as an example, ἐγὼ μὲν καὶ Διονύσιος ἐδειπνοῦμεν, σὺ μὲν γὰρ οὐ παρεγένου—"for you, you will remember, were not there (but we were)." See Hartung, Partikell. ii. 414. So here we may regard the μὲν as elliptical, and pointing at an understood contrast in the permanence of the ζωὴ ἀκατάλυτος just mentioned. It is hardly possible, even with the right construction of the sentence (see below), to regard this μὲν as answering to the δέ following ἐπεισαγωγῆ: its connexion with the γάρ will not allow this. If this had been intended, we should have expected the form of the sentence to be ἀθέτησις γὰρ γίνεται τῆς καὶ προαγωγῆς ἐντολῆς) there takes place (ἀπὸ κοινοῦ τὸ γίνεται, Ec.: that is, it belongs to both ἀθέτησις and ἐπεισαγωγῆ—see below) an abrogation (τί ἐστὶν ἀθέτησις; κλειψίς, ἐκβολή, Chrys.: ἀθέτησις, τούτέστιν ἐναλλαγὴ κ. ἐκβολή, Thl. Though nowhere else found in all Greek, except in the two places in this Epistle, it is a perfectly regular word from ἀθετέω, = νοθεύω, νομοθέτης) of the preceding commandment (ἐντολῆς is anarthrous because the epithet προαγωγῆς is thrown strongly forward into emphasis, which emphasis would be weakened by τῆς preceding, and altogether lost in τῆς ἐντολῆς τῆς προαγωγῆς. The ἐντολῆς intended is that mentioned in ver. 16, according to which the priesthood was constituted, not, as Chrys., Thdrt., Ec., Thl., Prim., Calv., Grot., Hamm., Kuinoel, al.,

the whole Mosaic law, however much that may be involved in the assertion, cf. the parenthesis in ver. 11. This commandment went before—not merely in time, but was an introduction to and gave way before the greater and final ordinance) on account of its weakness and unprofitableness (on the neuter concrete where the abstract substantive would rather be looked for, see Winer, edn. 6, § 34. 2, and besides reff., Rom. ii. 4; ix. 22: ch. vi. 17 al. Rom. viii. 3, as Gal. iv. 9, is remarkably parallel, both in thought and mode of expression: one of those coincidences which could hardly take place where there was not community of thought and diction),—for the law perfected nothing (this parenthetical clause is inserted to explain the implication contained in αὐτῆς ἀσθενὲς κ. ἀνωφελές. The law had not the power to bring any thing whatever to perfection, to its appointed end and excellence:—perfection, in any kind, was not by the law. This assertion must not be limited by making οὐδὲν represent a masculine, as Chrys. (τί ἐστιν, οὐδὲν ἐτελείωσεν; οὐδένα, φησὶν, τέλειον εἰργάσατο παρακοόμενος. ἄλλως δέ οὐδὲ εἰ ἡκούσθη, τέλειον ἐποίησεν ἂν καὶ ἐνάρτεον. τῶς δὲ οὐ τοῦτο φησιν ὁ λόγος ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐδὲν ἴσχυσε καὶ εἰκότως γράμματα γὰρ ἦν κείμενα, τότε πρῶτον καὶ τότε μὴ πρῶτον ὑποτιθέμενα μόνον, οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ δύναμιν ἐντιθέντα. ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ τοιαύτη). Similarly Ec. and Thl.),—and (δὲ, see above on μὲν γάρ: 'and' is the only English conjunction which will preserve the true connexion and construction of the sentence) (there takes place; γίνεται belongs to this also, see below) an introduction (ἐπεισαγωγῆ, superintroductio, a bringing in besides: the law being already there, this is brought in to and upon it: see reff.) of a better hope (the contrast is between the προάγονσα ἐντολή, weak and unprofitable, and a better thing, viz. the ἐλπίς which brings us near to God. This κρείττονος τινος, τούτέστιν, ἐλπίδος κ.τ.λ., is expressed by κρείττονος ἐλπίδος. This seems more natural, than with Chrys., Ec., Thl., Prim., to suppose any comparison between

rch 1 4 x.
25 Rev.
xviii. 7
sch ix 7

ἡ ὁσον ὁ οὐ ὁ χωρὶς ὁ ὄρκωμοσίας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ χωρὶς ὁ ὄρκω-
t here (3ce) and ver 28 only Ezek. xiii. 18, 19. Esdr viii. 93 (90) only. (see note)

ABCDK
LPB
a b c f g
h k l m
n o
17. 47

20. om oi μεν γαρ χωρις ορκωμοσι. (homœotel) D¹ 2. 21. 114 syr [(æth)].

the earthly hopes held out in the old covenant, and the heavenly hope of the new (εἶχε καὶ ὁ νόμος ἐλπίδα, φησὶν, ἀλλ' οὐ τοιαύτην· ἡλπίζον γὰρ εὐαρεστήσαντες ἔξειν τὴν γῆν, μηδὲν πείσεσθαι δεινόν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἐλπίζομεν εὐαρεστήσαντες, οὐ γῆν καθέξειν, ἀλλὰ τὸν οὐρανόν. Chrys.), by means of which we draw near to God (this note, of personal access to God, has been twice struck before, ch iv. 16; vi. 19, and is further on in the Epistle expanded into a whole strain of argument. See ch. ix. 11 ff.; x. 19 ff. It is that access, which was only carnally and symbolically open to them by shedding of the blood of sacrifices, but has been spiritually and really opened to us by the shedding of Christ's blood once for all, so that we being justified by faith can approach the very throne of God. The word ἐγγίζειν is the technical term in the LXX for the *drawing near* of the priests in their sacrificial ministrations.

Notice the reading ἐγγίζομεν, found in A al., as throwing light on the famous ἐξάμεν, Rom. v. 1). It remains to treat of the connexion of the above sentence, vv. 18, 19, which has been entirely mistaken by many, and among them by E. V. The ending clause, ἐπεισαγωγή δὲ κ.τ.λ., has been wrongly joined with οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελείωσεν ὁ νόμος: and that, either, 1. as *subject* to ἐτελείωσεν, as E V., "but the bringing in of a better hope did" (Beza appears here, as in so many other cases, to have led our translators into error; and so also render Castellio, Paræus, Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Michaelis, Stuart, al.): or, 2. as *predicate* to νόμος preceding, "For the law perfected nothing, but was the introduction," &c. So Faber Stap., Erasmus (par., "Lex . . . in hoc data est ad tempus ut nos perduceret ad spem meliorem"), Vatabl., Calvin, Jac. Cappel., Pyle, al. This latter is successfully impugned by Beza, on the ground that the law was not an ἐπεισαγωγή at all, from the very meaning (see above) of that word. The form of the sentence is also against it, in which the first member of the predicate, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελ. ὁ ν., has a definite verb expressed, whereas the verb of the second member would have to be understood. But neither is Beza's own connexion allowable: for first, it would be difficult to take out a positive verb and object from the clause οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐτελ. ὁ νόμος to supply after the subject ἐπεισαγωγή: secondly, there is no proper opposition in the arrangement of the two

clauses οὐδὲν γὰρ . . . ἐπεισαγωγή δέ: as the object was thrown emphatically forward in the first, so should it be at least expressed in the second: and thirdly, the position and anarthrousness of ἐπεισαγωγή itself are against the rendering: we should at least expect ἡ δὲ ἐπεισαγωγή, and probably ἡ δὲ κρείττωνος ἐλπίδος ἐπεισαγ. There is a third alternative, which Calvin takes, "nihil enim lex perfect, sed accessit introductio." But this, though tolerable sense, is harsher than either of the others. Ebrard indeed approves it, and in his usual slashing manner calls the interpretation of Bleek &c ein funktioſer Gedanke: but as usual also, he misunderstands the intent of that Gedanke: viz. that *in these words*, οὐ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰ. κ.τ.λ., there takes place both the ἀθέτησις and the ἐπεισαγωγή—a thought which, whether right or wrong, is surely not without sense.

20—22.] See summary at ver. 11. *Further proof of the superiority of the Melchisedek-priesthood of Christ—in that he was constituted in it by an oath*, thus giving it a solemnity and weight which that other priesthood had not. And inasmuch as (it was) not without an oath (Thdrt. and some of the older Commentators (hardly Chrys) join this clause with the former verse, and understand it to apply to the certainty of the κρείττων ἐλπίς. αὕτη ἡμᾶς προσοικεῖο τῷ θεῷ ὄρκος δὲ ἡμῖν βεβαῖο τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν. Thdrt. And so Calvin, "Nihil enim lex perfect, sed accessit introductio ad spem potiorem per quam appropinquamus Deo: atque hoc potiorem, quod non absque jurejurando res acta sit." So Luther. The vulg., "et quantum est, non sine jurejurando," is apparently meant as an exclamation, as indeed Primas. and Justiniani take it. But there can be little doubt that the right connexion is to take καθ' ὅσον as the protasis, the following, οἱ μὲν τοῦ αἵματος, as a parenthesis, and κατὰ τοσοῦτο κ.τ.λ. as the apodosis. So, distinctly, Thl. (having before said on καθ' ὅσον κ.τ.λ.,—ἰδοὺ ἄλλη διαφορά τοῦ τε νέου ἱερέως πρὸς τοὺς παλαιούς κ.τ.λ., he explains κατὰ τοσοῦτο, τουτέστι, καθόσον ὥμοσεν αἱ αὐτὸν ἑσθθαι ἱερέα). And so I believe Chrys. meant, though ordinarily quoted on the other side. He is by no means clear: and indeed the notes of his lectures on parts of this Epistle are evidently very imperfect. So almost all the modern Commentators, including Delitzsch. As

μοσίας εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, ²¹ ὁ δὲ μετὰ [†] ὀρκωμοσίας ^u [†] δια τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτόν, ^u "Ὁμοσεν Κύριος καὶ οὐ ^v μεταμεληθήσεται, Σὺ ἱερεὺς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· ²² κατὰ [†] τοσούτου καὶ ^w κρείττονος ^x διαθήκης γέγονεν ^y ἔγγυος Ἰησοῦς.

^x (see note.) Matt. xxvi. 28. 2 Cor. iii. 6. ch. viii. 6 all⁵. Exod. xxiv. 8. Jer. xxxvii. (xxxix.) 31. ^y here only [†]. Sir xxix. 15, 16. 2 Macc. x. 28 only. ^u ἔγγυος τῶν ἑκκοσι ταλάντων, Polyb. v. 27. 1. (-νάσθαι, Prov. vi. 1.)

21. μεθ' AB² k m Cyr-jer₁ Chr Thdrt[†] μετ' [B¹C¹N³]E³ [Euthal-ms]. om εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα N¹ (ins in marg N³). [aft συ ins εἰ D²KP vss Eus, (om₁).] rec at end ins κατὰ τὴν ταξιν μελχισηδεκ, with ADKL[P] N³-marg rel syrr copt [æth] Eus₂ Chr Thdrt Chron: om BCN¹ 17 vulg sah arm [Euthal-ms] Ambr.

22. rec τοσουτον, with D³KLN³ rel [Ath-ed, Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: txt ABCN¹ 17 Ath-ms₁ [-τω D¹P]. rec om καὶ, with AC²DKL[P]N³ rel [vulg copt Ath₁ Chr Thdrt Thl]: ins BC¹N¹ Damasc.

regards the ellipsis here, it is variously supplied. Some fill it up out of the apodosis, διαθήκης ἔγγυος γέγονε. And this seems on the whole more natural, and more agreeable to the style of our Epistle, than to put in, as E. V. after Ec., and Bengel, Lünem., al., γέγονεν ἀρχιερεὺς, or as Bleek, al., τοῦτο (viz. ἐπειταγωγὴ κρείττονος ἐλπίδος) γέγονεν (or γίνεται). ἡ ὀρκωμοσία, the swearing of an oath, is not found in classical Greek, but τὰ ὀρκωμόσια, in Plato, Phædr. p. 241 A, and Crito, p. 120 B, θύματα or ἱερεῖα being understood. Still, as Wolf remarks, ἡ ἀπωμοσία, ἡ διωμοσία, and many similar forms, are actually found),—for they, as we know (on μὲν γάρ, see above, ver. 18), without swearing of an oath are made priests (εἰσὶν γεγονότες, not only for the sake of rhythm, but as more strongly marking the existence of these priests at the time of writing. The quasi-aoristic use of γεγόνασιν is so common, that it would not convey to the reader here the meaning intended. Paulus and Klee render, "are without an oath made priests:" Böhme, "sunt sacerdotes, sed sine juramento (illi quidem singuli deinceps) facti:" which would require εἰσὶν ἱερεῖς χωρὶς ὀρκ. γεγονότες. Michaelis would render it "fuerunt, i. e. esse desiderunt:" which is against both grammar and context), but He with swearing of an oath, by Him who saith (i. e. certainly not the Psalmist, as some (hardly Schlichting), who cannot be said to have spoken this πρὸς αὐτόν, unless indeed we take πρὸς in the mere secondary sense of 'with reference to.' In the following citation it is the words of address only to which this refers: the former part is the mere introduction to them. Not seeing this has led to the above mistake. It was God who addressed Him, God who made Him priest, God who swore unto Him) to Him, The Lord (κύριος, as commonly in LXX, for ἡγῆ) swear, and will not repent (so ref.

Jer. Heb., דָּרְךְ נָה: i. e. the decree stands fast, and shall undergo no change), Thou art a priest for ever (see var. readd.):—of so much (in that same proportion, viz. as the difference between the oath and no oath indicates) better a testament (the meanings of διαθήκη, 1. an appointment, without concurrence of a second party, of somewhat concerning that second party,—of which nature is a last will and testament; 2. a mutual agreement in which all parties concerned consent, = a covenant, in the proper sense,—being confessed, our business here is, not, as Ebrard absurdly maintains, to enquire what is the fixed theological acceptance of the word, and so to render it here, irrespective of any subsequent usage by our Writer himself; but to enquire, 1. how he uses it in this Epistle, 2. whether he is likely to have used it in more than one sense:—and to render accordingly. Now it cannot well be doubted, that in ch. ix. 16, 17, he does use it in the sense of "testament." And just as little can it be questioned, that he is speaking there of the same thing as here; that the καινὴ διαθήκη there answers to the κρείττων διαθήκη here, this first mention of it being in fact preparatory to that fuller treatment. I therefore keep here to the E. V., which Bleek also approves in spite of Ebrard's strong but silly dictum, that every passage is to be interpreted as a reader would understand it who had never read any further) also hath Jesus become surety (ἔγγυος, see reff., occurs in the Apocrypha, and in the later classics, e. g. Xen. Vectig. iv. 20, τῷ δημοσίῳ ἐστὶ λαβεῖν ἔγγυους παρὰ τῶν μισθομένων, and Polyb. in reff.: but the form ἔγγυητός is much more common. Bl. remarks that Moeris's notice is wrong, ἔγγυον Ἀττικῶς, ἔγγυητὴν Ἑλληνικῶς. "Jesus is become the surety of the better covenant, i. e. in His person security and certainty is given to men, that a better covenant is made and sanctioned by God. For Christ, the

z = Luke xi. 53. 23 καὶ οἱ μὲν ^zπλείονές εἰσιν ἱερεῖς γεγονότες, διὰ τὸ
Acts ii. 40.
 xiii. 31 al.
 Num ix. 19. θανάτῳ ^aκωλύεσθαι ^bπαραμένειν 24 ὁ δὲ διὰ τὸ ^cμένειν
Acts xvi. 6
 al. Exod.
 xxxvi. 6. αὐτὸν ^cεἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ^dἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ^eἱερωσύνην.
b 1 Cor xvi. 6 Phil. i. 25 James i. 25 only. Gen xlv. 33 (see note). c John iiii. 35 bis xii. 34. 2 Cor ix.
 9, from Ps. cxi. 9. 1 Pet. i. 25, from Isa xl. 8. 1 John ii. 17 only. see ver. 3. d here only† (see note).
 e ver. 11.

23. rec γεγονότες bef ἱερεῖς, with BL[P]N rel vulg (Syr) syr copt [æth arm Euthalms] Eus, Chr Thdrt Damasc: om γεγ. K: txt ACD 17 Chr-ms Cyr₂[p]. [τω P Eus-ms.]

24. for ἱερωσύνην, ιερατιαν D¹.

Son of God, became man, to publish this covenant on earth,—has sealed it with His sufferings and death, and by His resurrection from the dead was declared with power to be sent by God as the Founder of such a Covenant." Lünemann. This seems better, considering the context, in which our hope mainly, and not at present Christ's satisfaction, is in question, than to bring in, as Calov., al., that satisfaction, or to regard His suretyship (Limborch, Baumgarten, al.) as meaning His mediatorship (see ch. viii. 6, where He is described as κρείττωνος διαθήκης μεσίτης) seen from both sides—that He is God's surety for man and man's surety for God. Ἱεροῦς is emphatically placed at the end: cf. John xix. ult.).

23—25.] *Further proof still of the superiority of Christ's priesthood, in that the Levitical priests were continually removed by death: Christ is undying and abiding.* This point was slightly touched before in ver. 8, and again in ver. 16 f.: in the first place, it was to shew the abiding nature of the superiority of the priesthood—its endurance in Melchisedek, and in Christ, Melchisedek's antitype, as contrasted with dying men who here receive titles. In the second, it was to bring out the difference between the ordinances which constituted the two priesthoods: the one, the law of a carnal commandment, the other, the power of an endless life. Here, the *personal* contrast is dwelt on: the *many*, which change: the *one*, who abides.

23.] And they indeed (the οἱ μὲν γὰρ of ver. 20: i. e. the Levitical priests) are appointed (on εἰσὶν γεγονότες, see above, ver. 20. ἱερεῖς is interposed to give it the secondary emphasis) *priests in numbers* (the chief emphasis is on *πλείονες*, as contrasted with ἀπαράβ. below. The alternative rendering given as possible in Bleek, "they indeed are many, who have been made priests," is hardly probable, seeing that thus the article οἱ would more naturally precede ἱερεῖς), on account of their being by death hindered from continuing (in *life*? or, in their *priesthood*? The latter is taken by Ec., Grot., Seb. Schmidt, Ernesti, Wahl

and Bretschneider, Kuinoel, al. And this is the more probable. The verb is a vox media, and may be applied to any sort of endurance treated of in the context (so in the examples cited from Herod. i. 30, καὶ σφι εἶδε ἅπασιν τέκνα ἐκγενόμενα καὶ πάντα παραμέναντα, and Artemidor. ii. 27, γυναῖκά τε κ. παῖδας μὴ παραμένειν μαντεύεται): which clearly here treats of abiding in the priesthood: besides which, it would be somewhat tautological to say that they were hindered by death from continuing in life. The other view is taken by Raphel, Wolf, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, De Wette, Lünemann; not seeing, says Delitzsch, was das für eine närrische platte Rede ist!)

24.] but He, on account of his remaining for ever (here again, our former argument conversely applies, and obliges us to understand this μένειν of endurance now in *life*, not in *priesthood*. It would be tautology to say, as Estius, Seb. Schmidt, al., "because He remains a priest for ever, He has an unchangeable priesthood:" besides that thus the members of the parallelism would not correspond. They, on account of their deaths, are subject to continual renewal: He, because He lives for ever, has, &c. See, besides reff., John xxi. 22 f.: 1 Cor. xv. 6: Phil. i. 25), *hath his priesthood unchangeable* (such is the construction: as in such sentences as εἶπε μεγάλη τῇ φωνῇ,—and χαλεπὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀποκαθάρσιν, Plut. de Discr. Am. et Adult., § 35, in Bl. The art. in such case is quasi-personal, and the adjective a pure predicate, not an epithet. ἀπαράβατος is a word of later Greek: see Lob. on Phryn. p. 313 (ἀπαράβατον παρ' αὐτοῦ λέγεται, ἀλλ' ἀπαράλιπτον: on which Lob says, "Ratio convenit: nam παρὰ-βατον vetus est sed poeticum: ἀπαράβατον neque vetus, neque oratoricum"). Many expositors, Thdrt., Ec., Thl., al., take it actively, διὰδοχον οὐκ ἔχουσιν, μὴ παραβαίνουσιν εἰς ἄλλον. But it seems doubtful whether the word ever has this meaning. Palm and Rost give it, but cite only this place as justifying it. On the other hand, the examples in Bleek and Wetst. all tend to substantiate the passive meaning, *unalterable*; which may not

25 ὁθεν καὶ σώζειν εἰς τὸ παντελὲς δύναται τοὺς ἡ προσ-
 ερχομένους δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ θεῷ, πάντοτε ζῶν εἰς τὸ ἐντυ-
 χάνειν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. 26 τοιοῦτος γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ ἔπρεπεν
 ἀρχιερεὺς, ὁ ὅσιος Ἀκάκος ἀμίαντος, ἱεροχωρισμένος

...ακακος
 C.
 ABDKL
 P^a a b
 c f g h k
 l m n o
 17. 47

1 Acts iii. 19 vii 19. Rom. i. 11, 20. ch. ix. 28 al. k Acts xxv 24. Rom. vii. 26, 34. xi 2 only; τ. 2 Macc.
 iv. 36 al. (-τεύεις, 1 Tim i. 1.) 1 see ch vii 1. 1 Cor v. 1 m ch. vi 7. n ch.
 ii 10 reff. o of persons, Acts ii. 27 & xiii (34), 35, from Ps xv 10 Tit i 8. (1 Tim ii 8) Rev xi.
 4. xvi. 5 only. Ps iv. 3 al. p = here (Rom xvi. 18) only Jer xi 19 q ch. xiv 16 reff.
 1. 27. 1 Pet. i 4 only τ. Wisd. iii. 13. 2 Macc xiv. 36. r = Rom vii 35, 39 (see note) Neh. ix 2

26. rec om 1st καί, with CKL[P]N rel latt copt [aeth arm Bas, Chr, Euthal-mss
 Thdr̄t]: ins ABD syrr Eusj. aft ακακος ins καί A.

be passed by or put aside. So Galen i. in Hippocr. says, πρὸς γὰρ τὸ κατεπεῖγον αἰεὶ χρὴ τὸν ἱατρὸν ἵστασθαι, καὶ μὴ καθάπερ νόμον ἀπαράβατον φυλάσσειν τὰ κελευθέντα πράττεσθαι. The same expression, νόμος ἀπαράβατος, is found in Epictet. 75. The sun, in Plut. de Oracul. Defect. p. 410, has a τάξις ἀπαράβατος: and Hierocles, Aur. Carm. p. 26, has, τὸ ἀπαράβατον τῆς ἐν τοῖς δημιουργηθεῖσιν εὐταξίας, and p. 72, ἡ τῶν καθηκόντων τήρησις ἀπαράβατος. So vulg. and D-lat., "*sempiternum*." Ambr. de Fuga Sæculi c. 3 (16), vol. i. p. 424, "*imprævaricabile*." Aug. de Pecc. Mer. i. 27 (50), vol. x. pt. i., "*intransgressibile*").

25.] Whence (ἐπειδὴ, φησίν, ἀεὶ ζῇ) also (as a natural consequence, something else, flowing from and accompanying the last: but with a slightly characteristic force: a new and higher thing follows. It is not easy to say whether καὶ belongs to σώζειν or to δύναται. Rather, perhaps, to the whole sentence, to δύναται-σώζειν-εἰς-τὸ-π. κ.τ.λ.). He is able to save (in its usual solemn N. T. sense, to rescue from sin and condemnation) to the uttermost (the Syr., vulg., Chrys. (οὐ πρὸς τὸ παρὸν μόνον φησίν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ (ωῇ), Ec., Thl., Luth., Calv., Schlecht., Grot., al. take εἰς τὸ παντελὲς of time: "He is ever able to save," or "He is able to save for ever." But this is not the usage of the word. Bleek has shewn by very many instances, that completeness, not duration, is its idea: as indeed its etymology would lead us to expect. It may refer to time, when the context requires, as in Ælian, V. H. xii. 20, λέγει Ἡσίοδος τὴν ἀηδὸνα μόνην . . . διὰ τέλους ἀγρυπνεῖν, τὴν δὲ χελιδόνα οὐκ εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἀγρυπνεῖν, καὶ ταύτην δὲ ἀπολωλέκηναι τοῦ ὕπνου τὸ ἥμισυ. But even then it is entirely, throughout, and only thus comes to mean "*always*." We have εἰς τὸ π. ἀφανισθῆναι, Philo, Leg. ad Caium, § 21, vol. ii. p. 567: γηραιὸς δὲ ὢν (Isaac) κ. τὰς ὄψεις εἰς τὸ π. ἡφανισμένος, Jos. Antt. i. 18. 5: τοὺς λεπρούς εἰς τὸ π. ἐξήλασε τῆς πόλεως, ib. iii. 2. 3, &c. &c.) those that approach (cf. ἐγγιζόμεν above, ver.

19) through Him (διὰ τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν πίστεως, Ec., Thl. The contrast is to those, whose approach to God was through the Levitical priesthood) to God, ever living as He does (this participial clause in fact is expegetical of the ὁθεν, giving the reason which is wrapt up in that conjunction) to intercede for them (on ἐντυγχάνειν, see reff. "As regards its usage, it is found with a dative frequently in classic Greek: but in the definite meaning of '*adire aliquem*' in reference to (περὶ) a person or occasion, to approach any one interceding (ὑπέρ) or complaining (κατά), it is not found until the later Greek, Polyb., Plut., Themestius, Ælian: see Wetst. on Rom. viii. 26. Here it implies the whole mediatorial work, which the exalted Saviour performs for his own with his Heavenly Father, either by reference to his past death of blood by which He has bought them for himself, or by continued intercession for them. See Rom. viii. 34, below, ch. ix. 24: 1 John ii. 1. And cf. Philo on the mediatorial and intercessory work of the λόγος, Vita Mos. iii. 14, vol. i. p. 155: ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ἦν τὸν ἱεραμένον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρὶ παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ, πρὸς τε ἀμνηστειὰν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν: and Quis Rer. Div. Hæc. 42, p. 501, δ' οὗτος ἰκέτης μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ θνητοῦ κηραίνοντος ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ ἄφθαρτον, πρεσβευτὴς δὲ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος πρὸς τὸ ὑπῆκοον." Bleek). 26—28.]

Further and concluding argument for the fact of Christ being such a High Priest: that such an one was necessary for us. This necessity however is not pursued into its grounds, but only asserted, and then the description of His exalted perfections gone further into, and substantiated by facts in his own history and that of the priests of the law (ver. 28).

26.] For such (i. e. such as is above described: retrospective, not prospective, as some have taken it. Then the following adjectives serve as appositional predicates, carrying forward τοιοῦτος, and enlarging on the attributes of our High Priest, which

s see ch. xii 3. ἀπὸ ^s τῶν ^s ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ ^t ὑψηλότερος τῶν ^u οὐρανῶν ABDKL
 Luke xiv 1. P s a b
 t see ch. i. 3. γενόμενος, ²⁷ ὃς οὐκ ^v ἔχει ^w καθ' ἡμέραν ^v ἀνάγκην, ὥσπερ c f g h k
 here only. l m n o
 Dan viii. 3. οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, πρότερον ^x ὑπὲρ τῶν ^y ἰδίων ^x ἁμαρτιῶν θυ- 17. 47
 u ch. ii. 14. 17. 47
 viii 1. Eph. 17. 47
 iv 10. 17. 47
 v w inf., Luke xiv 18. [xxiii. 17.] Jude 3 only. (1 Cor. vii. 37.) Jos Antt. xvi. 9 3 al. w Acts ii. 46. ch.
 ix 25, i. 3, 11 (see note) cf ch. ix 13. x ch. v. 1 ieff. y ch. ix. 10 ieff. z = ch.
 (ix 28.) xiii 16 James ii 21 1 Pet. ii. 5 (24. Matt. xvii 1 Mk. Luke xxiv. 51) only. Gen viii 20 al. fr.

27. ο ἀρχιερεὺς D¹ Chr-ms.

θυσίαν D[P] 47. 73. 178 lect-19 Chr-ms Thdrts-ms

were already slightly touched ch. iv. 14, 15) an High Priest was for us (emphasis on ἡμῖν) becoming also (on ἔπρεπεν see above, ch. ii. 10. The καὶ adds, and rises into a climax. 'Nay, not only for all the above-mentioned reasons, but even for this'), holy (we have no other word to express ὅσιος, which yet is never by the LXX confounded with ἅγιος, the latter being the rendering of שׁוֹרֵה, the former ordinarily of שׁוֹרֵה. In the classical usage of ὁσιος, it seems primarily to be predicated of *places and things*: but Bleek is not correct when he says that it is seldom used of persons, for it is frequently so found in Homer, Æschyl., Eurip., Aristoph., Thucyd., Xen., Plato, al.: see Palm and Rost sub voce. It seems always to be token, in such use, *piety towards God*; and is in this sense often used with δίκαιος, *just towards men*: e. g. ὑμᾶς ὁσιωτάτους κ. δίκαιοτάτους εἶναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Isocr. p. 297 B: δίκαιος κ. ὁσιος βίος, Plato, Legg. ii. p. 663 D. Here, we cannot help connecting it with the τὸν ὁσίον σου of Ps. xv. 10, as the especial title of the incarnate Son of God, perfect in piety and reverent holiness towards His Heavenly Father), *harmless* (ἄκακος τί ἐστιν; ἀπόνηρος οὐδ' ὑπουργός. καὶ ὅτι τοιοῦτος, ἔκουε τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· οὐδὲ εὗρεθ' ὁδὸς ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ. Chrys. It betokens simplicity, and freedom from vice or evil suspicion: see ref. Rom.), *undefiled* (reff.: not only from legal, but from moral pollution, in deed, word, and thought), *separated from sinners* (ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμ., from the whole race and category of sinners. This lets us into the true meaning, which is, not that Christ, ever and throughout, was free from sin (so Syr. ("separatus a peccatis"), Thl., Calv., Camero, Kuinoel, Klee, Ebrard, and many others), however true that may be, but (cf. next clause) that in his service as our High Priest, He, as the Levitical high priests in their service (Levit. xxi. 10 ff.), is void of all contact and commerce with sinners, removed far away in his glorified state and body, into God's holy place. So Grot., Bengel, Peirce, Tholuck, Bleek, De Wette, Lunem., Delitzsch. This expression exactly answers to that in ch. ix. 28, where it is said that

He shall come a second time χωρίς ἁμαρτίας: see there), and made (*advanced to be*: cf. especially John i. 15, ὁ ὁπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν. τὸ δὲ γενόμενος, says Thl., ὁδὸν ἡμῶν, ὅτι περὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα. ὡς γὰρ θεὸς λόγος, ἦν ἀπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὑψηλότερος) *higher than the heavens* (see reff.):

27.] *who hath not necessity* (the ind. pres. shows, that the Writer is not setting forth the ideal of a high priest, but speaking of the actually existing attributes of our great High Priest, as He is) *day by day* (not, as Schlichting, al., "καθ' ἡμέραν sc. ὁρισμένην, in anniversario illo videlicet sacrificio:" for this is inconsistent with usage: cf. κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν in reff. Had the *day of atonement* been here pointed out, this latter expression would have been the more natural one. Nor again must the expression be weakened to mean "*sæpissime*," "*quoties res fert*," as Grot.: or πολλάκις, as Böhlme, al.: or διὰ παντός, as De Wette: nor with Bengel may we regard it as an "*indignabunda hyperbole*, innuens, nihil po profecisse principem sacerdotem *quotannis*, stato die, offerentem, quam si cum vulgo sacerdotium quotidie obtulisset, ch. ix. 6, 7:" nor, worst of all, with Ebrard, think that the Writer looked down the course of centuries, and disregarding the intervals between, spoke of the days of atonement as "*one day after another*." The true meaning is the simple one, held fast by Calov., Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Bleek, Tholuck, Lunem., Delitzsch, al., that the allusion is to the *daily offerings* of the priests, Exod. xxix. 38—42: Num. xxviii. 3—8, which are spoken of as offered by the high priests, though they took part in them only on festival days (see Jos. B. J. v. 5. 7), because the high priests in fact lead and represent the whole priesthood. We have the very same inaccurate way of speaking in Philo de Spec. Legg. (de Homicidis) 23, vol. ii. p. 321, where he says, οὕτω τοῦ σύμπαντος ἔθνους συγγενὴς καὶ ἀγχιστεὺς κοινὸς ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ἐστί, πρυτανεύων μὲν τὰ δίκαια τοῖς ἀμφοβητοῦσι κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, εὐχὰς τε καὶ θυσίας τελεῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν), as the high priests, to offer (the common word in our Epistle is προσφέρειν. But ἀναφέρειν is

^a ἐφάπαξ ἑαυτὸν ^z ἀνεύγκας. ²⁸ ὁ νόμος γὰρ ἀνθρώπους ^{a = Rom. vi 10.}
^b καθίστησιν ἀρχιερεῖς ἔχοντας ^c ἀσθένειαν. ὁ λόγος δὲ τῆς ^{ch. ix. 12}
^d ὀρκωμοσίας τῆς μετὰ τὸν νόμον, ^e υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ^{x. 10 (1 Cor. xv. 6) only +.}
^f τετελειωμένον. ^{b ch. v. 1 reff.}
^{c ch v 2 reff.}
^{d vv. 20, 21 reff.}
^{e so ch. i. 1 al.}
^{f. in Heb.}

VIII. ¹ ὁ Κεφάλαιον δὲ ^h ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις, ⁱ τοιούτου ^{f = ch. ii. 10 (reff.).}
^{g = here (Acts xxii. 28) only. (Num. xxxi. 26, 49.) κεφάλαιον παιδείας λέγομεν τὴν ὁρθὴν τροφὴν, Plato, Legg. i. p. 643 c. (see xxx. in Bleek.) see for constr., Rom. viii. 3. h Acts xi. 19. 1 Cor. xiv. 16. ch. ix. 10, 17. xi. 4. i see 1 Cor. v. 1.}

Ambr.¹ Aug.¹. **προσενεγκας** ΑΝ 17 Cyr[-P₁].
28. καθιστ. ιερεις(αρχιερεῖς D³) ανθρ. D.

CHAR. VIII. 1. for ἐπι, εν Α.

purposely used here, as belonging more properly to sacrifices for sin. So in reff. James and 1 Pet., and Levit. iv. 10, 31) sacrifices first for his own sins, then for those of the people (so Philo, speaking also of the daily sacrifices: ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ἐνδελεχεῖς θυσίας ὁρᾷς εἰς ἴσα διηρημένας, ἣν τε ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀνάγουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς διὰ τῆς σεμιδάλως, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους, τῶν δυνόντων ἀνθρώπων, οὓς ἀναφέρειν διεύρηται, Quis Rer. Div. Hæres 36, vol. i. p. 497. Still it must be confessed that the application of such an idea to the daily sacrifices has no authority in the law: and it would seem probable, as Bleek suggests, that the ceremonies of the great day of atonement were throughout before the mind of the Writer, as the chief and archetypal features of the high priest's work, but repeated in some sort in the daily sacrifices. The most probable solution of the difficulty however is that proposed by Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, ii. 1. 287) and approved by Delitzsch: that καθ' ἡμέραν, from its situation, belongs not to οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς, but only to Christ: "who has not need day by day, as the high priests had year by year," &c. In this, which I have seen in Delitzsch since the foregoing note was written, I find nothing forced or improbable): for this He did (what? of necessity, by the shewing of ver. 26 and of ch. iv. 15, the offering for the sins of the people only. To include in τοῦτο the whole, 'first for his own, then for those of the people,' would be either to contradict these testimonies of the Writer himself, or to give some second and unnatural sense to ἁμαρτιῶν, as Schlichting, Grot., and Hammond, who regard it as importing only weaknesses when applied to Christ. Besides, as Del. well observes, the idea of "offering himself for his own sins" would be against all sacrificial analogy, according to which the sinless is an offering for the sinful) once for all (ἐφάπαξ, stronger than ἅπαξ. It is found in Lucian, Demosth. Encom. 21, and Dio Cassius: but not in classical Greek. It belongs to ἐποίησεν, not

to what follows), when He offered (see above) Himself (this is the first place in the Epistle where mention is made of Christ's having offered Himself. Henceforward, it becomes more and more familiar to the reader: "once struck, the note sounds on ever louder and louder:" Del.).

28.] Final bringing out of the contrast between the Aaronic priests and Christ. For (gives the reason for the difference in the last verse) the Law makes men (emphatic, opposed to υἱόν below) high priests, who have infirmity (cf. ch. v. 2, of the human high priest, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὸς περικείται ἀσθένειαν: and see below. The expression here involves, from the context, liability to sin, and subjection to, removal by, death. Christ had not the first, and therefore need not offer for his own sin: he was free from the second, and therefore need not repeat His sacrifice): but the word (utterance; or, purport: cf. ver. 21, ὁ δὲ μετὰ ὀρκωμοσίας διὰ τοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ.) of the oath which was after the law (τῆς μετὰ, not ὁ μετὰ ("sermo autem jurisjurandi qui post legem est," vulg.), which ought to be marked in the E. V. by the omission of the comma after "oath." This oath is recorded in David, i. e. subsequently to the giving of the law, and therefore as antiquating it and setting it aside. The argument is similar to that in Gal. iii. 17. Of course Erasmus's rendering, "supra legem," is out of the question) (makes) the Son (see on υἱόν, not τὸν υἱόν, note on ch. i. 1), made perfect (in this participle, as Del. remarks, lies enwrapped the whole process of the Son's assumption of human ἀσθένεια, and being exalted through it: for this τετελειώσθαι was διὰ παθημάτων, ch. ii. 10; v. 9. Those priests, by their ἀσθένεια, were removed away in death, and replaced by others: He, by that ἀσθένεια which He took on Him, went out through death into glory eternal, and an unrenovable priesthood) for evermore (these words belong simply and entirely to the participle, not as Luther, setzt den Sohn ewig und voll-

k ch i 3 i eff.
1 see ch iv. 16.
Matt xix
24. xxv 31.
1 in. xxi 31.
m ch. i 3 i eff.

ἔχομεν ἀρχιερέα, ἰ δς ἐκάθισεν ^k ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ ¹ θρόνου τῆς ἀβδκλ
lm μεγαλωσύνης ἐν τοῖς ⁿ οὐρανοῖς, ² τῶν ^o ἀγίων ^p λειτουρ- c i g h k
n ch. iv 14 i eff. o = ch. ix 8, 12, 24, 25 x 19 xiii 11 p ch 1. 7 reff. see note 17. 47

kommen, and Bengel, "Resolve: filius, semel consummatus, constitutus est sacerdos in aeternum." The E. V. has obliterated both sense, and analogy with ch. ii. 10 and v. 9, by rendering τετελ., "consecrated").

CHAP. VIII. 1—13.] *Not only is Christ personally, as a High Priest, above the sons of Aaron, but the service and ordinances of the covenant to which his High Priesthood belongs are better than those of that to which they belong.*

1.] Now the principal matter (κεφάλαιον most usually has this meaning. So Thuc. iv. 50, ἐν αἷς (ἐπιστολαῖς) πολλῶν ἄλλων γεγραμμένων, κεφάλαιον ἦν κ.τ.λ.: Plato, Gorg. p. 453 Δ. ἡ πραγματεία αὐτῆς (τῆς ῥητορικῆς) ἅπανα κ. τὸ κεφάλαιον εἰς τοῦτο τελευτᾷ: Demosth. p. 815. 6, καὶ τὸ μὲν κεφάλαιον ἀδικημάτων, ὡς ἂν συντομώτατ' εἰποι τις, τοῦτ' ἐστίν: and see many more examples in Bl. and Wetst., as in Thl., τὸ μέγιστον καὶ συνεκτικώτερον. The other meaning, *sum total*, would be apposite enough here, were the sense of κεφ. confined to ver. 1, which has been treated of before: but ver. 2 contains new particulars, which cannot be said to be the *sum* of any things hitherto said. Besides, even were that condition fulfilled, this sense would require not the present participle λεγομένοις, but the past, λεχθεῖσιν, or εἰρημένοις, and the participle itself would more probably be in the genitive, as in Isocr. Nicool. p. 90, κεφάλαιον τῶν εἰρημένων: Themist. de Pace, p. 230, κεφάλαιον τοῦ παρόντος λόγου. κεφάλαιον is not, "a principal matter," as Lünem. :—words thus thrown forward do not require the article to make them definite: cf. the examples given above) *in the things which we are saying (ἐπί, ὑπο).* lying as it were, by, and among. This seems best; we might render it, as in Luke xvi. 26, "besides," but the present part. seems to forbid rendering "the things already said," as most Commentators and E. V. Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1, p. 287 f., adopts a curious arrangement: taking κεφάλαιον δέ by itself, he understands ἀρχιερεῖσιν after λεγομένοις, and renders, "besides these, who are called high priests, we have," &c. This is far-fetched and unnatural: for had λεγομένοις borne any such meaning, we should certainly have had the predicate, which would thus be emphasized, expressed, and not understood: as in 1 Cor. viii. 5, 6, εἴτε

εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ κ.τ.λ., ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἰς θεὸς κ.τ.λ.): *we have such an High Priest* (emphasis on τοιοῦτον, which refers, not to what preceded, but to what is to follow, viz. δς ἐκάθισεν κ.τ.λ.) *who sat down* ("In ch. i. 3, the sitting at the right hand of God was mentioned as a pre-eminence of the Son above the angels, who stand as ministering spirits before the presence of God: here, where the same is said of Christ as High Priest, Schlichting, Limborch, Klee, al. rightly remark that there is again a pre-eminence in καθίσαι over the Jewish high priests: for these, even when they entered the holiest place, did not sit down by the throne of God, but only stood before it for a moment: cf. ch. x. 11, 12, καὶ πᾶς μὲν ἀρχιερεὺς ἕστηκε καθ' ἡμέραν λειτουργῶν . . . οὗτος δὲ . . . εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ." Bleek. Lünem. calls this fanciful: but such distinctions are not surely to be overlooked altogether) *on the right hand of the throne of majesty in the heavens* (better thus, than "of the majesty in the heavens," τῆς μεγ. τῆς ἐν τοῖς οὐρ. The last words, ἐν τοῖς οὐρ., may belong not merely to τῆς μεγαλωσ., but to the whole preceding, ἐκάθ. ἐν δεξ. τοῦ θρ. τῆς μεγ. But see on ch. i. 3, where we have the very similar expression, ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς: and where it seems simpler to join ἐν ὑψ. with τῆς μεγαλωσύνης. If taken as above, it will be best for this reason also to drop the English definite art. before 'majesty,' and regard τῆς μεγ. as abstract. Hofmann (Schriftb. ii. 1. 289, and Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. 190) strangely joins ἐν τοῖς οὐρ. with what follows, an order which hardly could be imagined in this Epistle, and wholly unnecessary for the sense, in which, Christ having been once asserted to have sat down in the heavens, it necessarily follows that the ἁγία afterwards spoken of are ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. On the expression ὁ θρόν. τῆς μεγ. Thl. remarks, τὸν πατρικὸν φησι, ἢ δι καὶ ὁ πατήρ λεχθεῖν ἂν αὐτῷ μεγαλωσύνη, ἢ δι απλῶς οὕτω θρόνος μεγαλωσύνης ὁ μέγιστος θρόνος. The former and not the latter is evidently the sense here. All such mere periphrases of the adjectival predicate would be unworthy of the solemnity and dignity of the subject and style), 2.] *minister* (λεῖτον ἐκάλουν οἱ παλαιοὶ τὸ δημόσιον, ὅθεν λειτουργεῖν τὸ εἰς τὸ δημόσιον ἐργάζεσθαι ἔλεγαν. Schol. in Demosth. Lept.

γος, καὶ τῆς ^ασκηνης· τῆς ^ςἀληθινῆς, ἣν ^τἔπηξεν ὁ κύ- ^{q = ver 5 ch. ix 1, 4, 6.}
 ριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος. ³ πᾶς γὰρ ἀρχιερεὺς εἰς τὸ ^uπρος- ^{Act 10. 44. Exod xxxiii. Jer. ii. 21.}

⁷ Josh. xviii. 1.
 there only

^{s = ch. ix 24. John i. 9. vi 32. xv 1. 1 Thess i. 9. 1 John ii. 6.}
 u ch. v. 1 (reff.).

2. rec ins καὶ bef οὐκ, with AD³KL[P] rel vulg syrr copt [æth arm] Eus, Cyr[-p Chr Thdrt Damasc] Chron: om BD¹N 17 Eus₁.

The LXX use the verb and subst. to express the Heb. כהן and כהן, in reference to the sacerdotal service in the sanctuary: see, for the verb, Exod. xxviii. 31, 39 (35, 43); xxix. 30; xxxv. 18: Deut. xvii. 12: 3 Kings viii. 11: 1 Chron. vi. 32: 2 Chron. xiii. 10: Ezek. xlv. 27, where we have λειτουργεῖν ἐν τῷ ἁγίῳ: xlv. 4 al.: and for the subst., Neh. x. 39: Isa. lxi. 6: Sir. vii. 30) of the holy places (τῶν ἁγίων is taken as masc. by times in Thl., and by Ec., τῶν ἡγιασμένων παρ' αὐτοῦ ἀνθρώπων ἡμῶν γὰρ ἔστιν ἀρχιερεὺς. But ἡμῶν ἀρχιερεὺς and ἡμῶν λειτουργός are very different things. 'The λειτουργός is subordinate to those whose minister he is, as in Josh. i. 1 A, τῷ Ἰησοῦ . . . τῷ λειτουργῷ Μωυσῇ: see also 2 Kings xiii. 18: 3 Kings x. 5: 4 Kings iv. 43; vi. 15: 2 Chron. ix. 4. See also Num. iii. 6; xviii. 2. It is taken by Luther (und ist ein Pfleger der heiligen Güter) as importing *holy things*, as it seems to be in Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii. 46, vol. i. p. 114, τοιοῦτος δὲ ὁ θεραπευτὴς κ. λειτουργὸς τῶν ἁγίων, and De Profug. 17, p. 560, ἡ Λευιτικὴ φυλὴ νεωκόρων κ. ἱερῶν ἐστίν, οἷς γὰρ τῶν ἁγίων ἀνάκειται λειτουργία. But this does not seem to answer to the usage of τὰ ἅγια in our Epistle. Cf. reff., in which τὰ ἅγια imports the holy place, i. e. the holy of holies. It does not seem necessary to supply any thing after τῶν ἁγίων, as τῶν ἀληθινῶν, or τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς: this distinction is brought out by what follows. As yet Christ is spoken of as being in common with the Levitical priests τῶν ἁγίων λειτουργός. See below), and of the true (archetypal, *only true*, as so often in St. John, and in one passage of St. Luke, xvi. 11: see reff. The difference between ἀληθινός and ἀληθής is well sketched by Kalnais, Abendmahl, p. 119, cited in Delitzsch: "ἀληθής excludes the untrue and unreal, ἀληθινός that which does not fulfil its idea. The measure of ἀληθής is reality, that of ἀληθινός ideality. In ἀληθής, the idea corresponds to the thing, in ἀληθινός, the thing to the idea") **tabernacle, which the Lord** (here evidently the Father: see note on ch. xii. 14) **pitched** (the usual LXX word of fixing the tabernacle, or a tent: see reff. And so in the classics: e. g. Herod. vi. 12, and many examples in Bleek

and Wetst. It is used similarly of the heaven in Isa. xlii. 5, ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ πῆξας αὐτόν), **not (any) man** (not οὐχ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, which would be the literal way of expressing 'not man,' generically: because by the indefinite ἄνθρωπος, anathous, every individual man is excluded. It is an important question, symbolically considered, whether any and what distinction is intended by the Writer, between τῶν ἁγίων and τῆς σκηνης. Delitzsch, in loc., has gone into it at length, and Hofmann has treated of it in two places especially, Weiss. u. Erf. ii. 188 ff. and Schriftb. ii. 1. 405 f. Both are agreed that τὰ ἅγια betokens the immediate, immaterial presence of God, the veritable Holy of Holies, beyond, and approached through, the heavens, ch. iv. 14. But as regards σκηνή, they differ. Hofmann maintains it to be the glorified body of Christ, and argues that it alone will satisfy such expressions as that in ch. ix. 11, οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως: in order to satisfying which, this σκηνή must belong to the new creation, the παλιγγενεσία, which commences with the glorification of Christ. This glorified body of His is the new and abiding temple of God, in which He dwells and meets with us who are united to and have put on that glorified body, our house, eternal in the heavens: for so Hofmann interprets 2 Cor v. 1 ff. On the other hand, Delitzsch controverts this view as inconsistent with the symbolism in ch. ix. 11, 12, where Christ διὰ τῆς μέσης κ. τελειοτέρας σκηνης . . . εἰσῆλθεν . . . εἰς τὰ ἅγια, taking this connexion of the words: and also with our ver. 5, where the Mosaic tabernacle is set forth as the representation and shadow of the heavenly. Accordingly, he believes the σκηνή here to be the heavenly Jerusalem, the worship-place (Anbetungsstätte) of blessed spirits (Ps. xxix. 9) and of those men who have been rapt in vision thither (Isa. vi.),—the ναὸς τῆς σκηνης τοῦ μαρτυρίου of Rev. xv. 5,—the place where God's *visible* presence (in contradistinction to His personal and invisible presence in the ἅγια) is manifested to His creatures angelic and human. See much more, well worth studying, in his note here. In weighing these two opinions, I own they seem to me to run into one, and of that one by far the

v ch. 11. 17 reff.
w — Acts xiii.
46. 2 Cor ix.
5. Phil. i. 24.
11 25 2 Macc.
ix. 21.

φέρειν ὡδωρά τε καὶ ὡθυσίας καθίσταται ὅθεν ἀναγ-
καῖον ἔχειν τι καὶ τοῦτον ὃ προσενέγκη. 4 x εἰ x μὲν x οὖν

ABDKL
P⁸ b a
c f g h k
l m n o
17. 47

x ch. vii. 11 only.

3. The last καὶ is added over the line by N¹ or N-corr¹.

4. rec (for οὖν) γαρ, with D³KL rel syr [arin] Chr Thdrst Damasc: xt ABD¹[P]N

larger component is on Hofmann's side. For what is the heavenly Jerusalem? What, but the aggregate, in their persons and their glorious abiding-place, of the triumphant saints and servants of God? And what is this aggregate, but the mystical body, of which Christ is the Head and they are the members, in its fulfilment and perfection? That glorified body of His, in which they are accepted before God, and in which as a heavenly temple, they serve God, and God dwells, He has passed through, not by passing out of it, but by finally establishing it as an accomplished thing in God's sight, and in and as proceeding forth from him carrying on his intercession and λειτουργία τῆς σκηνῆς τῆς ἀληθινῆς in the ἄγια itself. See more on this subject, ch. ix. 11: and the views of Bleek, Tholuck, al.: also a sermon of Schleiermacher's on the text, vol. ii. of his Predigten, p. 504. The idea of the σκηνή being the body of Christ is found in Joh. Philoponus (Cent. vii.) on Gen. i. (in Bleek): τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀποστόλου, "καὶ τῆς σκηνῆς . . . ἑνθρώπου," οὐχ οὕτω περὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λελέχθαι μοι δοκεῖ, καθὰ νινες ἔφρασαν, ὥς περὶ τοῦ κυριακοῦ σώματος, εἰ ἐπιστήσκει τις ἀκριβῶν τῇ τότῃ, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον,—καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο, καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. It is also the view of Beza, Gerhard, Owen, Bengel, al.).

3—6.] *This heavenly office and work our High Priest must have, if He be veritably a High Priest.* 3.] For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices (see the very similar passage, ch. v. 1, and note there): whence it is necessary that this (High Priest) also have somewhat which he may offer (there is here considerable difficulty. For the Writer is evidently, from what follows, laying the stress on the heavenly λειτουργία of Christ: and this δ προσενέγκη applies therefore to His work not on earth, but in heaven. If so, how comes it to be said that He has somewhat to offer in heaven, seeing that His offering, of Himself, was made once for all, in contradistinction to those of the Levitical priests which were being constantly offered? See especially ch. x. 11, 12, which, on this view, brings the Writer here into direct contradiction to himself. In order to avoid this, Lünemann and Hofmann (Schriftb. ii. 1. 288) attempt to make the aor. προσ-

ενέγκη retrospective: "it is necessary for Him to have (there, in heaven) somewhat (viz. His body) which he may have offered." But surely this is a view of the aorist which cannot be admitted. In such sentences, the uses of the aor. and pres. seem to regard not the time, objectively, of the act expressed, but its nature, subjectively, as an act rapidly passing in each case, or enduring. The straightforward construction of our sentence makes it necessary that προσενέγκη should refer to an act done in the state pointed out by the ἔχειν, however the nature of that act may be, in each case of its being done, such as to be accomplished at the moment, and not enduring onwards: which latter, expressed by δ προσφέρει, would certainly involve the contradiction above spoken of. Thus regarded then, what is it which our High Priest in heaven has to offer? In ch. v. 7, He is described as προσενέγκας prayers and supplications in the days of His flesh: and it might be thought that His ἐντυγχάνειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ch. vii. 25, might be here meant, the offering being those intercessions. But this would hardly satisfactorily give the τι, which as Delitzsch remarks, is too concrete for such an interpretation. It must be something with which and by virtue of which, and as offering and applying which, our High Priest enters and ministers in the Holy of Holies above. Now if we look to the analogy of ch. ix. 7, 12, we see, 1. that the high priest entered the holy place οὐ χωρὶς αἵματος, δ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ κ. τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ ἁγιοτημάτων,—2. that Christ is entered into the ἄγια of heaven οὐ δι' αἵματος τράγων καὶ μόσχων, διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος: see also ib. ver. 25. This blood of the one offering, Christ is represented as bearing into the Holy Place, and its application is ever set forth to us as a continuing and constantly repeated one. Thus this blood of sprinkling is regarded as being in heaven, ch. xii. 24: as being sprinkled on the believer as the end of his election, 1 Pet. i. 2: as cleansing us from all sin, 1 John i. 7: as that wherein the saints wash their robes and make them white, Rev. vii. 14. Still, as Delitzsch also remarks, this is not the place to enlarge on this matter, seeing that it is merely incidentally introduced here, the present object being to shew that it is in heaven, and not

f Rom. xv. 28. **τισται** Μωυσῆς μέλλων ^f ἐπιτελεῖν τὴν σκηνήν, ^g "Ορα γάρ **ABDKL**
 2 Cor. vii. 1. **φῃσιν**, ποιήσεις πάντα κατὰ τὸν ^h τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι **PN a b**
 viii. 6 al. **ἐν τῷ ὄρει**. ⁶ νυνὶ δὲ ¹ διαφορωτέρας ^k τέτυχεν ¹ λειτουρ- **c f g h k**
 1 Kings iii. 12. **γίας**, ^m ὅσῳ καὶ ⁿ κρείττονός ἐστιν ^o διαθήκης ^p μεσίτης, ^q ἥτις **l m n o**
 g Exod. xxv. 40, xxi. 30. **1 Acts vii. 44.** **1 Cor. x. 6.** **Rom. v. 14.** **al. 1. c.** and Amos v. 6 (cited in Acts vi. 43) only. **1 compar. ch. 1. 4 only.** **k = Luke xx. 35. Acts**
 xxv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 10. ch. xi. 35. 2 Mac. iv. 6. **1 = Luke i. 23 (ch. ix. 2. reff.)** **m constr., ch.**
 iii. 3. **n ch. 1. 4 reff.** **o ch. vii. 22 reff.** **p ch. ix. 16. xii. 14. Gal. iii. 19, 20. 1 Tim. ii. 6 only.**
 Job ix. 33 only. (**τρεῖς**, ch. vi. 17.) **q ver. 5 reff.**

5. rec ποιήσης: txt ABDKL[P]K rel Orig, Eus., [Euthal-ms].

6. νυν BD¹ Ath., [Antch., Damasc.], rec τετυχε, with BD²N³ rel Damasc.;
 τετυχκε [P 47] a b¹ Ath-3-mss [Chr, Thdrt Antch, Damasc.], τετυκε 17: txt AD¹
 KLK¹ Ath., om kai D¹K m vulg-mss(not am fuld &c) [arm] Thdrt(but ins ms₁)
 Damasc., διαθ. bef εστιν [KP] N-corr¹: the words from εστιν to κρείττοσ(. .) are
 omd by N¹, but N-corr¹ has supplied them except the last σ.

κ.τ.λ. ablatively: "who serve (God) in a delineation and shadow" &c. But this is far-fetched, and unnecessary, especially in the presence of ch. xiii. 10, where it is hardly possible to regard τῇ σκηνῇ otherwise than as the objective dative to λατρεύοντες of the heavenly things (i. e. the things in heaven, in the heavenly sanctuary: correspondent to τὸν τύπον τὸν δειχθέντα σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει: see also ch. ix. 23, 24. Chrys. understands it of spiritual things: τίνα λέγει ἐν ταῦτα τὰ ἐπουράνια; τὰ πνευματικά· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς τελεῖται, ἀλλ' ὅμως τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰσιν ἄξια,—and then goes on to instance the work of the Spirit in baptism, the power of the keys, the utterance of Christian praise, &c. And Luther renders, der himmlischen Güter. But the context clearly requires the other view): even as Moses was commanded ("admonished of God," E. V., an excellent rendering. χρηματίζω is used in the later classics, but as early as Demosthenes, for to give a decisive answer, "responsum ex deliberatione reddere," as Reiske. Hence it came afterwards to be appropriated mainly to responses, warnings, commands, given from the Deity: so Diod. Sic. iii. 6, τοὺς γὰρ θεοὺς αὐτοῖς ταῦτα κεχρηματικέναι: xv. 10, περὶ δὲ τῶν χρησμάτων ἔφησε, μὴ χρηματίζειν τὸν θεὸν καθόλου περὶ θανάτου. And so constantly in the Scriptures both LXX and N. T. reff. and Jer. xxxii. (xxv.) 30; xxxvii. (xxx.) 2: Luke ii. 26. The earlier classical verb is χράω of the deity giving the oracle, χράομαι of the person consulting it. Observe the perfect, not the aor., giving a fine distinction not reproducible in English: viz. that these figures of the heavenly things were still subsisting as ordained to Moses, when the Epistle was written) when about to complete (not in distinction from beginning, as if he were about to put the finishing stroke to the work already nearly ended: but involving the whole work: 'to take in hand and carry on to com-

pletion') the tabernacle: for (γάρ justifies the assertion by the following citation) Take heed, He says (supply ὁ θεός; there can be no doubt of this here, where the words following are God's own), that thou makest (ποιήσης and ποιήσεις give a like sense, and in English must be expressed by the same. The former is better Greek; the latter according to the LXX: manuscript authority must prevail) all things (πάντα is not in the LXX, nor in the Heb., but is supplied also by Philo, Legg. Allegor. iii. 33, vol. i. p. 108, κατὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ δεδειγμένον σοι ἐν τῷ ὄρει πάντα ποιήσεις) according to the pattern which was shewn (LXX, δεδειγμένον) thee in the mount. If now we ask what this τύπος was, we are met with various replies. Faber Stapulensis says, "Arbitror id insinuare, non nudam veritatem in monte Mosi fuisse ostentatam, sed veritatis adumbrationem et remotam quandam ideam. Et quomodo etiam vidisset veritatem, nisi per speciem nude et revelate divina conspexisset, quod viatorum et adhuc in vita mortali peregrinantium non est. Typus igitur erat quod videbat, nondum ipsa veritas et archetypus." And so Schlichting, concluding, "adeo ut tabernaculum antiquum exemplar tantum fuerit exemplaris, et umbra umbræ." This view, which is that also of Bleek and Storr, is strongly controverted by Delitzsch, who takes the τύπος to be the veritable heavenly things themselves, not seen however by Moses directly and naturally, which would be impossible, but made visible to him in a vision. I do not see that there is much to choose between the two views. If the latter be taken, then surely the vision thus vouchsafed to Moses was itself only an intermediate representation, and so this view comes much to the same as the other.

6.] But now (the logical, not the temporal νυνί, as in ch. ix. 26; xi. 16 (νύν), and frequently in St. Paul: 'ut res se habet: νυνὶ δὲ φῃσιν, ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἔστιν

^τ ἐπὶ ^η κρείττουςιν ^ς ἐπαγγελίαις ^ι νενομοθέτῃται. ⁷ Εἰ γὰρ ^τ ἡ πρώτη ἐκείνη ἦν ^η ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἂν δευτέρας ἐξήτειτο ^ν τόπος. ⁸ ^ω μεμφόμενος γὰρ αὐτοῖς λέγει ^χ Ἰδοὺ ^η ἡμέραι

15. iii. 6. 1 Thess. iii. 13 only. I, XX, Job only, exc. Gen. xvii 1. Wisd. x 5, 15. (-τως, 1 Thess ii. 10)
 v Acts xxv 16 ch xii 17. w Rom ix 19 (Mark vii 2 rec.) only. t. Sir. xi 7. xlii. 7. 2 Macc. ii 7 only.
 x Jer. lxxviii 1 (xxxi) 31—34. y so Luke xliii. 29. Jer ix. 25. xvi 14 al

7. for δευτερας, ετερας B¹.

8. αυτους AD¹K[P]K¹ 17 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt.

ἐν τῇ γῇ, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, βελτίονος ἐπέτυχε λειτουργίας, τοῦτέστι ἐπὶ βελτίονα λειτουργίαν ἔστιν ἀρχιερέως. (Ec.) He hath obtained (τέτευχα (rec.) is properly the Ionic form of the perfect, but occurs in Aristotle and later writers: but τέτυχα is also found in later writers, as Plutarch and Diod. Sic. The other reading here, τετύχηκεν, is the true Attic form) a more excellent ministry (than that of any earthly priests), in proportion as (there is an ellipsis in the earlier clause of τοσούτου, which now lurks under the comparative: so in ch. iii. 3) He is also (καί, introducing a special reference to an already acknowledged fact, as in ch. vi. 7, where see note) mediator (see reff. The meaning of μεσίτης, a later Greek word, is not far from that of ἔγγυος,—one who becomes a goer between two persons, assuring to each the consent of the other to some point agreed on in common. The Atticists give us the Attic Greek for it, μεσέγγυος. Philo uses the title of Moses, οἷα μεσίτης κ. διαλλακτής . . . τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους ἐποιεῖτο. And so St. Paul, in ref. Gal. The genitive after μεσίτης may either be of the persons *between whom*, as in ref. 1 Tim., εἰς καὶ μεσίτης θεοῦ κ. ἀνθρώπων: or of one of the parties *concerned*, as in Jos. Antt. xvi. 2. 2, τῶν παρ' Ἀγρίππα τινῶν ἐπιζητούμενων μεσίτης ἦν: or of the object of the mediation, the agreement or covenant, as Diod. Sic. iv. 54, μεσίτην γεγυότα τῶν ὁμολογιῶν ἐν Κόλχοις: Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 7, ταῦτα δυνόντες ἔλεγον καὶ θεὸν μεσίτην ὃν ὑπισχνούντο ποιοῦμενοι. And in this last sense is the gen. here. Jesus is the mediator, between God and us) of a better covenant, of one which (ἥτις, 'quippe quæ,' as always. This specific relative brings the thing referred to into its category, not only identifying it as ἡ would do, but classing it, and educing its property as belonging to the matter in hand: and thus having a ratiocinative force) has been laid down (see on ref. The word νόμος is also used of the new covenant by St. James, i. 25; ii. 12: see also iv. 12, and St. Paul, Rom. iii. 27; viii. 2; ix. 31) upon (on the condition of . . . so Xen. Hell. ii. 2. 20, ἐποιοῦντο εἰρήνην, ἐφ' ᾧ τὰ τε μακρὰ τεῖχη . . . καθελόντας κ.τ.λ.) better promises (viz. those which are about to be particularized

in the following citation. Theodoret says, ἡ μὲν γὰρ παλαιὰ διαθήκη σωματικὰς ἐπαγγελίας εἶχε συνεξευμένας, γῆν βρούσαν γάλα κ. μέλι . . . καὶ παίδων πλῆθος, κ. τὰ τούτοις προσόμοια ἡ δὲ καινὴ ζῶντων αἰώνιον κ. οὐρανῶν βασιλείαν. And so (Ec., Thl., Primas., Bengel, al. But as Bleek objects, it would be very improbable that the Writer should intend to refer the promises, on which the old covenant was based, to mere earthly blessings, in the face of such a designation of the hope of Abraham and the patriarchs as we find in ch. xi. 10—19). 7.] *Argumentation*, exactly as in ch. vii. 11, from sayings of God, to shew the imperfection of the former covenant. So Chrys.: ὥστε γὰρ λέγει θεὸς εἰ ἡ τελείωσις κ.τ.λ. (vii. 11), οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα τῷ αὐτῷ συλλογισμῷ κέχρηται. For if that first (covenant) were (or, had been. We are never sure of ἦν in such sentences, seeing that it is both imperfect and aorist. I prefer here the imperfect, seeing that the first covenant, in its ceremonial part, was yet observed. Bleek, after the vulg. ("si . . . culpa vacasset, non . . . locus inquireretur"), prefers the aorist) blameless (τὸ ἄμεμπτος ἀντὶ τοῦ τελεία τέθεικε, τοῦτέστιν ἀποχρῶσα πρὸς τελειότητα, ἄμεμπτος τοὺς ἐργαζομένους ἐργαζομένη. Thdrt. It is the contrary of ἀσθενὲς κ. ἀναφελές, ch. vii. 18), a place would not be sought (i. e. space opened, viz. in the words of the following prophecy, which indicate the substitution of such a covenant for the old one. Bleek gives a rather far-fetched interpretation,—that the τόπος is the place in men's hearts, as distinguished from the tables of stone on which the first covenant was written; referring to 2. Cor. iii. 3 for a similar distinction. But it is far better to understand it of a place in history, and regard the expression as τόπον εἰρίσκων and τόπον λαμβάνειν in reff., see also τόπον δίδναι, Rom. xii. 19. ἐξήτειτο must not be rendered pluperfect, as in E. V., al., but, as in vulg. above, imperf.) for a second (the emphasis is on δευτέρας).

8—12.] *Proof, that a place for a second is contemplated*, by citation from Jeremiah. 8.] For (there is an ellipsis of ἡτεῖται δέ, and the γὰρ introduces the substantiation of the assertion) blaming them (so ref. 2 Macc., μεμψόμενος αὐτοῖς

z Jer. 1. c. AN. ^y ἔρχονται, ^z λέγει κύριος, καὶ ^{ab} συντελέσω ^c ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον ABDKL
 φησί, B.
 a — Rom. ix. 28 Lam. ii 17
 b (1 c δια-
 θήσομαι)
 Jer. xli. (xxxiv.) 8, 15. c LXX, τῷ οἴκῳ. d Luke xxii. 20 ff. 2 Cor iii. 6. ch. ix. 15.
 e (1 c διεθέμεν) 2 Chron xxxiv. 33 Isa. xxviii 15. Jer. xli. (xxxiv.) 18
 1 m n o 17. 47

om 2nd ἐπι D¹.

for 2nd οἶκον, οἱ (sic) Ν¹.

ἔπεν. The dative after μέμφομαι is common in Greek: see Herod. iii. 4; iv. 180; Xen. Cyr. i. 4, 6, and many other examples in Bleek. But seeing that it appears difficult, after the word ἔμμεπτος has been used of the *covenant*, to apply the blame in μεμφομένος to any object but the covenant, many Commentators have taken the participle absolutely, and joined αὐτοῖς with λέγει. So Faber Stapulensis, Piscator, Schlichting, Grot., Limborch, Peirce, Michaelis, Storr, Kuinoel, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., al. But I cannot believe that the objective pronoun would be so loosely and ambiguously put, were it meant to be joined to λέγει. It surely must have been λέγει αὐτοῖς. And there is a propriety, which the ancients have not failed to observe, in αὐτοῖς, instead of αὐτῇ or αὐτῇν. So Chrys., having explained εἰ . . . ἦν ἔμμεπτος, by εἰ ἀμέμπτους ἐποίησε, proceeds, ὅτι γὰρ περὶ τούτου φησὶν, ἔκρινε τὰ ἐξῆς. . . οὐκ εἶπε μεμφομένος δὲ αὐτῇ, ἀλλὰ, μ. δὲ αὐτοῖς. And so Syr., vulg., Ec., Thl., Luther, Calv., Beza, Bengel, Wolf, al. He saith (the following citation is the great prophetic passage Jer. xxxi. (xxxviii.) 31—34, see also Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27. “After the sack of Jerusalem, Jeremiah with the other captives was brought in chains to Rama, where Nebuzaradan had his head-quarters. There took place, at God’s special command, his prophecies of the future entire restoration of Israel, of another David, of Rachel’s weeping over her children at Rama, and their future return, of the new covenant resting on absolute and veritable forgiveness of sins which Jehovah would make with his people, these prophecies forming the third part of the third trilogy of the three great trilogies into which the prophecies of Jeremiah may be divided: ch. xxi.—xxv., the book against the shepherds of the people; ch. xxvi.—xxix., the book of Jeremiah’s conflict against the false prophets; ch. xxx. xxxi., the book of restoration,” Delitzsch. “The question which has before now been abundantly handled, whether the saying refers to the return of the exiles, or to the covenant of which Christ is the mediator, or to the future general conversion of the Jews, or whether some things in it to one of these,

some to another, or whether the whole in its lower literal sense to the return of the exiles and in its higher spiritual sense to Christ and His kingdom, must be answered by the considerations before adduced on ch. i. 5. It belongs throughout to the cycle of Messianic prophecies, and is one of the most beautiful and sublime of them; and its true fulfilment can only be sought in the covenant brought in by the Saviour, and in the salvation through Him imparted to mankind, and ever more and more unfolded and completed. This is the case, however this salvation, in the perception and declaration of the Prophet, is bound up with the restoration of the ancient covenant people and their reunion in the land of their home.” Bleek), Behold, the days come, saith the Lord (φησι κύριος LXX-B, but λέγει AN. “The prophecy, taken from this rich cycle of eschatologic prophecies, whose clear Messianic sense allows of no evasion, begins with Jeremiah’s constant formula, ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται.” Delitzsch), and (καὶ explicative, answering to the Heb. 7 in an apodosis), I will accomplish upon (LXX, διαθήσασμαι τῷ οἴκῳ κ.τ.λ. The difference is beyond doubt intentional, to set forth the completeness of the new covenant. Twice in this same book (reff.), the LXX have rendered this same Heb. expression, כִּי כִּי by συντελεῖν διαθήκην. Augustine urges the word “consummabo,” De Spir. et Lit. c. 19 (34), vol. x. pt. i., “Quid est consummabo, nisi implebo?” ἐπί, with the accusative of motion, the covenant being brought upon them) the house of Israel and upon the house of Judah (both these, Israel first and Judah afterwards, were sent into captivity for their sins: and both are specified severally in God’s promise of grace and restoration) a new covenant (on διαθήκη see on ch. vii. 22), 9.] (this covenant is first specified negatively: it is *not* to be like that first one) *not* according to the covenant (כִּי כִּי, different in quality from, not after the measure of) which I made (LXX again, διεθέμην: see reff.) to (not “with:” it is a pure dative, and betokens mere agency on the part of the subject, God: the people of Israel, the objects, being only recipients, not co-agents) their fathers, in the day of my

ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ¹ἐπιλαβομένου μου τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν, ἔξαγαγείν αὐτοὺς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου, ὅτι αὐτοὶ οὐκ ²ἐνέμειναν ἐν τῇ διαθήκῃ μου, καὶ γὰρ ³ἡμέλησα αὐτῶν, ⁴λέγει κύριος. 10 ὅτι αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἦν ⁵διαθήσομαι τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνας, ⁶λέγει κύριος, ⁷διδούς νόμους μου εἰς τὴν ⁸διάνοιαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ⁹ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν ¹⁰ἐπιγράφω

ch. ii. 16 reff. const., here only? g constr., Acts xxvii. 30 Gal ii. 10 (from Deut. xvi. 26) only dat. Acts xiv. 22, h ch ii. 3 reff. i φησί. LXX. k Luke xxii. 29 his. Acts 2 Cor. 1 = 1 Thess. iv. 8. Rev. xvi. 17. 2 Cor. 1. 22 al Neh vii. 5 m Matt xlii 37 || Eph. ii. 3. iv. 18 al. 1 Chron xxix. 18 n with gen. Rev. xiv. 1. Exod. xxxiii. 28 xxvii. 39 (= xxix. 30 F.). Num. xvii. 2, 3. Deut xxvii 3, 8. 2 Kings 1. 18. Isa xxx. 8. with accus., Rev. iii. 12. Deut ii. 13. v. 22. vi. 9. x. 2, 4 xi 20 4 Kings xxiii. 3. Ps. cxliiii. 16. Ezek. xxxiii 16 o Mark xi 26 (|| L. v. r.). Acts xvii. 23. ch. x 13 Rev. xxi. 12 only. Prov. vii. 3.

9. ημεραις B 34. for γης, της D.

10. aft διαθηκη ius μου (as LXX-B) AD: om (as LXX-A Frid-Aug(=N)) BKL[P]N rel latt syrr coptt [Chr Euthal-ms]. καρδια εαυτων B¹(sic, see Table), in corde vulg Bede: καρδιαν αυτων (as LXX-B) K^N g Clem: καρδιας αυτων [P] 31, in cordibus D-lat Primas: txt [as LXX-B] ADLN³ rel [Chr, Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]. (om from αυτων to αυτων ο.) γραψω (as LXX-B) B.

taking hold of their hand (the idiom is Hebraistic: כָּפַף וְחָזַק בְּיָדָם. Justin M. Dial. c. Tryph. c. 11, p. 112, cites it ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἐπελαβόμεν. This expression would shew beyond a doubt, being one which the Writer of our Epistle would never have adopted in a translation of his own, that he is quoting the LXX) to bring them out of the land of Egypt: because they abode not in my covenant, and I disregarded them (thus, making ὅτι render a reason for the foregoing, and attaching it to the whole following sentence, most of the moderns: and this is apparently most agreeable to the Heb., וְאֵין אֶת־בְּרִיתִי אֲנִי, where, says Bleek, the אֲנִי is only a particle of relation or connexion with the preceding, either for the subject, "quippe illi," or for the object, "quod fœdus meum:" and either way it = "for (or because) they broke my covenant." But many take the sentence beginning with ὅτι as an independent one—"because they abode not in my covenant, I also disregarded them." So Chrys. (αὐτὴν τὴν αἰτίαν δεικνύς, δι' ἣν καταλίπαμεν αὐτούς), Thl., Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, al.), saith (φησί, LXX) the Lord.

On the fact, οὐκ ἐνέμειναν, Delitzsch gives a striking quotation from Schelling, Offenbarungsphilosophie,—"The Law appears to be the mere ideal of a religious constitution, as it has never existed in fact: in practice, the Jews were almost throughout polytheists. The substance of their national feeling was formed by heathendom: the accidents only, by revelation. From the queen of heaven down to the abominations of the Phœnicians, and even to Cybele, the Jews passed through every grade of paganism." "In fact," adds Delitzsch, "there is no period of the history of Israel before the capti-

vity, in which more or less idolatry was not united with the worship of Jehovah, except the time of David and the first years of Solomon, during which the influence of Samuel still continued to be felt. And when by the captivity Idol-worship was completely eradicated from the people, as far at least as regards that part of it which returned, it is well known that a hypocritical letter-worship got the mastery over them, which was morally very little better." See note on Matt. xii. 43.

10.] For (ᾗ: 'because' is too strong: the only reason rendered is for the expression καὶ ἡν above: 'now, I say: for . . .') this (predicate, explained in what follows) is the covenant which I will establish to the house (cf. Aristoph. Av. 438, ἡν μὴ διδωσιν γ' οἷδε διαθήκην ἐμοί) of Israel (Israel here in its wider sense, comprehending both Israel proper and Judah: because then all Israel shall be again united), after those days (Ec. understands τὰς τῆς ἐξόδου, ἐν αἷς ἔλαβον τὸν νόμον: Thl. says, ἐμοί δοκεῖ περὶ ἐκείνων τῶν ἡμερῶν λέγειν, περὶ οὐ ἀνωτέρα εἶπεν, ἰδοὺ ἡμέραι ἔρχονται. μεθ' ὧν διέλθωσιν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι, τοιαύτην διαθήκην διαθήσομαι, ὅταν ἐξῆς ἀκοῶσθ). But the ἐκείνας seems to point immediately to the time indicated by the aorist ἡμέλησα: and thus μετὰ τὰς ἡμ. ἐκ. will be, after the end of that dispensation, when those days of disregard are over), saith (φησί LXX) the Lord; giving (the LXX-BN have διδούς δώσω: the Heb. יִתֵּן. But A agrees with the text: and by the Writer repeating the same in ch. x. 16, it is probable that he had this reading in his copy of the LXX. The participle, as it stands, is best joined, as Ec., with διαθήσομαι, and καὶ . . . ἐπιγράφω taken as a fresh and independent clause. This is

p = ch 1 5 reff. *αὐτοὺς, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς* ^p εἰς θεόν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔσονται μοι ABDKL
 μ Luke xv 15. ¹¹ καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν ἕκαστος τὸν ^a πολίτην Psa b
 xia. 14 ^{only} Prov. ^{c f g h k}
 Acts xxi 39 ^{only} ¹ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστος τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ, λέγων ¹ Γνωθὶ τὸν 1 m n o
 xi 9, 12 ² κύριον, ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με ^s ἀπὸ μικροῦ ^s ἕως μεγά- 17 47
 xxiv 28 ³ λου αὐτῶν, ¹³ ὅτι ^t ἔλεως ἔσομαι ταῖς ἀδικίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ
 Jer. xxxvi. ^{see Rom 1.}
 (xxix) 23. ²¹ Gal iv 9.
 r here only. ¹ John iv 6 al. ¹ Kings iii. 7. ^s Acts viii 10 ^{Isa. xxii 24.} ^t Matt. xvi 22 only. constr.,
 see Rom 1. ³ Kings viii 34, 36, 50 al.

for μοι, μου **Ν**¹ (corr'd "ipsa ut videtur manu").

11. διδάξουσιν D³ Chr-2-mss Cyr₁. rec (for πολίτην) πλησίον, with a c f vulg
 syr-mg [æth] Chr[-montf Euthal-ms] Cyr₁ [Thl]: txt ABDKL^x rel syrr copt arm
 Chr-mss Thdrt Damasc Aug. for 1st αὐτ., εαυτου D¹. om 2nd αὐτου D¹ 46.

The ησ of εἰδήσουσιν is written above by the first hand in B. rec aft μικρου
 ins αὐτων (as LXX-B^x), with D³L rel syrr copt [æth] Thdrt Damasc Thl Cc: om (as
 LXX-A) ABD¹K[P]^N 1 o 17 latt [basim arm Clem₁ Euthal-ms] Chr₁ Cyr₁ [syr coptt
 Clem₁ om αὐτων at end.]

the first of the κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι on which the new covenant is established) **my laws** into their mind (διάνοια, their inward parts, their spiritual man, as distinguished from the mere sensorium which receives impressions from without: Heb. כִּלְכִּל, and on their heart (LXX-A, καὶ ἐπιγρ. αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τὰς κ. αὐτῶν. Either gen., dat. (as B), or accus. is suitable: if accus., the act of transference by inscription, rather than the fact of being inscribed, is in view: if gen. sing., which from the analogy of διάνοιαν, and of Prov. vii. 3 [Alex.] Ald. [so Tromm.: not Holmes] (ἐπιγρᾶνον ἐπὶ πλακῆς τῆς καρδίας σου), our καρδίας most likely is, then the fact of their superimposition and covering of the heart: if the dat., then that of their situation upon its tablet. See instances of the gen. and accus. in reff.) **will I inscribe** (γράφω LXX-B) **them** (contrast to the inscription of the old law, which was on tables of stone: see 2 Cor. iii. 3): and **I will be to them for** (εἶναι εἰς, ὡς πρὶν, as ch. i. 5, which see) **a God, and they shall be to me for a people.**

11.] *Second of the κρείττονες ἐπαγγελίαι* —universal spread of the knowledge of God: following on the other, that God would put His laws in their minds and write them in their hearts. And they shall not have to teach (see var. readd., which give the later usage of οὐ μὴ with the indic. fut.) **every man his (fellow-)citizen** (ἑκάστην ἑαυτοῦ LXX-A ἀδελφόν: B^x, as text. The LXX have several times rendered πᾶν by πολίτης, see reff.), and **every man his brother** (LXX-A πλησίον), **saying Know** (Heb. ידע, plural: "Know ye") **the Lord: because all shall know** (εἰδήσω is properly an Ionic future of εἶδω, but used, at least in its aoristic form εἶδησα, by the Attics also, e.g. Aristot. de Anima i. 2 (so Lobeck: but I cannot find it). See Lobeck, Phryn. p. 743, where more examples are given, but none of the Attic

use of εἰδήσω: nor does this fut. seem to occur elsewhere either in the LXX or N.T.) **me, from the small (one)** (the Heb. bears out the rec. here (which agrees with LXX-B^x) in expressing the αὐτῶν: עֲדָרָהּ עֲדָרָהּ-יָדָהּ. The formula is found generally without the pronoun, as in reff. and Gen. xix. 11: 1 Kings v. 9; xxx. 2, 19: 4 Kings xxiii. 2; xxv. 26, &c.: but with it in Jer. vi. 13: Jonah iii. 5) **even to the great (one) of them** (that is, "they shall be all taught of God," as cited by our Lord in John vi. 45, from Isa. liv. 13, as written ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, alluding to such passages as this and Joel ii. 28, 29. See also 1 John ii. 20, 27, and notes there. Under the old covenant, the priests' lips were to keep knowledge, and they were to teach the people God's ways: under the New, there is no more need for the believer to have recourse to man for teaching in the knowledge of God, for the Holy Spirit, which is given to all that ask, reveals the things of Christ to each, according to the measure of his spiritual attainment and strength of faith. And the inner reason of this now follows, making, formally, the third of these better promises, but in fact bound up with, and the condition of, the last mentioned): 12.] **because** (not, as Michaelis on Peirce, "shall know me, that:?" but ὅτι is the causal particle: see above, and cf. the conclusion, Isa. xxxiii. 24. "By God passing by the former guilt of His sinful people, and beginning a new relation of grace with them, is this blessed change made possible." De Wette. Bleek and Delitzsch have good notes here) **I will be merciful** (ἡσέω. "In other places also is the verb ἡσέω given in the LXX by the formula ἡσέω εἰμι: always of God only, in reference to men; sometimes absolutely, 3 Kings viii. 30, 39: 2 Chron. vi. 21: Amos vii. 2; but generally with a dative, either of the per-

b = ch. viii. 2 τό τε b ἅγιον c κοσμικόν. 2 σκηνὴ γὰρ d κατεσκευάσθη ἡ
 ref. Exod. xxviii. 23 [29]. c Tit. ii. 12 only +. (see note.) d ch. iii. 3, 4 ref.

2. [κατεσκευασται 17.]

even made of some which are not insisted on, nor their symbolism explained: and the main point of comparison, the access into the holiest place, is hastened on. In this particular especially the infinite superiority of the new covenant is insisted on: and the whole access of Christ into God's presence for us is elaborately contrasted with the former insufficient ceremonial access by means of animal sacrifices. In one point, above all, is this contrast brought out: *the supreme efficacy of the blood of Christ, as set against the nullity of the blood of bulls and of goats to purge away sin.* Then the subject of the heavenly tabernacle and holy place is recurring to, and the future prospect of Christ's re-appearing from thence opened. 1—5.]

The liturgical appliances of the first covenant.

1.] Now accordingly (μέν answers to δέ ver. 6, not to δέ ver. 11, see there. οὖν takes up the thought of ch. viii. 5, where the command is recited directing Moses to make the tabernacle after the pattern shewn him in the mount. In pursuance of that command it was that ἡ πρώτη κ.τ.λ.) the first (covenant) (not, the first tabernacle, as the rec. wrongly and clumsily glosses. There is no question between a first and second tabernacle: the μέζων καὶ τελειότερα σκηνὴ is a prototype, not an after-thought. The gloss has probably arisen from a blunder in interpreting τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς in ver. 8: see there) had (it was no longer subsisting in the Writer's time as a covenant, however its observances might be still surviving. ὡσεὶ ἔλεγε, τότε εἶχε, νῦν οὐκ ἔχει δέκνυσιν ἤδη τοῦτω αὐτὴν ἐκκεχωρηκυῖαν τότε γὰρ εἶχε, φησίν. ὥστε νῦν, εἰ καὶ ἔστηκεν, οὐκ ἔστιν. Chrys. Or perhaps the εἶχε may refer back to the time indicated in ch. viii. 5, when Moses made the tabernacle: had, when its liturgical appliances were first provided. But I prefer the other view) also (as well as this second and more perfect covenant: not that this has all the things below mentioned, but that it too possesses its corresponding liturgical appliances, though of a higher kind) ordinances ('The vulg. renders 'justificationes culturae.' But the idea of δικάωμα is ever passive. It imports always the product of either right appointment, or righteous judgment, or righteous conduct: the ordinance having the force of right (ref. Luke), the righteously uttered judgment (Rom. v. 16), the decree according to righteousness (Rev. xv. 4), the

righteous performance (Rom. v. 18); here beyond doubt, and ver. 10, in the first of these senses, in which the LXX have it for σκηνή, πτ and their synonyms. It is from δικαιοῦν, to give the force of law, to make of legal obligation. The old covenant also had liturgical ordinances, which were 'juris divini,' ordinances which rested their obligatory right upon revelation from God and declaration of His will." Delitzsch) of service (*worship*: see ch. viii. 5 and note), and its (or, the: see below) worldly sanctuary (Thom. Aq., Luther, al. take ἕγιον not in a local but in an ethical sense, = ἀγίωτης: Wolf understands by it "vasa sacra totumque apparatus Leviticum." But as the whole passage treats of the distinction between two sanctuaries, one into which the Levitical priests entered, and the other into which Christ is entered, it is certain that the signification must be local only. As regards the meaning of κοσμικόν, it must not be taken with Homberg as = κόσμιον, 1 Tim. ii. 9; iii. 2, for both usage and the art. are against this: nor again, with Theodor.-mops., Thdr., Ec.(alt.), Grot., Wetst., Hammond, as σύμβολον τοῦ κόσμου: nor again as Kypke, "toto terrarum orbe celebratum," as Jos. B. J. iv. 5. 2, where the high priests Ananus and Jesus are described as τῆς κοσμικῆς θρησκείας κατάρχοντες, προσκυνοῦμενοί τε τοῖς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης,—a meaning which would apply only to the temple, not to the tabernacle, which, from ver. 2, is here spoken of: nor again as Chrys. (ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ Ἕλλησι βατὸν ἦν, κοσμικὸν αὐτὸ καλεῖ· οὐ γὰρ δὴ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι κόσμος ἦν), Thl., Erasmus, al., which would only be true of a part of the ἕγιον, viz. the court of the Gentiles: but as in ref., and constantly in the Fathers, "mundanus," belonging to this world. So Plut., Consol. in Bl., κατὰ . . . τὴν κοσμικὴν διάταξιν: Hierocl. Carm. Aur. 126, τῆς κοσμικῆς εὐταξίας. So that it stands opposed to ἐπουράνιον, and is an epithet distinguishing the sanctuary of the first covenant from that of the second, not one common to the two. This is also shewn by the art. τό, to the consideration of which we now come. The art. itself is remarkable, as is also the non-repetition of it before κοσμικόν. And this latter circumstance has induced some, among whom is Delitzsch, to take κοσμικόν as a predicate, "and its (or, the) sanctuary, a worldly one." For the necessity or verisimilitude of this, usage is alleged, and such

πρώτη, ἐν ᾗ ἡ τε ^e λυχνία καὶ ἡ ^f τράπεζα καὶ ἡ ^g πρόθεσις ^e Matt. iv. 15. Luke viii.
 16 || Mk. xj. 33 only, exc. Rev. i. 12 al⁶. Exod. xxv. 31—39. f Matt xv. 27 al⁷. Exod. xxv. 23—30.
 g 2 Chron. xiii. 11. 2 Macc. x. 3. elsw., ἄρτοι τῆς προθέσεως, as Matt. xii. 4 ||. Exod. xl. 21. (23.)

passages as τὸ σῶμα θνητὸν ἅπαντες ἔχουμεν, where we have ἔχω with a definite subst. as an object, and an indefinite predicate attached. But if I do not mistake, the peculiar arrangement of the clause here forbids such a rendering. For, 1. εἶχεν is not peculiar to this clause, but common to the two of which the sentence consists: and we should therefore expect, especially from a writer so careful of rhetorical equilibrium, that the objects in the two clauses should correspond: not that the first of them should be *merely* objective, and the second predicative. Again, 2. the use and position of the copula τε seems to forbid any such disjoining of substantive and epithet: being, however loosely used in later Greek, a closer copula than καί. I conceive the article to be rather used to distribute the object and epithet which follow it: the first covenant had not merely a worldly sanctuary, but the only sanctuary which was upon earth: that one which was constructed after the pattern of things in the heavens. Possibly another reason for inserting it might be, to define beyond doubt the substantival use of the neuter adj. ἅγιον when joined with an epithet such as κοσμικόν. As to the omission of the art. before κοσμικόν, it is no bar to rendering the adj. as an epithet: cf. τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος πονηροῦ, Gal. i. 4).

2—5.] *Exegetical of τὸ ἅγιον κοσμικόν, by a particular detail.* 2.] For the tabernacle (most Commentators, as De Wette, Bleek, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al., render (correctly enough for the Greek, cf. ch. vi. 7: Acts x. 41; xix. 11; xxvi. 22), “a tabernacle,” and then take ἡ πρώτη as specifying. But I should rather query, whether this be not carrying nicety too far for the idiom of modern languages: and whether we can come closer in English to σκηνή ἡ πρώτη, and σκηνή ἡ λεγομένη ἁγία, than by ‘the tabernacle, namely, the first one,’ and ‘the tabernacle which was called holy.’ For as Delitzsch remarks, “the general idea σκηνή is put forward anarthrously, and afterwards defined by appositional epithets having the article.” But when we say ‘a tabernacle,’ we do not express the general idea σκηνή, but an indefinite concrete example of it. The English only admits such expressions in plurals and abstracts: e. g. γῆ ἡ πιόσσα, “land which hath drunk:” δυνάμεις οὐχ αἱ τυχοῦσαι, “miracles of no common sort.” Or we may say that in both cases σκηνή being thrown emphatically forward, loses its article. At all events, by render-

ing it “a tabernacle” in both places, as Delitzsch (not the rest, that I can discover), we give a tinge of indefiniteness which certainly does not belong to it, and seem to lose the solemn reference to the well-known tabernacle) was established (on κατασκευάζω, see on ch. iii. 3. It is often found of the setting up or establishing of a tent: Xen. Cyr. ii. 1. 25, σκηνὰς αὐτοῖς κατασκεύασε: ib. 30, Κύρος δὲ αὐτῷ σκηνὴν μὲν κατασκεύαστο: Jos. c. Apion. ii. 2, Μωσῆς, ὅτε τὴν πρώτην σκηνὴν τῷ θεῷ κατασκεύασεν) the first one (πρώτη, in situation, to those entering: see Acts xvi. 12 note, and compare the Homeric expression ἐν πρώτῃσι θύρῃσι. In the citation from Josephus above, the expression is used in a *temporal* sense, as distinguished from the subsequent one, in the temple of Solomon. The question, whether the Writer thinks (locally) of two tabernacles, or is speaking of the *first portion* of one and the same tabernacle, is of no great importance: the former would be but a common way of expressing the latter: and we can hardly deny that ‘two tabernacles’ are spoken of, in the presence of σκ. ἡ λεγομένη ἁγία ἁγίων below), in which were (not, “are,” as Luncm., holding it to be ruled by λέγεται below. But λέγεται only refers to a name, now, as then, given: the position of the articles enumerated in the πρώτη σκηνή must be contemporaneous with κατασκ. above) the candlestick (with seven lights: of gold, carved with almond flowers, pomegranates and lilies: see Exod. xxv. 31—39; xxxvii. 17—24. There were *ten* of these in the temple of Solomon, see 1 Kings vii. 49: 2 Chron. iv. 7: but in the second temple, the Mosaic regulation was returned to, and *only one* placed in the tabernacle: see 1 Macc. i. 21; iv. 49: Jos. Ant. xii. 7. 6: also B. J. v. 5. 5 (see below); vii. 5. 5, where he describes Vespasian’s triumph, and the candlestick as borne in it, which is now to be seen in relief on the arch of Titus at Rome) and the table (for the shewbread; of shittin (acacia?) wood, overlaid with gold, Exod. xxv. 23—30; xxxvii. 10—16, of which there was *one only* in the Mosaic tabernacle, and in the second temple (1 Macc. ut supra), but *ten* in Solomon’s temple, see 2 Chron. iv. 8; also ib. ver. 19: 1 Chron. xxviii. 16: 1 Kings vii. 48) and the shew of the bread (there can be little doubt that Tholuck and Delitzsch are right, who understand ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν ἄρτων not of the *custom of exhibiting* the bread, but, seeing that

h = ch. viii. 5
 i ch vi 19 reff.
 Exod xxxi
 31 ff
 k Num iv 19.
 3 Kings viii
 6. 2 Chron iv 22. v 7.
 9. -αμα, ib. 10, 11)
 1 here only (see note)
 2 Chron xxvi 19. Ezek. viii. 11 only.
 3 m ch xi 7 reff.
 n Rev. x. 19. Exod xxxi 7. Num Deut Joshi passim

τῶν ἁ ἄρτων, ἡ ἥτις λέγεται ἡ ἅγια. ³ μετὰ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον ἈΒΔΚΛ
 ἡ καταπέτασμα σκηνῇ ἢ λεγομένη ἡ ἅγια ἁγίων, ⁴ χρυσοῦν ^{PN a b}
 ἔχουσα ^{c f g h k} ^{i m n o} ^{17. 47} θυμιατήριον, καὶ τὴν ^{mn} κιβωτὸν τῆς ⁿ διαθήκης

aft ἁρτων ins και το χρυσοῦν θυμιατήριον, oing χρ. θυμ. και in ver 4, B basm [æth].

ins 3 a bef ἁγια B. aft ἁγια. (sic A) ins ἁγιων AD¹ [Orig-int.] .

3. ins 3 a bef ἁγια and των bef ἁγιων BD³KLK³ [των (but not τα) P 47 coptt] : om AD¹N¹ rel [Chr Euthal-mis Cyr¹ Thdr̄t Damasc].

the Writer is speaking of concrete objects, as 'strucs panum,' the heap of bread itself thus exhibited. **πρόθεσις**, says Del., is the Greek word for *panis*. We have it similarly used in LXX, ref. 2 Chron. There it is in the plural, which Bleek maintains would have been the case here were it so meant, in reference to the double row of pieces: but I cannot see why the whole mass should not be called the *πρόθεσις*: **which tabernacle** (the categorical *ἥτις*, 'that tabernacle namely, which') is called the holy place (Erasmus, Steph., Eras. Schmid, Mill, al. write this *ἅγια*, as fem., and agreeing with *σκηνή*, and so Luther, *die heilige*, and E. V., "the sanctuary." The vulg., "quæ dicitur sancta," appears to refer the clause to "propositio panum" immediately preceding. D-lat. (see D¹ in digest) has "sancta sanctorum." There can be no doubt that it is neut. plur. This is insisted on as early as by Thdr̄t.: *προπαροξυτόνας ἀναγνωστέον τὰ ἅγια· οὕτω γὰρ ἡμᾶς διδάσκει νοεῖν τὸ ἔτερον ὄνομα· viz. ἅγια ἁγίων*, ver. 3. So Erasmus. (annot.) and all the moderns. But even thus the omission of the art. is significant. The Writer is not so much speaking of the holy place by name, τὰ ἅγια, as by quality and predication, (the) holy (places). 3.] But (as bringing out by anticipation the same contrast which we have in vv. 6, 7, *εἰς μὲν τὴν πρόπτην . . . εἰς δὲ τὴν δευτέραν*) after (i. e. in entering: '*behind*,' as we should say, if regarding it 'in situ.' So Herod. iv. 49, *οἱ ἔσχατοι πρὸς ἡλίου δυσμέμεν μετὰ Κύνης οἰκείουσι*) the second veil (**καταπέτασμα**, class. *παπέτασμα*, see ch. vi. 19, is used in the LXX for the veil or curtain hanging before the sanctuary. There were in reality two of these, as described in Exod. xxvi. 31—37: one before the holy of holies itself, *ἡγῆ* (vv. 31—35), the other before the tabernacle door, *ἡγῆ* (vv. 36, 37). For both of these the LXX in Exod. l. c. have *καταπέτασμα*, and so also for the first veil in Num. iii. 26. And Josephus, B. J. v. 5. 4, *πρὸ δὲ τούτων* (the gates of the *πῶτος οἴκος*) *ισόμηκες καταπέτασμα*: and below, § 5, τὸ δ' ἐνδο-

τάτω μέρος . . . διέρρητο ὁμοίως καταπέτασματι πρὸς τὸ ἐξῶθεν. Similarly in Antt. viii. 3, 3, *κατεπέτασε δὲ καὶ ταύτας* (the outside doors) *τὰς θύρας, ὁμοίως τοῖς ἐνδοτέρω καταπέτασμασι*. Usually however in the LXX, the exterior veil is called *κάλυμμα* or *ἐπίσπαστρον*, and the word *καταπέτασμα* reserved for the interior one. So Exod. xxvi. 36: cf. Levit. xxi. 23, *πλὴν πρὸς τὸ καταπέτασμα οὐ προσελεύσεται*: xxiv. 3: Num. iv. 5. And so in Philo, Vita Mos. iii. 9, vol. ii. p. 150, *ὅπερ ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν πρόναον, εἰρηγόμενον δυσὶν ὑφάσμασι, τὸ μὲν ἐνδον ὃν καλεῖται καταπέτασμα, τὸ δ' ἐκτὸς προσαγορεύεται κάλυμμα*: so also above, § 5, p. 148. But elsewhere he calls both by the name *καταπέτασμα*, by implication at least: e. g. De Victim. § 10, p. 246, *ἀντικρὺ τοῦ πρὸς τὰς ἀδύτοις καταπετάσματος, ἐσωτέρω τοῦ προτέρου*: and De Gigant. § 12, vol. i. p. 270, *τὸ ἐσώτατον καταπέτασμα κ. προκάλυμμα τῆς δόξης* (the not "α," see above) tabernacle which is called holy of holies (*ἅγια* again, not *ἁγία*, see above. *ἡγῆ* *ἡγῆ*, sometimes τὸ ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων, a periphrasis of the superlative adopted from the Heb.), 4.] **having** (on *ἔχουσα*, see below) a golden censer (or, altar of incense) ("Maxima totius epistolæ difficultas in verbis hiscæ consistit, atque hic locus fortasse præter cæteros dubium apud veteres reddidit huius epistolæ auctoritatem." Calmet, in Tholuck. The first difficulty is respecting the meaning of the word *θυμιατήριον*. And here the etymology gives us no help. For the word is a neut. adj., importing any thing having regard to or employed in the burning of incense. It may therefore mean either an altar upon which, or a censer in which, incense was burnt. The latter meaning is found in Dmōsth. p. 617. 3, *ἐκπώματα δὲ ἡ θυμιατήρια, ἃν μὲν ὑπερβάλλῃ τῷ πλήθει κ.τ.λ.*: and so LXX, reff.: Josephus, Antt. iv. 2. 4, *κομίζων ἕκαστος θυμιατήριον οἰκοθεν σὺν θυμιάμασι*. The former, in Herod. iv. 162, *Εὐέλθων, ὅς τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θυμιατή-*

ο περικεκαλυμμένην ᾧ πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ, ἐν ᾗ ὁ στάμνος (Exod. xxv. xiv 65 || L only Exod. xxviii 20. 3 Kings vii 42. viii 7 only. p Mark i. 45. Luke xix 43 only Jer. xx. 9. Sui ii. 7. Sus 23 only. q here only. Exod. xvi. 33. 3 Kings xiv. 3 A (in B the omitted passage follows xii. 2) only.

4. [πανταχοθεν 47.]

ριον ἐν ἀξιοθέητον ἀνέθηκεν: Ælian, V. H. xii. 51, καὶ κατακλιθέντι (Μενεκράτει) θυμιατήριον παρέθηκε (Φιλίππος), καὶ ἐθυμιάτο αὐτῷ. It is true, the LXX have generally called the altar of incense τὸ θυσιαστήριον θυμιάματος or. -των, cf. Exod. xxx. 1, 27: Levit. iv. 7: 1 Chron. vi. 49; xxviii. 18: 2 Chron. xxvi. 16, 19: or τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν, Exod. xl. 5, 24 (26): Num. iv. 11: 3 Kings vii. 48: 2 Chron. iv. 19: or τὸ θυσιαστ. τὸ ἀπ-ἐραντι κυρίου, Levit. xvi. 12, 18: or merely τὸ θυσιαστήριον, where the context shews which altar is meant, Levit. xvi. 20: Num. iv. 13, 14: Deut. xxxiii. 10: 3 Kings vi. 20: and also θυσιαστήρια, where both the altars, of burnt-offering and of incense, are intended, Exod. xxxi. 8: Num. iii. 31. But later, the more appropriate word θυμιατήριον became the usual Hellenistic name for the altar of incense. So Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 46, vol. i. p. 504, τριῶν ὄντων ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις σκευῶν, λυχ-νίας, τραπέζης, θυμιατηρίου, τὸ μὲν θυμιατήριον κ.τ.λ.: and id. Vita Mos. iii. § 7, vol. ii. p. 149, ἐδημιουργεῖτο καὶ σκεύη ἱερὰ, κιβωτός, λυχνία, τράπεζα, θυμιατήριον, βωμός. And Josephus, Antt. iii. 6. 8; iii. 8. 2, 3: B. J. v. 5. 5, καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον μέρος . . . εἶχεν ἐν αὐτῷ τρία θαυμασιώτατα κ. περιβόητα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἔργα, λυχνίαν, τράπεζαν, θυμιατήριον. So also Clem.-alex. Strom. v. 6. 33, pp. 665 f. P., and other Fathers. And thus it has been taken here by the old lat. in D, by Æc. on ver. 7 (καὶ θυμιάσει ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, τοῦτέστιν, ἐπὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ θυμιατηρίου οὗ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἁγίοις τῶν ἁγίων κ.τ.λ.), and of later expositors Tostatus (on Exod. xxv. qu. 6; on 1 Kings vi. qu. 16), Calvin, Justiniani, Estius, Corn. a-Lap., La Cerdà (Adverss. c. 81, p. 112), Schlichting, Junius, J. Capellus, Gerhard, Brochmann, Mynster, Owen, Bleek, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünemann, Delitzsch. On the other hand, the meaning "censer" is adopted by Syr., vulg. ("thuribulum"), Thl. (μετὰ γε τοῦ χρυσοῦ θυμιατηρίου ἅπαξ εἰσῆλθι τοῦ ἐναντιοῦ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ἄλλο γὰρ θυμιατήριον καὶ ἄλλο θυσιαστήριον, on ver. 7), Anselm, Th. Aquin., Lyra, Luther, Grot., Villalpandus (on Ezek.), Hammond, De Dieu, Calov., Reland, Lünborch, Wolf, Bengel, Wetst., Carpzov, Deyling, Michaelis, Schulz, Böhlme, Stuart, Kuinoel, Von Gerlach, Stier, Bisping, al. And on this side of the question it is remarkable, that much stress is laid by

the Mishna upon *the censer to be used on the day of expiation*, as distinguished from that used on any other day: on the fact of its being *of gold*, and of a particular and precious kind of gold. I give nearly the whole passage from Surenhuius, Ordo Festorum, ii. 229, as certainly forming an important element in deciding the difficulty. "In omni die deprompsit thuribulo argenteo et in aureum infundebat: hodie deprompsit aureo, et intrabat cum eo. In omni die deprompsit thuribulo quod quatuor cabos continebat, et in alterum infundebat quod tres cabos capiebat: hodie deprompsit thuribulo quod tres cabos capiebat, et intrabat cum eo. . . . In omni die grave, hodie leve: in omni die manus ejus brevis erat, hodie longa: in omni die aurum ejus viride erat, hodie rufum" (on which Sheringham notes, "Thuribulum quo singulis diebus odores incendebantur, ex auro viridi constabat, quod minus pretiosum erat, sed pretiosum tamen. Martial. xii. 15, 'miratur Scythicas virentis auri Flammæ Jupiter, et stupet superbi Regis delicias.' Sed in die expiationis thuribulum rutilante auro coruscabat, quod genus auri pretiosissimum et præstantissimum fuit, et דָּוָב דָּוָב, ut aiunt Talmudici, vocabatur, quia juvenum sanguinem specie referebat. Quamvis verisimilium videtur a nomine loci sic vocari: vide 2 Chron. iii. 6"). See also the citation below on τὴν κιβωτόν. If this latter interpretation be adopted, we are involved in the following difficulty. This *golden censer* is no where named in the law: the word rendered "censer" by E. V., in Levit. xvi. 12, is כִּתְּרִית, a shallow basin, in which the high priest on the day of atonement was to take incense from the incense-altar into the holy place: and is called in the LXX πυρεῖον, not θυμιατήριον. Besides which, it is not specified as golden; nor was it kept in the holy of holies. Indeed it could not have been, or the high priest would have been obliged to fetch it from thence before burning incense in it, which is most improbable. Of these, the first-mentioned objection is not decisive; for our Writer is speaking, not of Mosaic usage only, but of several things outside the provisions of the law itself; and thus our explanation of any difficulty need not be sought in the provisions of the law only, but also in subsequent Jewish usage. This especially against Delitzsch, who, strictly confining

r John vi. 31,
49 Rev. ii.
17 only.
Num xi. 6.
11. Isa xxi. 6.

χρυσὴ ἔχουσα τὸ ῥ μάννα, καὶ ἡ ῥ ῥάβδος ῥ Ααρὼν ἡ ῥ βλασ-

s Num. xiii. 1-11.

t Matt xiii. 26 Mark iv. 27. James v. 18 only. Gen. i

ΑΒΓΔΕΖ
ΠΣαβ
ε ρ θ κ λ
ι μ ν ο
17. 47

ου η (bef βλαστησασα) B m.

us to Mosiac ordinance *here*, and asserting that the Writer speaks of it and nothing else, yet *below*, on the pot of manna, &c., confesses that he follows tradition. If now, influenced by the above difficulties, we adopt the interpretation '*altar of incense*,' for θυμιατήριον, a difficulty arises, certainly not less than any of those adduced above. On the one hand the word ἔχουσα at first sight seems to admit of no other meaning than a local one, '*containing*.' The parallelism with ἐν ἡ above appears to demand this, and the fact that the other things mentioned are beyond question intended to be *in*, not merely belonging to, the Holy of holies. On this, see more below. Taking it as our first impression, we are startled by the fact, that the altar of incense was *not* in the Holy of holies, but *outside it*, ἔσω τοῦ προτέρου καταπατάσματος, as Philo de Vict. Off. § 4, vol. ii. p. 253. Hence Bleek, De Wette, and Lünemann, suppose that the Writer has fallen into a mistake, and Bleek infers from this that he was not an inhabitant of Palestine, but an Alexandrine. But as Delitzsch observes, whichever he were, he must have been a Monstrum von Unwissenheit, to have fallen into any such error. "Then," continues Delitzsch, "since we cannot submit him to such an imputation, is there any intent which our Writer may have had, inducing him to ascribe the altar of incense to the Holy of holies, notwithstanding that he knew its local situation to be in the Holy place?" There is such an intent, recognized even by Bleek himself. "The Author," says Bleek, and after him Tholuck, "treats the Holy of holies, irrespective of the veil, as symbolical of the heavenly sanctuary, and had also a motive to include in it the altar of incense, whose offerings of incense are the symbol of the prayers of the saints, Rev. viii. 3 f." And even so it is. Not only the N. T. writings, but the O. T. also, Isa. vi. 6, speak of a heavenly altar, which is the antitype there of the earthly ἄλтарь. Considering the fact that this antitypical altar belonged to the Holy of holies, into which Christ entered through the torn veil, it was obvious for our Writer to reckon the typical altar also among the things belonging to the Holy of holies. Philo, who regarded the λυχνία as the type of heaven, the θυμιατήριον as σύμβολον τῶν περιγελαίων, εἰς ὧν αἱ ἀναθυμιά-

σεις (Vita Mos. iii. 10, vol. ii. p. 251), had no such motive. Our second question then is, whether our Writer is justified, having this motive, in reckoning the altar of incense among the furniture of the Holy of holies. And our answer is, Entirely so: but not for the reason given by Ebrard, because the smoke of the incense was not intended to roll backwards, but to penetrate into the holiest place as the symbol of supplication and homage: which reason is none at all (but see below), seeing that the same might be said of the smoke of the fat of the altar of burnt-offering, and in the same way the golden table and the shewbread might be reckoned in the Holy of holies; for the cakes, a thank-offering of the twelve tribes for the blessing bestowed on them, lay on the table, that He who sat between the cherubim might behold them. Nor can we refer to Exod. xxi. 35, where the only reason for the altar of incense not being named among the furniture outside the veil, is, that its construction was not yet prescribed;—nor can we adduce the fact of its being called in Exod. xxx. 10, ἁγία ἁγίων, holy of holies, seeing that the altar of burnt-offering is in Exod. xl. 10, distinguished by the same name. But the following considerations have weight: α. that the altar of incense, by Exod. xxx. 6 and xl. 5, is to be placed before the ark of the covenant or before the Capporeth (mercy-seat), i. e. in the middle between the candlestick on the right and the table of shewbread on the left, so that its place is subordinate to the ark of the covenant: β. that on the day of atonement, it, as well as the mercy-seat, was sprinkled with the blood of the sin-offering: γ. that in 1 Kings vi. 22, as well as by our Writer, it is reckoned to the Holy of holies, being there called ἁγία ἁγίων, the altar belonging to the sanctuary (E.V., '*the altar that was by the oracle*'). Thenius indeed holds ἁγίων to be an error for ἁγία, '*before the sanctuary*,' but Keil maintains rightly that that passage of Kings and our passage here mutually defend and explain one another. The solution to be gathered from this would be, that the altar of incense, being appointed by the Mosiac ordinance to stand in immediate contiguity to the veil separating the Holy of holies, and being destined in its use especially for the service of the Holy of holies (for this, notwithstanding

τήσασα, καὶ αἱ "πλάκες τῆς διαθήκης· 5 ὑπερανῶ δὲ αὐτῆς u 2 Cor. vi. 3
bis only.
ΕΛΟΘ. XXXI.
Deut. XXXI. 19.

18. XXXII 19. 3 Kings viii. 9.

v Eph. i. 21. iv. 10 only.

5. *υπερ* δε αυτην D¹, *super eam* D-lat, *superque eam* vulg.—*υπερανων* m.

the objection brought by Delitzsch, might have weight; the exterior altar of burnt-offering did not belong in any such strict sense to the sanctuary and mercy-seat), and being described in more than one place of Scripture (e.g. Exod. xxx. 6: 1 Kings vi. 22) as connected with the sanctuary, is taken by the Writer as appertaining to the Holy of holies: he choosing, thus to describe it, the somewhat ambiguous word *ἐχουσα*, and not *ἐν ᾗ* as before. For we may set off against what was just now said about the strict parallel at first sight between *ἐν ᾗ* in the former clause and *ἐχουσα* in this, that it may be fairly alleged, that the very fact of variation of terms, in such a parallelism, points to some variation of meaning also. I have thus given both views of the solution to be sought: and will now state the result. 1. On either hypothesis, *ἐχουσα* cannot be kept to its stricter meaning of *containing*. For neither the censer nor the incense-altar was *kept* in the holy of holies. 2. The language of the Mischna concerning the golden censer is very strong, and more weight still is given to it when we reflect that it is especially of the day of expiation that our Writer is preparing to speak. 3. The word *χρυσούν* should not be overlooked in the consideration. When the ark of the covenant by and by is spoken of, which like the altar of incense was overlaid with gold, it is not said to be *χρυσούν*, but only *περικεκαλυμμένη πάντοθεν χρυσίῳ*. And this predicate being thus emphatically thrown forward, it is hardly possible to help feeling that a stress is laid on it, and it is not used without design. And if we enquire what this design is, we can hardly find fault with the reply which says that it is to distinguish a *χρυσούν* *θυμιατήριον* from some other kinds of *θυμιατήρια*. 4. On the whole then I should say that the balance inclines towards the 'censer' interpretation, though I do not feel by any means that the difficulty is removed, and should hail any new solution which might clear it still further) and the ark of the covenant (see Exod. xxv. 10 ff.; xxxvii. 1 ff.: called by this name, *הַקֶּדֶשׁ הַקָּדוֹשׁ*, Josh. iii. 6 and passim) covered round on all sides (*ἐσωθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν*, Exod. xxv. 11) with gold (*χρυσίῳ*, not *χρυσῷ*, perhaps for a *portion* of gold, or perhaps, as Delitzsch, for *wrought* gold. See Palm and Rost's Lex. But all distinction between the words seems to have been lost before Hellenistic Greek

arose, and the tendency of all later forms of speech is to adopt diminutives where the elder forms used the primitives. The ark, a chest, was of shittim (acacia) wood, overlaid with plates of fine gold, Exod. 1. c. The ark of the covenant was in the Holy of holies in the Mosaic tabernacle, and in the temple of Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 4, 6. In the sack by the Chaldeans, it disappeared. See a legend respecting its fate in 2 Macc. ii. 1—8, where curiously enough *τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ τὴν κιβωτὴν καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ θυμιάματος* are classed together. The second temple did not contain it, but it was represented by a stone basement three fingers high, called *πῦθρον*, "the stone of foundation" (Delitzsch: see Gesen. Thesaurus, under *πῦθρον*, iii.). So in the Mischna, "Ex quo abducta est arca, lapis ibi erat a diebus priorum prophetarum, et lapis fundationis fuit vocatus; altus e terra tribus digitis, et super ipsum thuribulum collocabat." So Jos. B. J. v. 5. 5, of the sanctuary, in his time, *τὸ δ' ἐνδοτάτω μέρος εἴκοσι μὲν ἦν πηχῶν διεύργετο δὲ ὁμοίως καταπετάσματι πρὸς τὸ ἔξωθεν*. *ἔκειτο δὲ οὐδὲν ὅλως ἐν αὐτῷ, ἔβατον δὲ κ. ἔχραντον κ. ἀθέατον ἦν πᾶσιν, ἁγίου δὲ ἁγιον ἐκαλεῖτο*, in which (was) a golden pot (Exod. xvi. 32—34). The word '*golden*,' *λάβε στάμνον χρυσούν ἕνα*, is added by the LXX: so also Philo de Congr. Quær. Erud. Gr. 18, vol. i. p. 533, *ἐν στάμνῳ χρυσῷ*: the Heb. has merely "a pot," as E. V.) containing the manna (viz. an omer, each man's daily share, laid up for a memorial, cf. Exod. xvi. 32 with ib. 16. That this pot was to be placed in the ark, is not said there, but it was gathered probably from the words "before the Lord." In 1 Kings viii. 9 and 2 Chron. v. 10, it is stated that there was nothing in the ark in Solomon's temple, except the two tables which Moses put therein at Horeb. But this, as Delitzsch observes, will not prove any thing against the pot of manna and the rod having *once* been there; nay rather, from the express declaration that there was *then* nothing but the tables of stone, it would seem that formerly there had been other things there. The Rabbis certainly treat of the pot of manna as of the rod, as *being in the ark*: see the testimonies of Levi ben Gershom and Abarbanel in Wetst., h. 1.), and the rod of Aaron which budded (see Num. xvii. 1—11. It was to be laid up "before the testimony," in which Ben Gershom

^d κατεσκευασμένων εἰς μὲν τὴν πρώτην σκηπὴν ^e διὰ παντὸς ^d ch. iii. 3, 4
^f εἰσίσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς τὰς ^g λατρείας ^h ἐπιτελοῦντες, ⁷ εἰς δὲ ^e Acts ii 25
 τὴν δευτέραν ⁱ ἅπαξ τοῦ ⁱ ἐνιαυτοῦ ^k ὁ ἄρχιερεὺς ^k οὐ ^f (from Ps xv.
 8) x 2.
^k χωρὶς αἵματος, ^δ ¹ προσφέρει ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν τοῦ ^f w εἰς, Acts
 λαοῦ ^m ἀγνωμάτων ⁸ τοῦτο ⁿ δηλοῦντος τοῦ ^o πνεύματος <sup>iii 3 xxi.
 26 only.</sup>

Acts xxi. 18 only+. g ver 1. h ch. iii. 5 reff. of sacred rites, Lev. vi 22 τὸν μέγαρον
 ἀρχιερέα, ὅποτε μέλλοι τὰς νόμῳ προστεταμένας ἐπιτελεῖν λειτουργίας, Philo, de Somn. i. 37,
 vol. i. p. 653. i Exod. xxx. 10. Levit. xvi. 34. see ver. 25. k ch. vii. 20.
 1 ch. v. 1 reff. m here only. Gen xlii 12. Judith v. 20. Sir. xxiii. 2. li. 19. 1 Macc xiii. 39 only.
 n ch. xii. 27. 1 Cor. i. 11. iii. 13. Col. i. 8. 1 Pet. i. 11. 2 Pet. i. 14 only. Exod. vi 3. o ch. iii. 7 reff.

δρόμενα, ἀλλὰ αἰνίγματά τινα ἦν, περὶ δὲ
 οὐκ ἔστι φησὶ νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος, ἵσως
 ὡς μακροῦ δεομένων λόγου. 6, 7.]

We now have that whereunto the above
 details have been tending, viz. the use
 made of the sanctuary by the high
 priest on the day of atonement. 6.]

But (transitional) these things being thus
 arranged (it is impossible in English to
 give the force of the perfect participle as
 connected with the present which follows.
 To say 'having been arranged,' and fol-
 low it by 'enter,' would be a solecism:
 which shews, that our participle 'having
 been' is not so much a perfect as an
 aorist. Resolved, the sentence would be:
 'these things have been thus arranged
 (i. e. were thus arranged and continue so),
 and the priests enter.' In taking our
 present-perfect participle, 'being,' we
 lose the historical past involved in the
 perfect, pointing to the time when they
 were so arranged. To carry the sense of
 'abiding even now,' in the perfect, so far,
 as to suppose the Writer to imagine that
 the ark &c. were still, at the time he was
 writing, in the Sanctuary (Bl., Lünem.,
 De W.), is quite unnecessary, and indeed
 unreasonable: he clearly conceives of the
 whole system and arrangement as sub-
 sisting, but not in every minute detail.
 The arrangement was essential to the
 system: the failure of some of its parts,
 accidental to it. κατεσκευασμ. in allu-
 sion to the same word ver. 2), into the
 first (foremost) tabernacle (indeed) con-
 tinually (i. e. day by day, at any time,
 without limits prescribed by the law: cer-
 tainly, twice at least in every day, see
 Exod. xxx. 7 ff.) enter (on the present,
 see above. It must not, as in vulg., be
 rendered by an imperfect, "introibant;"
 D-lat., "intrabant;" Luther, gingen; and
 E. V., "went," which is remarkable, as
 Beza's version has "ingrediuntur") the
 priests (the ordinary priests) accomplish-
 ing the services (so Herod., ἀλλας τε
 θρησκίας κυρίας ἐπιτελοῦσι: he uses ἐπι-
 τελεῖν likewise of θυσίας, ii. 63; iv. 26:
 εὐχολάς, ii. 63: ὁρτάς, iv. 186. See other
 examples in Bl. The services meant are

the morning and evening care of the lamps,
 the morning and evening offering of in-
 cense, and the weekly change of the shew-
 bread), 7.] but into the second (in-
 nermost, the Holy of holies) once in the
 year (i. e. on the day of atonement, the
 10th day of the 7th month: the same ex-
 pression is used in reff. Exod. and Levit.
 The entrance took place, on that day,
 twice at least, from Levit. xvi. 12—16:
 the Mishna says, four (three?) times,
 Joma v. 1; vii. 4. Much trouble has been
 spent by antiquarians on the question:
 see the whole treated in Bleek, if it be
 thought worth while: it may suffice here
 to say that the Writer follows the ordinary
 way of speaking among the Jews and our-
 selves, meaning by 'once,' on one occa-
 sion. No one would think, if I said I was
 in the habit of seeing a certain person but
 once in every year, of asking how long I
 spent in his company during that day, and
 how often I looked upon him. Cf. Philo,
 Leg. ad Cai. § 39, vol. ii. p. 591, εἰς ἓ
 (ἄδυνα) ἅπαξ τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ὁ μέγας ἱερεὺς
 εἰσέρχεται τῇ νηστείᾳ λεγομένῃ μόνον ἐπι-
 θυμιάσων. So ἅπαξ δι' ἑτους, id. de
 Monarch. ii. 2, p. 223: ἅπαξ κατ' ἐνιαυ-
 τόν, Jos. B. J. v. 5. 7: and 3 Macc. i. 11)
 the high priest alone, not Macc. (see
 ch. vii. 20) blood, which he offers (see
 ch. viii. 3) on behalf of himself and the
 ignorances (sins of ignorance, see ch. v. 2:
 cf. Philo, Plant. Noë, § 25, vol. i. p. 345,
 αἱ . . . θυσίαι . . . ὑποκινησκούσαι τὰς
 ἐκάστων ἀγνοίας τε κ. διαμαρτίας. See
 Schweighäuser's Lexicon Polybium, where
 he gives as the sense of ἀγνοια,
 "peccatum, delictum, præsertim errore et
 per imprudentiam commissum:" giving
 numerous instances. But further on, he
 says, "Nonnunquam tamen de graviore
 culpa et deliberato crimine usurpatur:"
 giving also examples. And similarly under
 ἀγνοῶ, "nude, peccare: πολεμῶν τοῖς
 ἀγνοήσασιν, bellum gerere cum eis qui pec-
 carunt, deliquerunt, v. 11. 5: τὰ ἡγνοη-
 μένα, errata, peccata, xxxviii. 1. 5." So
 that here the word may have a wider mean-
 ing than mere sins of ignorance) of the
 people (it has been a question, whether

p Rom. ix. 11 only. ¹ τοῦ ἁγίου, ² μήπω ³ πεφανερῶσθαι τὴν ⁴ τῶν ἁγίων ⁵ ὁδὸν ABCKL
 q Rom. xvi. 26 al fr Jer. xl. (xxxiii.) 6 only. ⁶ ἔτι τῆς πρώτης σκηνῆς ἐχούσης ⁷ στάσιν, ⁸ ἡτίς ⁹ παρα- P^{na} b c f g h k i m n o 17. 47
 t = here (Luke xxiii. 9 || Mk. 26. Acts xv. 2 al⁴) only. Polyb. v. 5. 3. τῶν ἐτησίων ἡδὲ στάσιν ἐχόντων = τῶν ἐτ. ἐπεχόντων, id. c. 6. u = ch. viii. 5 reff. v Gospp., passim (but Mt. Mk. L. only). Epp., ch. xi. 19 only. Eccl. i. 17 A (not F.) BN.

8. *μηπως πεφανερῶσαι* D¹[-gr]. for *ἐτι, ἐπι* D¹[-gr].
 9. *αὐτῆς ins πρώτη* D¹, *quā priori parabola* D-lat.

ἑαυτοῦ can be taken as dependent on ἀνομιῶν—“on behalf of his own sins and those of the people.” So vulg. (“pro sua et populi ignorantia”), Luth., Calv. (vers.), Schlichting, Limborch (vers.), al.: but as above Syr., D-lat. (“pro se et populi delictis”), Faber Stap., Vatabl., Erasm. (vers.), Beza (vers.), Calov., Bengel, Schulz, Böhme, De Wette, al. And no doubt grammatically this latter is in strictness right: the other rendering requiring τῶν before ἑαυτοῦ. The question however in all such cases is not whether the sense would not be better expressed by a more elegant construction, but whether the N. T. dialect was likely to have expressed it without that more elegant construction. And here, though I prefer the more strictly grammatical rendering, I am by no means sure that the other is absolutely excluded. The parallel of ch. vii. 27, πρότερον ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν, ἔπειτα τῶν τοῦ λαοῦ, is very strong: and we have a similar irregularity of grammatical construction in 1 John ii. 2, ἡσαυδὸς περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ἅλων τοῦ κόσμου):

8.] the Holy Spirit signifying (by the typical arrangement of the sanctuary, excluding all from it except the high priest once a year: δηλοῦντος is not, as Semler, to be referred back to the prophecy of Jeremiah above quoted. We often have the verb in this meaning of ‘signifying by a representation’: so in ch. xii. 27, and Jos. Antt. iii. 7. 1, περιτίθεται τὸν μαχαλοῦν λεγόμενον, βούλεται δὲ συνακτῆρα μὲν δηλοῦν, διάζωμα δ’ ἐστὶ κ.τ.λ.: ib. 7. 7, δηλοῖ δὲ καὶ τὸν ἥλιον κ. τὴν σελήνην τῶν σαρδωχῶν ἑκάτερος: cf. also viii. 6. 2. See Libanius and Hermogenes in Wetst. In the latter, δηλοῦν, “subindicare,” is opposed to φανερῶς λέγειν) this (which follows), that the way to (‘of’): so in reff.,—see Kühner ii. p. 176, Anm. 4: but not in τὴν εὐθὺς Ἀργεὺς κάπιδαυρίας ὁδόν, Eur. Hipp. 1197, where the genitives are governed by εὐθὺς: cf. εὐθὺς σφῶν . . . πλεύν, Thuc. viii. 96, and Lob. on Phryn. p. 144) the holy places (i.e. the true holy places in heaven: for it is of antitype, not of type, that the Writer is here speaking. Hence there is no danger of mistaking τὰ ἅγια here for the outer tabernacle: it is

as in reff., and τὸ ἅγιον in Ezek. xli. 23 and Levit. xvi. 16, 17, 20, 23, 27, the holy place κατ’ ἐξοχὴν. Syr. has a curious rendering—“the way of the holy ones” (masc.) has not yet been manifested (not, had not: the present form is maintained throughout: see below) while the first tabernacle is as yet standing (what first tabernacle? That which was first in time, or first in order of space? Clearly the latter, which has already been used in ver. 6: no reason can be given for changing the sense to the temporal one, especially as the Writer is regarding the whole as present, and drawing no contrast as to time. In fact, if time be regarded, the heavenly, not the earthly tabernacle is the first. Still less, with Peirce and Sykes, can we understand the tabernacle in the wilderness, as distinguished from the temple: which would yield no assignable sense. Bleek supposes that ἡ πρώτη σκηνή, thus understood, symbolizes the whole Jewish Levitical worship which took place in the first or outer tabernacle: Ebrard, that the whole, exterior and interior tabernacle, is symbolical, the exterior of relative, the interior of absolute holiness: and he sees an equality of ratios which he thus expresses—πρώτη σκηνή: ἅγια ἁγίων :: (πρώτη σκηνή + ἅγια ἁγίων): Christ. But both of these ideas are well refuted by Delitzsch, who reminds us that the first as well as the second tabernacle was symbolical of heavenly things. Thl. says, ἀρχεται λοιπὸν ἀναγωγικώτερον θεωρεῖν τὰ περὶ τῶν σκηνῶν, καὶ φησὶν, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων ἔβατα ἦν τοῖς ἁλλοῖς ἱερεῦσιν, ἃ τύποις εἰσὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν, ἡ μέντοι πρώτη σκηνή, τοιούτεστιν ἡ μετὰ τὸ ἐξῆθεν θυσιαστήριον τὸ χαλκοῦν πρώτη εὐθὺς οὐσα, βάσιμος ἦν αὐτοῖς διὰ παντός, σύμβολον οὐσα τῆς κατὰ νόμον λατρείας, ἐδηλοῦτο συμβολικῶς, ὅτι ἔως οὐ ἵσταται ἡ σκηνή αὕτη, τοιούτεστιν ἔως οὐ κρατεῖ ὁ νόμος καὶ αἱ κατ’ αὐτὸν λατρεῖαι τελούνται, οὐκ ἔστι βάσιμος ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ὁδός, τοιούτεστιν ἡ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰσοδος, τοῖς τὰς τοιαύτας λατρεῖας ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μὲν ἀφανὲς ἔστι καὶ ἀποκλεισται, μόνω δὲ τῷ ἐν ἁρχιερεὶ χριστῷ ἀφωρίσθη ἡ ὁδὸς αὕτη. The phrase στάσιν ἔχειν, besides reff. Polyb., occurs in Plut. Symp. viii. 8, εἰ νέα πάθη τότε

βολή^w εἰς τὸν^v καιρὸν τὸν^x ἐνεστηκότα, καθ' ἣν^z δώρᾳ τε^w Luke i. 20.
καὶ θυσίαι^z προσφέρονται μὴ δυνάμεναι κατὰ^a συνείδησιν^x 1 Pet. i. 11
b τελεῖσθαι τὸν^c λατρεύοντα, 10 μόνον^d ἐπὶ^e βρώμασιν^x Rom viii.
38. 1 Cor.
iii. 22. vii.
25 Gal i.

4. 2 Thess. ii. 2. 2 Tim. iii. 1 only 1 Marc. xii. 44. y = Acts xv. 11. xviii. 25. 2 Thess. ii. 3 al.
z ch. v. 1 reff. a Acts xxiv. 1. 1 Cor. vii. 7, &c. x. 25, &c. 2 Cor. i. 12. ch. x. 2 al. Eccl x.
20. Wisd. xvi. 11 only. b ch. ii. 10 reff. c absol., ch. x. 2 reff. (ch. viii. 5 reff.)
d ch. viii. 1 reff. e plur., Matt. xiv. 15 || L. Mark vii. 19. Luke iii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 13. 1 Tim. i.
3. ch. xiii. 9 only. Job vi. 5.

rec (for ἦν) δν, with D³KL[P] rel D-lat [Euthal-ms] Thdr̄t Thl: txt ABD¹N 17 vulg
[Chr] Damasc Ec Primas.

πρῶτον ἔσχεν ἐν τῇ φύσει γένεσιν κ. στάσιν: and in Dion. Hal. vi. p. 415, μέχρις ἂν οὐρανός τε καὶ γῆ τὴν αὐτὴν στάσιν ἔχωσι. See other examples in Kypke. On the sense, cf. Jos. Antt. iii. 7. 7, τὴν δὲ τρίτην μοῖραν (τῆς σκη- νῆς) μόνῃ περιέγραψε τῷ θεῷ διὰ τὸ καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεπίβατον εἶναι τοῖς ἀνθρώ- ποις),

9.] the which (ἥτις = 'quippe quæ,' as almost always. ἥτις, viz. the first or anterior tabernacle, and that especially considered as obstructing, by its yet remaining, the way into the holiest. This is better than with Primasius to understand quæ res, and account for the gender by attraction) is (not, "was," see above) a parable (τοιούστι τύπος κ. σκια- γραφία, Thl. παραβολή is predicate, not subject, as Calvin, Storr, De W., al. If we make it subject, the verb to be supplied would not be the mere copula, but a significant verb, which would require to be expressed) for (in reference to: or it may be taken as indicating the terminus ad quem, 'until:.' but I prefer the other: see reff.) the time (period, or season, with reference to the divine dispensations) now present (so Primasius, commenting on the "parabola temporis instantis" of the vulg., "Quod enim agebatur in templo tum temporis, figura erat et similitudo istius veritatis quæ jam in ecclesia completur." And thus recently, and to my mind decisively, Delitzsch. But observe, the first tabernacle was not a parable of the present time, so that ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐνεστηκώς should be the thing represented:—but a parable,—for, reserved unto, or given in reference to, the present time,—of heavenly things, to which the access is in the present time revealed.

This application of τὸν καιρ. τ. ἐνεστ. to the time now present, has not been the general view of Commentators. καιρὸν ἐνεστηκότα, says Chrys., ποῖον λέγει; τὸν πρὸ τῆς τοῦ χριστοῦ παρουσίας μετὰ γὰρ τῆς παρου- σίας τοῦ χριστοῦ οὐκέτι καιρὸς ἐστὶν ἐνεστώς· πῶς γάρ, ἐπιγενόμενος καὶ τέλος ἔχων; and Thl., Schlichting, Seb. Schmidt, Baumg., Bengel, Stein, al. But this meaning, "the time which was instant," would not agree with the pres.

προσφέρονται, to which consequently those interpreters are obliged to do violence. Accordingly we have modifications of this view, e.g. that of Ebrard, al., reading καθ' ὅν below, that ὁ καιρ. ὁ ἐνεστηκώς is the present time of offering O. T. sacrifices, in which the readers of the Epistle were still taking a part. "The author might have called the time of the O. T. worship 'the past time,' and he would doubtless have so called it, had he been minded to speak from his own standing-point: but with practical wisdom he here speaks from that of his readers, who yet joined in the temple worship, and for whom the period of sacrifices was not yet passed away." Ebrard:—that of Bleek, Tholuck, and Lü- nemann, "This πρώτη σκηνή is, or there lies in its establishment, a parabolic setting forth of the character of the present time in general, i. e. of the time of the O. T.,—of Judaism." Bl. And so E. V., "which was a figure for the time then present." See more below under καιροῦ διορθώσεως), according to which (παραβολήν: so Eucum., καθ' ἣν παραβολὴν καὶ καθ' ὅν τύπον: i. e. in accordance with which typical meaning; a specification accounting for and justifying the profitless character of the ordinances about to be spoken of. Some (as Lün., al.) have referred ἦν to πρώτης σκηνῆς, but καθ' ἣν would hardly thus apply: we should rather expect ἐν ᾗ. Those who read καθ' ὅν naturally refer it to καιρὸν, thereby modifying their view of what is to be understood by τὸν καιρ. τ. ἐνεστηκότα: see above) both gifts and sacrifices are offered (see reff. for these words. The present implies only the matter-of-fact endurance of the Levitical offerings, not their subsistence in the divine plan) having no power (μὴ δυν., subjective, 'quæ non valeant:.' not οὐ δυν., 'invalida,' 'quæ non valent.' The gender of the participle, as so often, is taken from the subst. next to it) to perfect in conscience (see below) him that serveth (i. e. not the priests, as Est., al., who ἐπετέ- λουν τὰς λατρείας, but the people, who offered through them. "The offering Israelite assures,—doing, as he does, that which God's law requires,—his part, as a

καὶ ὁ πόμασιν καὶ τὰ διαφόροις ἡ βαπτισμοῖς, ἰδικαιώματα
 σαρκός, ἡ μέχρι καίρου ἡ διορθώσεως ὁ ἐπικείμενα. ἡ χρι-
 ὡν

† 1 Cor. x. 3 only. Ps. ci.
 9 only. Dan. k
 1. 16, Theod.
 g Rom xii 5
 (ch. i. 4, viii. 6) only. Deut. xxii 9
 13, viii. 4 ver. 1. Rev. xi. 4 xix. 8 only. Exod. xv. 25, 26.
 13, viii. 4 ver. 1. Rev. xi. 4 xix. 8 only. Exod. xv. 25, 26.
 7. 1 Tim. vi. 7 1 Tim. vi. 14. iii. 14 al. Ps. civ. 19.
 19. 2 Tim. iv. 6 al. Ps. xxxvi. 39.
 23. John xi. 38. xxi. 9. Acts xxvii. 20. 1 Cor. ix. 16 only. Job xxi. 3
 h = ch. vi. 2 reff.
 k see Col. ii. 13
 m and constr. Luke xiv. 44. Acts iii.
 n here only†. Polyb. v. 68. 2 al. fr.
 o Luke i. 1. λυμν.
 17. 47

10. rec καὶ δικαιώμασι, with D³KL rel vulg syr Chr Thdr̄t Damasc : δικαιώμα D¹ (and lat) sah : καὶ δικαιώματα BN³ 67². 219 : txt A[P]N¹ 17 Syr copt arm [Euthal-ms] Cyr¹. (The question seems to be whether δικαιώμασι was an alteration to suit the preceding datives, or δικαιώματα to suit the follg ἐπικείμενα. In the former case καὶ would find its way into the txt and the readg of B is a conjunction of the two : in the latter καὶ would naturally be struck out as coupling different cases and the readg of B was previous to its being expunged.)

member, in the people of the law and of the promised salvation : he obtains also, if he does this with right feeling, operations of divine grace, which he seeks in the way prescribed : but, seeing that the Holy of holies is not yet unveiled, the offerings cannot τελειῶσαι him κατὰ συνείδησιν, i. e. cannot put his moral-religious consciousness, in its inward feeling, into a state of entire and joyful looking for of salvation, so that his συνείδησις should be an onward-waxing consciousness of perfect restoration, of entire clearing up, of total emancipation, of his relation to God." Delitzsch : who continues, "The material offerings of animals are only parables, referring to the time when that which is parabolically set forth becomes actual and passes into reality. They are, considered of themselves, incapable of any action on the inner part of a man, they are").

10] only (consisting) in (supply οὔσαι or προσφερόμεναι, and understand ἐπὶ as pointing out the ground whereupon, the condition wherein, the offering of the δῶρὰ τε καὶ θυσίαι subsisted. Some of the ancient Commentators joined ἐπὶ with τελειῶσαι,—"not able to perfect . . . in his conscience, only as regards meats and" . . . So Œc., αἱ λατρεῖαι, φησὶν, οὐκ ἴσχυον ψυχικῶς τινα τελειῶσαι, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὴν σάρκα εἶχον τὴν ἐνέργειαν κ. τὰ σαρκικὰ κ.τ.λ. And so recently Ebrard. But this is not the fact, as it would be here stated. The gifts and offerings, e. g. those of the day of atonement, had far other reference than merely to meats and drinks and washings : nay, these were parables in reference to higher things. Another set joined it with λατρεύοντα, "him who serveth under condition of meats" &c. But this is questionable as to usage, and would make a very lame and dragging sentence. Thl. apparently joins ἐπὶ with ἐπικείμενα below : μόνον, φησὶν, ἐπικείμενα τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις κ. διαταττόμενα περὶ βρωμάτων κ. πομάτων. Others, as Grot., Bengel, Bleek, De Wette, give ἐπὶ the meaning "together with," which is hardly

either philologically or contextually suitable. If δικαιώμασιν be read, then on this view it would be more likely ἄλλοις δικαιώμασιν : if δικαιώματα, it could hardly be said that the meats and drinks and washings were δικαιώματα in the same sense as the δῶρὰ τε κ. θυσίαι, seeing that they were only their conditions, not their cognates) meats and drinks and divers washings (probably the Writer has in mind both the legal and the Talmudical conditions imposed upon the λατρεύοντες. See the very parallel place, Col. ii. 16. The law prescribed much about eating : nothing about drinking, except some general rules of uncleanness, such as Levit. xi. 34,—and in peculiar cases, such as the prohibition of wine to the Nazarite, Num. vi. 3,—and to the priests when on actual service in the tabernacle, Levit. x. 9. But subsequent circumstances and usage added other observances and precedents : as e. g. Dan. i. 8 : Hagg. ii. 13. See Matt. xxiii. 24 : Rom. xiv. 21. So there is no necessity to suppose that the allusion is to the feasts after sacrifice (ch. xiii. 10), or to the passover. The διάφοροι βαπτισμοί may refer to all the various washings ordained by the law, Exod. xxix. 4 : Levit. xi. 25, 28, 32, 40 ; xiv. 6—9 ; xv. 5 ff. ; xvi. 4, 24 ff. : Num. viii. 7 ; xix. 17 ff. al. But it seems likely that not the sacerdotal washings, so much as those prescribed to or observed by the people, are mainly in view : such as those mentioned in Mark vii. 4f, ordinances of (the) flesh (i. e. belonging to flesh, as opposed to spirit. They regarded material things, gifts, sacrifices, meats, drinks, washings, which from their very nature could only affect the outward, not the inward man. Of course δικαιώματα σαρκός is in apposition with δῶρὰ τε καὶ θυσίαι. The ordinary reading, καὶ δικαιώμασιν, has, besides manuscript authority, these two objections against it : 1. seeing that the things mentioned were themselves δικαιώματα σαρκός, we should rather require (see above) καὶ ἄλλοις δικαιώμασιν : 2. we should have δυνάμεναι followed by ἐπικείμενα, which,

στὸς δὲ ^p παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν ^q μελλόντων ^q ἀγα- ^p = Matt. iii.
^{1.} 1 Mac.
^{iv} 46.
 q ch. x. 1. see ch. ii. 5. vi. 5. xiii 14. Rom. v. 14.

11. for μελλόντων, γενομένων BD¹ syrr Chr-ms(secunda manu), factorum D-lat: txt AD³KL[P]K rel vulg syr-ing coptt æth [arm] Eus₂ Cyr-jer₂ Cyr₁ Chr-2-mss(and montf) [Euthal-ms Ps-Ath₁ Procl] Thdrt Damasc.

however possibly allowable, would certainly be very harsh), imposed (cf. Il. ζ. 458, κρατερὴ ἐπικείσεται ἀνάγκη: also Acts xv. 10, 28, which is a remarkable parallel. ἐπεὶ δὲ ζυγὸς ἦν ὁ νόμος βαρὺς, εἰκότως εἶπε τὸ ἐπικείμενα. Thl.: who then, as Eccl., quotes Acts xv. 10) until the season of rectification (i. e. when all these things would be better arranged, the substance put where the shadow was before, the sufficient grace where the insufficient type. διόρθωσις, cf. ref. and Aristot Polit. 8: τῶν πιπτόντων οἰκοδομημάτων κ. δδῶν σωτηρία καὶ διόρθωσις. See many more instances of its use in Lobeck's note on Phryn. p. 250 f. The expression probably refers to ch. viii. 8 f., —the time when God would make with His people a better covenant. I need hardly remind the reader who has kept pace with what has been said on τὸν καιρὸν τὸν ἐνεσθηκότα above, that this καιρὸς διορθώσεως is one and the same with that. Those who give another meaning there, yet agree in referring these words to Christian times). 11, 12.] *The fulfilment of these types by Christ.* But (the contrast is to the μὴ δυνάμ. and the μέχρι καιρ. above—to the ineffectiveness and the merely provisional nature of the Levitical offerings) Christ (not 'Jesus' here: because the Writer will introduce with emphasis that name which carries with it the fulfilment of all type and prophecy. Nor again, ὁ χριστός (παραγεν. δὲ ὁ χρ.), because he will not say that 'the Messiah' was come, but will use that well-known name as a personal name belonging to Him whom now all Christians know by it) having appeared (παραγίγνεσθαι is the usual word for *appearing* or *coming forward* as a historical person: appearing on the stage of the world: see ref. And it is of this appearance of Christ in history that the word is here used. That appearance was the point of demarcation between prophecy and fulfilment, between the old covenant and the new. So that παραγενόμενος is rather to be taken of the whole accomplished course of Christ summed up in one, than either of His first incarnation upon earth, or of His full inauguration into His Melchisedek High Priesthood in heaven. Chrys., Thl., al. join it so closely to ἀρχιερεὺς τ. μ. ἀγ. as to make that predicator clause the very

object of His παραγενέσθαι: so Thl., οὐκ εἶπε δὲ γειόμενος ἀρχ. ἀλλὰ παραγενόμενος ἀρχ.: τούτῃστιν εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἔλθων. οὐ πρότερον παρεγένετο, εἴτα, συμβῶν οὕτω, ἐγένετο ἀρχιερεὺς, ἀλλ' ὁ σκοπὸς τοῦ παραγεγενῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἢ ἀρχιερασύνην ἦν. Chrys. very similarly, adding, εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἔλθων, οὐχ ἕτερον διαδεξάμενος: οὐ πρότερον παρεγένετο, καὶ τότε ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ ἅμα ἦλθε. But there is no need of this. It was not εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἀρχιερέα, but as *being* ἀρχιερεὺς, that Christ παρεγένετο. There is no need for a comma after παραγενόμενος on the rendering above given) as **High Priest of the good things to come** (the question of the reading has much divided Commentators here. I have had no hesitation in retaining the rec., believing γενομένων to have been either a clerical error, or a correction in the sense given e. g. by Ebrard, who requires a contrast between the mere antitypical and foreshadowed goods of the O. T. and the substantial and fulfilled goods of the N. T. But no such contrast is here to be found. The contrast is between weak rites which could not, and the sacrifice of Christ which can, purify the conscience: the stress of our sentence is not at all on τὰ μέλλοντα or τὰ γεγόμενα ἀγαθά, but on χριστός in the first degree, and on παραγενόμενος in the second. ἀρχιερεὺς is the office common to both the subjects of comparison. τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά are in this case the blessed promises of the Christian covenant, different, in the very nature of the case, from *their* μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, but still, in formal expression, a term common to them and us: so that the expression ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν might in its scantiness of sense have been used of a Jewish high priest, just as it is in its fullness of completed sense used of Christ now. Herein I should differ both from Hofmann and Delitzsch, the former of whom (Schriftb. ii. 1. 292) maintains that the difference between the O. T. and the N. T. High Priest is that the one is an ἀρχιερεὺς ἀγαθῶν, which the other was not: and the latter, disputing this distinction, states the difference to be, that the one is an ἀρχ. τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, which the other was not. The fact being, that both might be described as ἀρχ. τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, but that Christ has

^r = Acts xiv.

22, 1 John

v. 6.

^s = Matt. xi.

11, ch. vi. 13

al. fr.

24 only, Isa. xvi. 12.

θῶν, ^r διὰ τῆς ^s μείζονος καὶ ^t τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς, οὐ

^u χειροποιήτου, ^v τούτέστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς ^w κτίσεως, ¹² οὐδὲ

^t = Rom. xii. 2. 1 Cor. xii. 10.

James i. 25.

^u Acts vii. 48. xiii. 24.

Eph. ii 11 ver.

v ch. ii. 14 reff.

^w = (see note) Rom. viii. 21.

by His revelation brought life and immortality to light; so that those words bear another and a more blessed meaning now than they could then: in fact, that, as brought out in ch. x. 1, which is a key-text to open this, the law had σκίαν τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, whereas we have αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων. After what has been said, it is hardly necessary to add that I take μέλλοντα as meaning not, which were future '*respectu legis*,' but which are now future; the κληρονομία ἀφθάρτου of 1 Pet. i. 4, the ἐπαζόμενα of our ch. xi. 1: see our Writer's usage in reff. The gen. after ἀρχιερέως is, as Hofm. and Delitzsch well remark, not an attributive, but an objective one: the μέλλοντα ἀγαθὰ are the objects and ultimate regard of his High Priesthood), through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands; that is, not of this creation (1. *How are these words to be constructed?* 2. *To what tabernacle do they refer?* 1. They belong to εἰσῆλθεν below, not to παραγενόμενος ἀρχιερέως above, as Primasius, Luther, Schulz, al. For in that case, οὐδέ would be left without any preceding member of the negation to follow, or it must be considered as the sequence to οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, or to οὐ χειροποιήτου, either of which would be absurd. So likewise recently Hofmann, joining however the whole, down to ἰδίου αἵματος, with the subject ἀρχιερέως. Of his whole view, I shall treat below. 2. The διὰ is local: as the Jewish high priest passed through the πρώτη σκηνή in entering into the earthly ἅγια, so our High Priest has passed through the μείζων κ. τελειότερα σκηνή to enter into the heavenly ἅγια (on the second διὰ, see below). But, this settled, *what is this greater and more perfect tabernacle?* The Fathers for the most part interpret it of *Christ's body* or *human nature*. So Chrys. (not however excluding the other interpretation, but maintaining that different things are typified by the same types: ὁρᾷς πῶς καὶ σκηνὴν κ. καταπέτασμα κ. οὐρανὸν τὸ σῶμα καλεῖ; . . . τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν τοῦτο ποιεῖ; ἡμᾶς διδάξει βουλόμενος, καθ' ἕτερον καὶ ἕτερον σημαίνονμεν τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ὅντα. οἶόν τι λέγω, καταπέτασμα δ' οὐρανὸς ἐστιν ὥσπερ γὰρ ἀποτερίζει τὰ ἅγια καταπέτασμα, καὶ ἡ σὰρξ κρύπτουσα τὴν θεότητα καὶ σκηνὴ ὁμοίως ἡ σάρξ, ἔχουσα τὴν θεότητα καὶ σκηνὴ πάλιν δ' οὐρανός: ἐκεῖ γὰρ ἐστιν ἔνδον ὁ

ἀρχιερέως), Thl. (similarly), Thdr., Ec., Ambros. (on Psal. cxviii.), Primas, Clarius, Calvin, Beza, Est., Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Hammond, Bengel, al. Ebrard takes it of *Christ's holy life*, and τὰ ἅγια of His exaltation; passing, in fact, from reality into symbol: Ecclampadius, Cajetan, Corn. a-Lap., Calov., Wittich, Wolf, al. of *the Church on earth*: Justiniani and Carpov (relying on several passages of Philo, where the world is called the temple of God), *the whole world*: Hofmann, *the glorified Body of Christ*, which, and not the Body of His flesh, he maintains can alone be said to be οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, and in which dwells (Col. ii. 9) all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., and Stier, *the lower region of the heavens*, through which Christ passed in ascending to the throne of God: Tholuck, merely a superadded feature, having no representation in reality, but serving only to complete the idea of a heavenly sanctuary. Delitzsch keeps to his interpretation in ch. viii. 2 (which see discussed in note there) as against Hofmann. But here, as there, I believe that his and Hofmann's views run up into one: though perhaps here the weight is on his side, as it was there on Hofmann's. Hofm.'s reason for joining διὰ τῆς μεζ. . . ἰδίου αἵματος, with ἀρχιερέως, is, that unless it be so joined, the stress laid on εἰσῆλθεν ἐφάπαξ is split up and weakened by the negative and positive qualifications appended to εἰσῆλθεν. But the answer is plain, with Delitzsch, that nothing can be farther from the truth; these qualifications being in fact the very conditions, on which the completeness and finality of that entrance depended. Another of Hofm.'s objections may be as easily answered; viz. that if we join διὰ . . . δι' both with εἰσῆλθεν we must understand the first διὰ local, the second instrumental. But as the preposition in Greek carries both meanings, so does it both in German (durch), and in English (through): and besides, both meanings are, in their inner import, one and the same. The σκηνή here, as in ch. viii. 2, is the οὐρανοί (ch. iv. 14, διεληλυθότα τοὺς οὐρανούς) through which Christ passed not only locally, but conditionally, being the abode of blessed spirits and just men made perfect = His mystical Body (see on ch. viii. 2: and below, on the other epithets of this tabernacle), and τὰ ἅγια is the δ' οὐρανὸς αὐτός (ver. 24, εἰς-

d. διον .. ^r δι' αἵματος ^{xy} τράγων καὶ ^{xz} μόσχων, ^r διὰ δὲ τοῦ ^a ἰδίου ^x ver 19.
 ABDKL ^(x) αἵματος εἰσῆλθεν ^b ἐφάπαξ εἰς ^c τὰ ἅγια, ^d αἰωνίαν ^e λύτρω- ^{LXXv. xvi.}
 PN a b c ^(x) ^{Luke xv 23, 27, 30.} ^{Rev. iv 7 only} ^{Ezek 1 30} ^{a Acts xx 28.} ^{ch. xiii. 12} ^{1y 10}
 d f g h k ^{1 ch. vi. 27 ref.} ^{c ch. xiii. 2.} ^{d ch. v. 9 ref.} ^{fem., 2 Thess. ii. 16 only.} ^{e Luke}
 l m n o ^{but Tr. Ald. & some mss.,} ^{γ here, &c (3ce) and ch x 4 only.} ^{Isa xxxiv 6} ^{z as above}
 17. 47 ^(x) ^{Luke xv 23, 27, 30.} ^{Rev. iv 7 only} ^{Ezek 1 30} ^{a Acts xx 28.} ^{ch. xiii. 12} ^{1y 10}
^{b ch. vi. 27 ref.} ^{c ch. xiii. 2.} ^{d ch. v. 9 ref.} ^{fem., 2 Thess. ii. 16 only.} ^{e Luke}
^{1 68. ii. 38 only.} ^{Γς ca 9 (see note.)}

12. ins eis τα αγια bef εφap., retaining same words below N¹(N-corr¹ disapproving).
 [aft τα αγ. ins των αγιων P.]

ἦλθεν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν), the especial abode of the invisible and unapproachable God. As regards the epithets of this σκηνή, first it is distinguished by the art. τῆς, = nearly ἐκείνης τῆς, 'that tabernacle of which we know.' Then it is called μεῖζων, in contrast with the small extent and import of that other, and τελειότερα, in contrast with its ineffectiveness and its exclusion from the divine presence: perhaps also with its merely symbolical, and its transitory nature. "The indeterminate οὐ χειροποίητου, a word of St. Luke in similar connexion, Acts vii. 48; xvii. 24, is explained by the Writer himself by οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως, and serves as an apposition to the preceding. That tabernacle is not built by hands of men, but by the Lord Himself, ch. viii. 2; it is of His own immediate placing, not belonging to this creation, not only not to this material creation which surrounds us, out of which we get our building materials, but altogether not to this first and present creation: it belongs to the age of the future, to the glorified world." Delitzsch. The rendering "not of this building" E. V., also Erasmus, Luther, Beza, Wolf, Bengel, Guinoel, al., is wrong, and misses the idea, giving in fact a tautological explanation for οὐ χειροποίητου. As to the word χειροποίητος, it is classical, see Herod. ii. 140; Thuc. ii. 77; Pausan. Eliac. ii. 19; Polyb. i. 75. 4; iv. 64. 4; and other examples in Bleek, nor yet (οὐδέ, exclusive, but not necessarily climacterical; q. d. 'no, nor with any of the typical accompaniments of that other tabernacle.' It is neatly stated by Delitzsch, that οὐτε is the opposite of καὶ 'and,' οὐδέ of καὶ 'also') through (as a medium of preparation and approach. The instrumental sense very nearly approaches the local: so that there need be no scruple about the apparently different senses given to διὰ in the two clauses: see above) blood of goats and calves (the plurals are simply generic: for the portion of the ceremonies of the day of atonement, see ref. Levit.), nay rather (on this strongly contrasting δέ, see note ch. ii. 6) through (see above; through, as His medium of entrance: it was as a key opening the holiest to Him) His own blood (not δι' αἵματος ἰδίου, nor διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ

ἰδίου, but, which is more emphatic than either after the former anarthrous αἵματος, διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος—q. d. 'through that blood of His own.' St. Luke has used the very same expression in ref. Acts) entered (χριστός above is the emphatic subject of the whole sentence) once for all (see ref.) into the holy places, and obtained (on εὐρίσκω in this sense, see ch. iv. 16. The aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. itself εἰσῆλθεν. The redemption was not accomplished when He entered, but accomplished by His entering. And our only way of expressing this contemporaneity in English is by resolving the part. into another aorist with the copula, as in ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, and similar cases. Consult the note on ch. ii. 10, which is not, however, a strictly parallel case. Here as there, the contemporaneous completion of the two acts must be kept in view, and any such rendering as Ebrard's, "in bringing about," carefully avoided. The form of the word, εὐράμενος, is Alexandrine, found also in Philo, but not in Attic Greek: see Lobeck on Phryn. p. 139 f. The middle is of that force which Krüger calls dynamic, Sprachlehre § 52. 8. It imports the full casting of oneself into the action: thus in an ordinary case, τοὺς τὸν πόλεμον ποιοῦντας, Isoer., but Ἄγεις οὐκ ἐκ παρέργου τὸν πόλεμον ἐποιεῖτο, Thucyd. So that εὐράμενος here gives an energy and full solemnity to the personal agency of our Redeemer in the work of our redemption, which εὐρών would not give) eternal redemption for us (αἰωνίαν, answering to ἐφάπαξ above: as Hofmann remarks, the λύτρωσις is the aim and end of the approach of our High Priest to God: if then this approach has once for all taken place, the λύτρωσις is therewith for ever accomplished. For the fem. form αἰωνίαν, see ref. 2 Thess. It occurs sometimes in the LXX: e. g. Num. xxv. 13: Isa. lxi. 4 al. λύτρωσις (reff.) is used elsewhere by St. Luke only: so also λυτράτης, Acts vii. 35. λυτροῦσθαι, Luke xxiv. 21, is also used by St. Paul once, Titus ii. 14, and St. Peter, 1 Pet. i. 18. ἀπολύτρωσις is St. Paul's word, occurring also in Luke xxi. 28, and in our ver. 15, and ch. xi. 35. In both words, as applied to our final redemption at the coming of Christ, the idea of ransom is rather in the background,

f = ch. iv. 16 σιν^f εὐράμενος. 13 εἰ γὰρ τὸ αἷμα^g τράγων καὶ^h ταύρων
 [Rom. iv. 1] καὶ^{ik} σποδὸς^{il} δαμάλεως^{im} ραντίζουσα τοὺςⁿ κεκοινωμένους
 al. Gen. xxvi. 12. h as above (g). Matt xxii 4. Acts xiv. 13 only. 1 Num. xix 9 (ῥαντισμός).
 g ch. x. 4 Ps. xlix 13. Isa i. 11. m vv. 19, 21. ch. x 22 only. Lev vi 27. 4 Kings ix.
 k Matt xi. 21. Luke x. 13 only. l here only. n = Matt. xv. 11, &c. || Acts (x. 15. xi. 9) xxi. 28 only +.
 33. Ps. l. 7 (9) only. (-τισμός, ch. xii. 24)

13. rec transp τραγων and ταυρων, with KL[P] rel syr [æth arm] Athl, Cyr-jer, Cyr[-p2] Did, Chr, Euthal-ms Damasc, Ambr₁: txt ABDN latt Syr coptt Thdrd Primas. κεκοιμημενους D¹[-gr].

and that of deliverance prevails over it: but in both, as applied to the redemption which Christ wrought by His death, the idea of price paid for redemption and redemption by that price, is kept prominent. This may be especially shewn by the two great texts Matt. xx. 28 (and || Mark), ὁ υἱὸς τ. ἀνθ. . . ἤλθεν δοῦναι τ. ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν, and 1 Tim. ii. 6, ὁ δὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. The price paid for our redemption is His *death* (ver. 15) as the sacrifice of Himself, Titus ii. 14: 1 Tim. ii. 5 f.,—His *blood* Eph. i. 7, as the sacrifice of His life, Matt. xx. 28: 1 Pet. i. 19. And here also it is His blood which is the λύτρον. Delitzsch, from whom the substance of the above is taken, goes on to shew, on the ground of the analogy between Christ and the O. T. high priests who took the blood in before God and sprinkled it on His mercy-seat, that it was God to whom this λύτρον was paid, and not, as many of the Fathers held, Satan. See his notes, in his Comm. pp. 386-7. On the matter itself,—the entrance of Christ into the holiest διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, I cannot do better than refer the student to the following pages of Delitzsch, where he has treated at length, and in a most interesting manner, the various hypotheses. I do not sum up the results here, because it is a subject of such peculiar solemnity, that the mind requires its treatment in full, in order to approach it reverently: and such full treatment would far exceed the limits of a general commentary. I have indicated some of the principal lines of hypothesis on ch. xii. 24, where the direct mention of the αἷμα ραντισμοῦ makes it necessary).

13—X. 18.] *Enlargement upon, and substantiation of, αἰωνίαν λύτρωσιν εὐράμενος*: on which then follows, x. 19 ff., the third or directly hortatory part of the Epistle. “For the blood of His self-offering purifies inwardly unto the living service of the living God (vv. 13, 14): His redeeming death is the inaugurating act of a new covenant and of the heavenly sanctuary (vv. 15—23): His entrance into the antitypical holiest place is the conclusion of his all-sufficing atonement for sin (vv. 24—26), after which only remains His re-appearance to complete the realization of

Redemption (vv. 27, 28). In distinction from the legal offerings which were constantly repeated, He has, by his offering of Himself, performed the actual will of God which willed salvation (ch. x. 1—10): our Sanctification is now for ever accomplished, and the exalted Saviour reigns in expectation of ultimate victory (x. 11—14): and the promised new covenant has come in, resting on an eternal forgiveness of sins which requires no further offering (x. 15—18).” Delitzsch. 13, 14.] *Argument, ‘a minori ad majus,’ to shew the cleansing power of Christ’s blood.* For (rendering a reason for αἰων. λύτρ. εὐράμενος) if (with indic.,—‘as we know it does’) the blood (τὸ αἷμα, compared with τὸ αἷμα below, because it is not the one blood compared with the other in its quality, but the shedding of the one blood compared with the shedding of the other: the articles then *distribute the subject* in each case) of goats and bulls (viz. the yearly offering on the day of atonement, Levit. xvi. ταύρων this time, both as more precise, males alone being offered, and as forming an alliteration with τράγων) and ashes of an heifer (see the whole ordinance, full of significance, in Num. xix. 1—22. σποδός has no art. because the ashes were to be laid up, and a portion used as wanted) sprinkling (= ραντίζομένη ἐπὶ. ραντίζειν is a Hellenistic form: ραίνειν is the pure Greek, and also the commoner form in the LXX (14 times: the other 3 only. See reff.): who however in Num. xix. call the water in which were ashes of the red heifer, ὕδωρ ραντισμοῦ) those who have been defiled (D-lat., vulg., Luth., Calv., De Wette in his version, al. make this accus. depend on ἀγιάζει. But to this there are two objections: 1. it is much less likely that ραντίζουσα should be absolute, than that ἀγιάζει should: 2. on this hypothesis, those who were the subjects of the virtue of the blood of the goats and bulls would also be described as κεκοινωμένοι, which they were not in the same sense as those who were sprinkled with the water of separation containing the ashes of the heifer. This latter objection is to me decisive. The word κοινῶ, in this usage of to make unclean, to defile, as the opposite of ἀγιάζω, as κοινός itself

ο ἀγιαῖ ^ρ πρὸς τὴν τῆς σαρκὸς ^α καθαρότητα, ¹⁴ ^τ πόσω ^ο ἄνω ^{ch. ii. 11 reff.}
^τ μᾶλλον τὸ ^ς αἷμα τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὃς ^τ διὰ ^τ πνεύματος ^υ αἰών ^{p = Acts iii. 10.}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{q here only.}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{Exod xxiv. 10}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{A[ποδότης]}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{see ch. x. 29.}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{1 Tim. iii. 16. a of πν., here only.}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{w of Christ, 1 Pet. i. 19 only (Jude 24 reff.) of sacrifices, Num. vi.}
^ν οὗ ἐαυτὸν ^ν προσήνεγκεν ^ω ἅμωμον τῷ θεῷ, ^κ καθαρῶ ^{2 Cor. vii. 1. Eph. v. 26. Tit. ii. 14 al. Ezek xxxvii. 23.}

14. for αἰώνιον, αἰγιον D¹[P]⁸ a b f h 67² latt coptt Cyr, Did, [Chr, Euthal-ms Damasc]: αἰγιον αἰώνιον k: txt ABD³KL⁸ rel syrr arm Ath¹, [Did.] Thdr̄t.

over against ἄγιος, is Hellenistic, and first found in the N. T.: the LXX have for it *μαῖνα* and *βεβηλῶν*, and for the person defiled, *ἀκάθαρτος*. In 1 Macc. i. 47, 62 only, is *καὶνός* found in the sense of unclean) sanctifyeth to (so as to bring about) the purity (not "purifying," as E. V.) of the flesh (it is evident, that the Writer speaks only of the Levitical rites in their matter-of-fact results as 'opera operata,' not of any divine grace which might accrue to the soul of the faithful Israelite from a spiritual partaking in them. The outward effect of the sacrifices of the day of atonement, as well as of the sprinkling of the ashes of the heifer, was, to render ceremonially pure before God, in the one case from the imputation of the defilement of sin on the whole people, in the other, from the defilement actually contracted by contact with death or uncleanness. These effects they had in themselves: what others they had, out of themselves, belonged not so much to them, as to that great Sacrifice which they represented), how much more (see the logical connexion at the end) shall the blood of (the) Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered HIMSELF (emphatic) without fault to God (first, when did He offer Himself? Clearly not, as Socinus, Schlichting, Grot., which last says, "Oblatio autem Christi hic intelligitur ea, quæ oblationi legali in adyto factæ respondet, ea autem est non oblatio in altari crucis facta, sed facta in adyto cœlesti:" with whom Bleek agrees. For, as Delitzsch rightly observes, when Christ is antitypically or by way of contrast compared with the victims of the O. T. sacrifices, as the ritual word ἅμωμον here shews that He is, then beyond question the offering on the cross is intended, which corresponds to the slaying the victim and offering him on the altar. Besides which, the "oblatio in adyto" was but the completion of the "oblatio in altari," and, when Christ's self-offering is spoken of generally, we are to take the whole from the beginning, not merely that which was the last act of it. This will guide us to the meaning of the somewhat difficult words διὰ πνεύματος αἰώνιου: for thus do we read, and not

ἀγίου, which appears to have originated in a mistaken view of the words. The animals which were offered, had no will, no πνεῦμα of their own, which could concur with the act of sacrifice. Theirs was a transitory life, of no potency or virtue. They were offered διὰ νόμου rather than διὰ any consent, or agency, or counteragency, of their own. But Christ offered Himself, with His own consent assisting and empowering the sacrifice. And what was that consent? the consent of what? of the spirit of a man? such a consent as yours or mine, given in and through our finite spirit whose acts are bounded by its own allotted space in time and its own responsibilities? No: but the consenting act of His divine Personality—His πνεῦμα αἰώνιον, His Godhead, which from before time acquiesced in, and wrought with, the redemption-purpose of the Father. Thus we have πνεῦμα contrasted with σὰρξ in speaking of our Lord, in several places: cf. Rom. i. 3, 4: 1 Tim. iii. 16: 1 Pet. iii. 18. This divine Personality it was, which in the Resurrection so completely ruled and absorbed His σὰρξ: this, which causes Him to be spoken of by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 45 as a πνεῦμα ζωοποιούν, and in 2 Cor. iii. 17 f. as absolutely τὸ πνεῦμα. Not however that any confusion hence arises in the distinction of the divine Persons: πνεῦμα αἰώνιον is not the Spirit of the Father dwelling in Christ, nor is it the Holy Spirit given without measure to Christ, but it is the divine Spirit of the Godhead which Christ Himself had and was in His inner Personality. And I conclude with Delitzsch as to the relevancy of such a clause here: the eternal spirit is absolute spirit, divine spirit, and thus self-conscious, laying down its own course purely of itself unbound by conditions, simply and entirely free: so that Christ's offering of Himself διὰ πνεύματος αἰώνιου is, as such, a moral act of absolute worth, as Baumg., Von Gerlach, Ebrard, Lünem., al. "Jam vero," says Seb. Schmidt, "cum hic Spiritus æternus adeoque infinitus sit, utique pondus meriti et satisfactionis, quod ab eodem spiritu est, æternum et infinitum est. Quod si æternum et infinitum sit, ne quidem infinita Dei justitia in eo aliquid desiderari potuit." The διὰ is beautifully

^y ver 9
^z 2 Cor. vi. 1.
^{Ps} 1. 2 (4).
^a ch. vi. 1 (reff.).
^b ch. vi. 25
^{reff.}
^c ch. vii. 5 reff.
^d ch. vii. 12 reff.
^e ch. viii. 8 reff.
^f ch. viii. 6 reff.
^g Luke xxi. 28. Rom. iii. 24. 1 Cor. i
^{30.} Eph. i. 7, 14. iv. 30. Col. i. 14. ch. xi. 35 only. Dan. iv. 32 (LXX) only.

^{rec} ^uμων, with D⁸L⁸N rel am(with [fuld]) tol F-lat) syr basm [æth arm(rieu) Ath-1-2-mss
^{Did,} Mac,] Chr-3-mss(and montf) Damasc: txt AD¹K[P] h vulg-ed D-lat Syr copt
^{Ath,} Cyr, [Euthal-mss] Thdrt. aft ζωντι ins και αληθινω A[P] 21¹. 31. 66-marg
^{copt} Mac¹ Chr comm₂ Thl.

C εστιν..
 ACDKL
 PN a b c
 d f g h k
 l m n o
 17. 47

paraphrased by Ecolampadius, "per ardentissimam caritatem a Spiritu ejus æterno profectam." See for the prep., in this connexion, Acts i. 2; xi. 28; xxi. 4. It is by virtue of—so that His divine Spirit was the agent in the *προσφορά*, penetrating and acting on the Humanity. *ἄωμος*, as

above observed, is (reff.) the regular word of the ritual in reference to the victims which must be without spot when offered. Therefore to understand it of the perfection of the glorified human nature of the ascended Saviour, as Schlichting and the Socinian interpreters, is clearly beside the meaning, and contrary to analogy. See many further details on this difficult passage in Bleek and Delitzsch), *purify our* (the question of reading, *ἡμῶν* or *ὁμῶν*, is one not easy to settle. At the word *καθαριεῖ* we unfortunately lose the evidence of B, the ms. terminating there, and being completed by a later hand. From all analogy it would seem that we must infer *ἡμῶν* to have been its reading here. It is true, as Bl. and Delitzsch assert, that *ὁμῶν* has a more lively and emphatic aspect: "habet aliquid inexpectatum," as Böhme: but I cannot bring myself for this purely subjective reason to desert the guidance of the best and oldest mss., though their company is now weakened by the defect of its most important member) *conscience* (our English word *conscience* does not reach the fulness of *συνείδησις*, the *self-consciousness as regards God*, the inner consciousness of relation to Him. This is, by the blood of Christ, shed in the power of the divine Spirit, thoroughly purified, freed from the terror of guilt, cleared from alienation from Him and from all selfish regards and carnal pretences, and rendered living and real as He is living and real) *from dead works* (just as death was under the old law the fountain of ceremonial pollution, and any one by touching a dead body became unclean, so carnal works, having their origin in sin, with which death is bound up, pollute the conscience. They are like the touching of the dead body, rendering the man unclean in God's sight, as not springing from life in Him: in-

ducing decay and corruption in the spirit. See on ch. vi. 1, and Chrys. there quoted. Here, the reference to the dead body can hardly be set aside, being more pointed than there, where I have rather advocated the general sense of *νεκρός*.

The Writer does not here set forth *how* this blood of Christ acts in purifying the conscience: it is not his aim now to speak of *our* way of participation of its benefits, but merely of *its* cleansing power itself) *in order to the serving* (ministering to, which the unclean might not do in the ceremonial sanctuary, nor can the unclean do in heart and life) *the living God* * (God in His spiritual reality and absolute holiness: not a God concealed by veils and signs, but approached in His verity by the sanctified soul)? 15.] See summary above at ver. 13. This pre-eminent spiritual virtue of His redeeming blood constitutes his fitness to be Mediator of the new covenant, the main blessing of which, forgiveness, extends even back over the insufficient former one, and ensures the inheritance to the called. **And on this account** (*διὰ τοῦτο* is not to be taken as Schlichting, Böhme, and Bleek, prospectively, responded to by the *ὅρας* below: for in this case we should have an entire break between the last verse and this. It is true, as Del. observes, that a new side of Christ's work is here introduced: but it is one which stands in the closest relation to that which has preceded. Rather should we refer *διὰ τοῦτο* backwards, and understand it, on account of *this virtue of His blood*: or if it seem better, extend its reference further back still, over vv. 11—14, on account of *this great work which He hath accomplished by his death*: = 'because these things are so') *is He mediator of a new covenant* (see ch. viii. 6 and note. There is a stress on *καινῆς*, but not so strong an one as Bl. and Del. suppose: Del. would explain,—therefore is the covenant, of which He is the mediator, a new one. But surely *this predicate* does not carry the logical weight of the sentence, but rather both the words, *διαθήκης καινῆς*, the latter of which is taken up and responded to by *πρώτη* below, and

τῶν ⁿ ἐπὶ τῇ ⁱ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ ^k παραβάσεων, τὴν ^{lm} ἐπαγγ- ^{h 2 Cor. ii. 14.}
 γελίαν ^m λάβωσιν οἱ ⁿ κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου ^o κληρονο- ^{vi. 4 Phil.}
 μίας. ^{16 p} ὅπου γὰρ ^q διαθήκη, θάνατον ^s ἀνάγκη ^t φέρεσθαι ^{i. 3 ver. 26 al.}
^{ch. vi. 15. xi. 33, 39} ^{8 al.} ^{o Heb., ch. xi. 8 only.} ^{n = Heb., here only. (see ch. iii. 1.)} ^{Rom viii. 30. ix. 11.} ^{Gal. v.}
^{q = here 3ce only? (Gal. iii. 15.)} ^{2ο διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην, Plato, Legg. 922 c. 923 e. (al. in Bleek.)} ^{1 ch. iv. 1 reff.} ^{1 Cor. iii. 3 James iii. 16.}
^{r ch. viii. 10 (reff.) x. 16. Acts xiii. 25.} ^{s = ver. 23. Rom. xiii. 5.} ^{t = here only. (see note.)}

the former by *ὑπου γὰρ διαθήκη* in the next verse. For its meaning here, see below), in order that,—death having taken place, for the propitiation of the transgressions under the first covenant,—they who have been called may receive the promise of the eternal inheritance (first, the object of the new covenant is an eternal inheritance,—cf. τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, ver. 11, ἡ οἰκουμένη ἡ μέλλουσα, ch. ii. 5: and therefore the idea of inheritance having once come in, gives to διαθήκη that shade of meaning which is deepened and insisted on below, viz. that of a TESTAMENTARY covenant or arrangement. Then, going backwards from κληρονομίαν,—ἐπαγγελίαν λάβωσιν, an expression (see reff.) used also by St. Luke, is to be taken in the sense of receiving the fulfilment of a promise, not merely of having the promise granted. Then, the κεκλημένοι are the κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι of ch. iii. 1: cf. also ἡ ἔνω κλήσις of Phil. iii. 14: and reff. here. Calvin well remarks, “Loquitur de vocatis, ut Judæos, qui hujus vocationis erant participes, magis officiat.” This end, of the called being put in possession of the promise of the eternal inheritance, is to be attained, θανάτου γενομένου εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῶν ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ παραβάσεων. Without this death, it could not be attained. The full reason of this, that death must take place first, is presently gone into: it is with the concluding words of this clause that we are at present concerned. These transgressions under the first covenant are in fact those of all mankind. Israel was a pattern of God’s dealings with all: and His revelation of His will to Israel extended categorically to all mankind. Against this will, primævally revealed, revealed to the patriarchs, revealed in the law, our parents and the antediluvian earth, the sons of Noah and the postdiluvian earth, Israel itself as a people, had deeply and repeatedly transgressed: and before a new inheritance by testament could come in, there must be a propitiation of all these former transgressions. All the propitiatory sacrifices, so called, of the former covenant, were but imperfect and typical: but as this is to be a real inheritance, so there must be real and actual propitiation. Cf. the remarkable parallel, Acts xiii. 39, ἀπὸ πάντων

ὧν οὐκ ἠδυνήθητε ἐν νόμῳ Μωυσέως δικαιοθῆναι, ἐν τούτῳ πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων δικαιούται. See more below. This is fully and strikingly treated by Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 300: see also Delitzsch’s note here.

It is right to mention that some versions and expositors take κεκλημένοι τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας together. Thus Syr., Faber Stap., Chr. F. Schmid, al., and recently, Tholuck and Ebrard (this latter, apparently, missing the sense of ἐπαγγελίαν λαβεῖν): which arrangement would perhaps be grammatically justifiable, but according neither to our Writer’s usage, nor to the requirements of the sentence. The severing of a genitive in government from its governing noun is not uncommon in our Epistle, and frequently found in other governments also, in St. Luke: and, the stress being here on inheritance, as presently taken up in the next verse, it is not probable that it would be introduced merely in the most insignificant place possible, as a mere adjunct to the description of the subject of the sentence. So that on all grounds the other and more usually accepted construction is to be preferred. The ἐπὶ with dat. τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ, in the sense of ‘under,’ ‘during the time of,’ the first διαθ., easily gets its meaning from the primitive sense of close superposition. The things happening ἐπὶ τῇ πρώτῃ διαθήκῃ, had it for their substratum, were superimposed on it, as it were. See ch. x. 28; and Winer, edn. 6, § 48. c).

16.] For (justification of θανάτου γενομένου, by an appeal to common usage) where a testament is (it is quite in vain to attempt to deny the testamentary sense of διαθήκη in this verse. Many have made the attempt: e. g. Codurcus, in a long excursus, which may be seen in Critici Sacri, vol. vii. part 2, fol. 1067 ff.: Whitby in loc., Seb. Schmidt, Michaelis, al., and recently Ebrard and Hofmann. As these recent expositors have written with the others before them, it may be well to give an account of their views of the passage. Ebrard understands it thus: “Wherever sinful man will enter into a covenant with the holy God, the man must first die,—must first atone for his guilt by death (or must put in a substitute for himself).” This he gives as the summary of his argumentation. But, as Hofmann asks, where

u ch. viii. 1.
v ch. ii. 2 reff.

τοῦ ἱ διαθεμένου. 17 α διαθήκη γὰρ ὕ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς ὕ βεβαία,

does he find one word of this in the general assertion of the Writer? The text speaks axiomatically of something which every one knows in common life. Ebrard interprets theologically: by a declaration which it requires a theologian to accept. The Writer speaks in the abstract—of all διαθήκαι whatever: Ebrard interprets in the concrete—of one particular set of διαθήκαι. It is true, Eb. attempts to anticipate this objection, by saying that from the context, every one would know what sort of διαθήκη was meant. But this does not meet it in the least degree. Our verse is a perfectly general axiom, extending over all διαθήκαι, in whatsoever sense the word be taken. Hofmann on the other hand rejects (Schriftb. ii. 1. 302 ff.) both meanings, *testament* and *covenant*, and maintains that of *ordinance*, *disposition*, understanding that disposition to extend to the whole property. Then, he says (see also Weissagung u. Erfüllung, ii. 165), “This idea of necessity implies that he must die who makes such a disposition of his whole property: because, as long as he lives, he can be always adding to his property, so that this disposition (διαθήκη) cannot be meant to be used of the time while the disposer is alive.” But this, though approaching nearer the true meaning, is just as futile as the other. Why may not a man yet living make such a disposition? And if it cannot be made till death, wherein does it in reality differ from a testament? It would be quite impossible to follow out the various argumentations by which the testamentary sense has been sought to be evaded. It will be far more profitable for us to endeavour to substantiate that which I believe to be the only admissible acceptance. And this I will do by starting from the word itself about which all the question is raised. διαθήκη, from διατίθεμαι, ‘disponere,’ διατίθεσθαι, ‘disponere sibi,’ regards, in ordinary Greek usage, that disposition of a man’s property which he makes in prospect of his death, and signifies, 1. *a will or testament*. So in Plato, Legg. xi. p. 926 B, δς ἂν διαθήκην γράφῃ τὰ αὐτοῦ διατίθεμενος, and in reff.: in Demosth. 1136. 12, τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν ἂν γνησίων ὄντων παίδων ὁ πατὴρ διάθηται, ἕαν ἀποθάνωσιν οἱ παῖδες πρὶν ἡβῆσαι, κυρίαν εἶναι, and al. On the other hand, the word is by no means tied to this its more usual meaning. The general one, of a *disposition* of any kind, is sometimes found applied to other circumstances than those at the close of life. So Aristoph. Av. 439, where Peis-

thærus says, μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω ἡγὼ μὲν οὐ, ἦν μὴ διαθῶνται γ’ οἷδε διαθήκην ἐμοί, . . . μήτε δάκνειν τούτους ἐμέ κ.τ.λ.: where it evidently means a *covenant*, an *agreement*. And in this sense, either where there are two distinct parties, or where one only arranges or ordains a ‘dispositio,’ do we find the word most often used in the LXX and N.T. In the former sense, 2. of a *covenant*, with two agreeing parties, it is not so frequent as in the latter: but we find it Gen. xxi. 27, 32, διέθεντο ἀμφότεροι διαθήκην: in Job xl. 23 (xli. 4) of Leviathan, θήσεται δὲ μετὰ σοῦ διαθήκην: 2 Kings iii. 12: Josh. ix. 6, 11 al. fr. The other sense, 3. that of a *disposition* or *ordinance* made by God πρὸς τινα, or μετὰ τινος, is the most ordinary one in the LXX. To it may be referred almost all the passages where in a loose sense of the word we in English render ‘covenant’: e. g. Gen. vi. 18; ix. 9 &c.; xv. 18: and a hundred other places. In this latter sense it is that the word has come to be used absolutely and technically as in ἡ κιβωτὸς τῆς διαθήκης, ἡ διαθήκη κυρίου, &c.: and in the quotation in our ch. viii. 8 ff. Now, having these three leading senses of the word before us, we are to enquire, which of them our Writer is likely to have intended when he wrote as a general axiom, ὅπου διαθήκη, θάνατον ἀνάγκη φέρεσθαι τοῦ διαθεμένου. It is obvious that in no general axiomatic sense can it be predicated of a *covenant*, or of an *ordinance*. There may be particular instances where a death (setting aside for a moment τοῦ διαθεμένου) might have been the requisite ratification of a covenant, or result of an ordinance: but such particular cases are clearly not here in question. Only when we recur to sense (1), that of a *testament*, can it be true, that where a διαθήκη is, there must of necessity be death, and that, the death τοῦ διαθεμένου, of him who has made the testament. And if it be objected to this, that a testament may exist many years before the death of the testator, the answer is easy, that the Writer here defines his own meaning of ὅπου διαθήκη, when he says διαθήκη γὰρ ἐπὶ νεκροῖς βεβαία: viz. that the document in question does not in reality become a διαθήκη, a *disposition*, till it is of force, till things are disposed by it. I believe then it will be found that we must at all hazards accept the meaning *testament* here, as being the only one which will in any way meet the plain requirements of the verse) **there is necessity that the death** (θάνατον is prefixed before

ἐπεὶ ὡ μὴποτε ἡ ἰσχὺει ὅτε ζῇ ὁ ἱ διαθέμενος· 18 ὅθεν ὡ constr. here only
οὐδὲ ἡ πρώτη χωρὶς αἵματος ἡ ἐγκεκαίνισται. 19 λαλη- Winer, § 55.
2. d. edn. 6
x = Gal. v.
3 Kings viii.

ε λα-
ληθ...
Α' C D K L
P N a b c
d e f g h
k l m n o
17. 47

6. James v. 16.

γ ch u 17 reff
36 (-νις, John x 22. -νισμός, Num vii 64

z ch x. 20 onlv

Deut xx. 5 3 Kings viii.

17. for μηποτε, μη τοτε D¹N³ Isid^{exp}.

18. rec ουδ', with [K(e sil) P]N rel [Damase]: txt ACDL a c h k o 17 [47 Chr
Thdrt].—οθεν ουδεν η D¹. aft πρωτη ins διαθηκη D¹(and lat).

ἀνάγκη, as carrying the whole weight of emphasis, and is for this reason also anarthrous) of him who made it (the *testator*, as E. V., but it is important to mark that it is διαθέμενος, not διατιθεμένου, as it ought to be on the interpretation of Ebr. al. In the meaning, Christ is the διαθέμενος: and this agrees wonderfully with St. Luke's manner of speaking in that text which is in fact the key-text to this: *καὶ γὰρ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν*, Luke xxii. 29. There the great and primary διαθέμενος is the Father, who is not here in question, as neither is His διαθήκη with His Son: but as regards *us*, the διαθέμενος is Christ; to whom alone, as human, the axiom, spoken of human relations, is applicable, and not to the divine Father. And when Ebrard insists on the former of these facts, and altogether omits noticing the second, saying that according to our interpretation God Himself must have died, we can only marvel at this fresh instance of the inconceivable rashness and carelessness which unfortunately characterize his spirited and clever commen-

* *tary* be implied (it is not easy to express the exact sense of φέρεσθαι here. For we must remember, 1. that we have had θανάτου γενομένου in ver. 15, quite far enough off to prevent it being probable that φέρεσθαι is a mere rhetorical elegance to avoid repeating γενέσθαι, and inducing us to think that some meaning different from γενέσθαι is here intended: even could it be shewn that φέρεσθαι could bear to be rendered = γενέσθαι, which I am not aware that it has been: 2. that in looking for a sense for φέρεσθαι, we must be careful not to give too pregnant or emphatic an one, seeing that it holds a very insignificant and unemphatic place in the sentence. This being premised, I believe the most suitable sense will be found in such phrases as πάσας αἰτίας φέρειν, *to allege all grounds*, Demosth. p. 1328. 22; παραδείγματα φέρειν, *to produce examples*, Polyb. xvii. 13. 7; φέρειν τινι τοὺς ἀπολογισμούς, *to make one's apologies to*, id. i. 32. 4. And of these I would take 'alleged,' 'carried in to the matter,' in fact, 'implied,' which seems the best word: he who speaks of διαθήκη, (ἅμα) φέρει, carries in to, involves in, that assertion, the death of the διαθέμενος. On

the logical connexion, see below): 17.] for (renders a fresh reason within the domain of the former γὰρ, explaining the axiom of ver. 16) a testament is of force (βεβαία, see on ch. ii. 2, and Rom. iv. 16) in the case of the dead (ἐπὶ, over, the thing predicated being the substratum or condition of the subject. Doubtless in choosing the plural, and indeed the word itself, the Writer has in his mind the transition which he is about to make from the death of the New Testament to the typical deaths of the Old, which were of animals, between which and men, νεκρά, not ἀποθανόντα, would be the common term), seeing that it (a διαθήκη) is never (we should expect οὐποτε here, the assertion being absolute and of matter of fact: but it appears to be a habit of later writers after ἐπεὶ to use the subjective, not the objective negation. So Ælian xii. 63, ἐπεὶ μὴ πάντα ἦν πλούσιος: Lucian, Hermot. 47, ἐπεὶ μηδὲν ἡγεμόνος τοιοῦτον ἔς γε τὸ παρὸν εὐποροῦμεν: Ptol. Geogr. viii., ἐπεὶ μηδὲν ἔχει τοιοῦτον . . . ἀντιπαραγράφειν. But we must not render μὴποτε as = μῆπω, which vulg., Faber Stap., Eras., Luther, Calv., Böhme have done. Many expositors take it interrogatively: "surely it is not?" &c. So Æc., Thl., De Dieu, Bengel, Lachmann, and even Delitzsch: but quite unnecessarily, as the above usage is undoubted, and the question introduces an unnecessary harshness) availing when (ὅτε corresponding to μὴποτε) he that made it is alive.

18.] Whence (τοῦτέστι, διότι ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τὸ θάνατον προηγεῖσθαι τῆς διαθήκης. Thl.) neither has the first (διαθήκη, testament) been inaugurated (perf., inasmuch as the rites &c. belonging to it were still subsisting. ἐγκαίνισμα is an Alexandrine verb: used in the LXX for to re-create or make anew: also for to put forth as new, to inaugurate: see reff., and numerous citations in Trommiius. Notice that the reference is, *here*, simply to the first encænā of the law when it was put forth as new: not to any subsequent renewal of sacrifices by death: this is presently alluded to, vv. 21 ff. Thl. gives for ἐγκεκαίνισται, —τοῦτέστι, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς συντάξεως κ. τῆς βεβαιώσεως ἔλαβεν) without (apart from, free from the exhibition of) blood. 19.] For (explan-

a Acts xxii. 12. ^a θείσης γὰρ πάσης ἐντολῆς ^a κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑπὸ Μωυσέως ^a ACD KL
 ch. viii. 4. P a b c
 b Exod. xxiv. 6-8. d e f g h
 c Rev. i. 14. k l m n o
 ver. 12 reff. 17. 47
 d Rev. i. 14. only. Deut. xxii. 11. d Matt xxvii. 28. Rev. xiii 3, 4. xvi. 12, 16 only. Exod. xxi. 4. Num. xix 6. e John xix 29 only. Exod. xii. 22 al. f = Luke iv. 17, 20. g ver. 13 reff. h ch. x. 29 reff. i Josh xxiii 16. Judg. ii 20 al. k attr., ch. vi 10 reff. l ch. xi. 22. w πρόσ, here only. 1 Kings xx. 29 2 Chron. xix 9. Su. xli. 3 dat., Matt iv 6 || L. (from Ps xc 11) xvi. 9 al.

19. aft πασης ins της D¹ Chr. rec om τον (bef νομον), with D³K[P]N¹ rel Chr Damasc: ins ACD¹LN³ g k 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Chr-ms Thdrt Thl. om υπο D¹[-gr].
 rec om των (bef τραγων), with [P] rel Thdrt [Damasc]: ins ACD[N¹] latt [Euthal-ms] Thdrt-ms.—om και των τραγων (homæotel) KLN³ k syrr Chr: transp μοσχων and τραγων D. rec ερραντισεν, with [P] rel: txt ACDKLN f o 17 [47 Euthal-ms].
 20. for ενετειλατο, διεθετο C lect-l.

tion of the assertion in last verse) **when every commandment had been spoken according to the law** (these last words, **κατὰ τὸν νόμον**, belong not to ἐντολῆς, as vulg. (“lecto enim omni mandato legis”), Schlicht., Calov., Jac. Cappell., Seb. Schmidt, Bengel, Chr. F. Schmid, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, al., which would be more naturally τῆς κατὰ τ. ν. (as indd Thl. gives it in his altern.: *τουτέστι, καθὼς ὁ θεὸς ἐνομοθέτησεν ἵνα λαληθῶσιν εἰς τὰ ὄντα παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ· ἡ, πάσης ἐντολῆς τῆς κατὰ τὸν νόμον, τουτέστι τῆς νομοθετηθείσης*),—but to λαληθείσης, spoken according to the law, i. e. as the law directed, not varying from it in any point. The law was ὁ νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν, and these ἐντολαί were faithfully reported) by Moses to all the people (see Exod. xxiv. 3, *καὶ διηγήσατο τῷ λαῷ πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα*. The παντί, not given in Exodus, may be inferred from ἀπεκρίθη δὲ πᾶς ὁ λαός, which follows in the same verse), **taking the blood** (the additional detail of Exod. xxiv. 5 is omitted, viz. that “he sent young men of the children of Israel, which offered burnt-offerings, and sacrificed peace-offerings of oxen unto the Lord.” It was of this blood that Moses took) **of the calves and goats** (the former only are mentioned in Exodus: *בָּרָקִי הִקְרִיבֻּהוּ*. But this is only said of the peace-offerings. The *burnt-offerings* (see above) after the analogy of the rites on the day of atonement, might be presumed to be goats. Indeed the key to the additional made here to the text of Exodus is, that the account is filled up by subsequent usage. We may presume, that the solemn legal appointment of various ceremonial details was in fact only a divine sanction of practices already existing: sacrifice having been long in use, and that under the direction and approval of God Himself) **with water** (prescribed, in Num. xix. 6, 17, to be mixed with the ashes of the red heifer which were to be

kept for purifying: cf. also Levit. xiv. 50 f.: see above), **and scarlet wool and hyssop** (see Levit. xiv. 49 ff.: by comparing which with Num. xix. as above, it may fairly be inferred, as our text here assures us was the fact, that these instruments were the ordinary ones in cleansing and sprinkling, even before their positive enactment as such by the law. The hyssop indeed we find thus prescribed, ref. Exod., in sprinkling the blood on the door-posts at the Passover. As to the manner of using, the stalk or bunch of hyssop was wrapt round with scarlet wool to make it absorb the blood, being tied with the same wool to a staff of cedar-wood to keep it stiff. On *hyssop* itself, there are various opinions, enumerated in Winer, Realw., “Ysop.” The most approved makes it to be a plant growing on walls, ‘hyssopus officinalis,’ with small lancet-formed woolly leaves, about an inch long, a knotty stalk from 1 foot to 1½ high, with blue (sometimes white) flowers), **he sprinkled both the book itself** (nothing is said of this in Exod. xxiv. And hence some have endeavoured to take **αὐτό τε τὸ βιβλίον** with **λαβών**, not with **ἐράντισεν**. So the Coptic and Armen. versions: and so Grot., Wittich, Cramer, Bengel, Michaelis, Storr, al. But it is obvious, that the **καὶ** after **βιβλίον** renders this impossible. The book is of course that out of which he had just read the ordinances of God: **τὸ βιβλίον τῆς διαθήκης**. If, as Stier supposes, Moses took the book (Exod. xxiv. 7) from off the altar, where it was lying when he sprinkled the altar with blood, then the book was sprinkled likewise: but nothing in the text of Exodus implies this) **and all the people** (LXX, *λαβών δὲ Μωσῆς τὸ αἷμα, κατεσκεύασεν τοῦ λαοῦ*. Of course the words **πάντα τὸν λαόν** are not to be taken to mean that he sprinkled every individual; but merely the whole mass, as they stood), **saying, 20.] This is the blood of the testament** (LXX, *ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης*. It has been suggested, first it

πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὁ θεός. ^{21 m} καὶ τὴν σκηνὴν ^m δὲ καὶ πάντα ^{m Heb., here only. Matt. xvi. 18 Luke ii. 35 al. n Matt xii.}
 τὰ ^{no} σκευὴ τῆς ^{op} λειτουργίας τῷ αἵματι ⁹ ὁμοίως ^ε ἐράν-
^{29 ||. 2 Tim ii. 20 al. Exod xl 8 (10). o 1 Chron. ix. 28. see Num. iv. 12. 2 Chron. xxiv. 14.}
^{p ch. viii. 6. Luke i. 23. 2 Cor ix. 12. Phil. ii. 17, 30 only. q Heb., here only.}

21. rec ερραντισε, with D³[P] rel: txt ACD¹KLX f o 17 [47].

would appear by Böhme, that the change has been made by the Writer after the tenor of the N. T. inauguration of the testament by our Lord, τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, Luke xxii. 20, the only Gospel in which ἐστιν fails) which God (LXX, κύριος: changed apparently to preserve more completely the O. T. character of the saying) commanded (LXX διέθετο, which would seem at first sight more appropriate to ver. 16. But ἐντέλλεσθαι διαθήκην is a common LXX expression elsewhere, see besides reff. Deut. iv. 13; xxix. 1: Ps. cx. 9: Jer. xi. 3) in regard to you (it is much disputed, how the logic of this passage can cohere: seeing that, how properly soever the latter διαθήκη may be spoken of and argued on as being a testament, the former one could have no such character, and consequently cannot be thus argued on. And the question is very variously answered according to the standing-point of different Commentators. Even such as Tholuck, Lüneemann, and Bleek, question the applicability of the Writer's argument. But, I believe, wrongly. The matter seems to stand thus. The word διαθήκη has the double sense of a covenant and a testament. Both these senses may be applied to both διαθήκαι: to the latter more properly belongs the testamentary sense, but to the former also in as far as it was typical of and foreshadowed the other. In the latter, all is clear. Christ, the heir of all things, has bequeathed to us His people an everlasting inheritance; has died, sealing the testament with His blood. In the former all this is formally, though inadequately represented. The κληρονομία, faintly shadowed forth by temporal possessions, had yet a recognized blessed meaning far beyond those possessions: the testator was imperfectly, but still was formally represented by the animals slain in sacrifice: there was a death, there was a sprinkling of and sealing by blood: and surely it requires no more stretch of concession to acknowledge the victim in sacrifice to represent the Lamb of God in his sonship and his heritorship, than it does in his innocence and propitiatory power. The one idea is just as poorly and inadequately set forth by it as the other. But in both cases there is an inheritance, and in both it is the same. In both it is bequeathed: in the latter

actually by One who has come in person and died: in the former, only typically, by the same One ceremonially present. So that, if our *δοεν* in ver. 18 were to be filled up, it would be, 'Whence, i. e. since the former covenant also had its testamentary side, and thus was analogous to as well as typical of the latter.' The charge brought against the Writer on account of his transition of meaning in διαθήκη, is equally without foundation. He is thinking in Greek. In Greek, διαθήκη has these two meanings: not divided off from one another by any such line of demarcation as when expressed by two separate words, but both lying under one and the same word. What more common, or more ordinarily accepted, than to educe out of some one word its various shades of meaning, and argue on each separately as regards the matter in hand? Take the very word 'Testament' as an example. In our common parlance it now means a book: the *Old Testament*, the book of the former covenant, the *New Testament*, the book of the latter. But we do not therefore sink the other and deeper meaning; nay we rather insist on it, that it may not become lost in that other and more familiar one. I cannot see how the Writer's method of procedure here differs essentially from this).

21.] And moreover he in like manner sprinkled with the blood the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry (this cannot be spoken of the same occasion as that referred to in the previous verses: for at that time the tabernacle did not exist. Nor again can it be said of any practice of sprinkling with blood which existed throughout the legal ordinances: for the aorist shews the reference to be to some one act, and the subject of the verb is, as before, Moses. This being so, we must look beyond the ordinances of the law itself for the fact here detailed. For all that we have in the law respecting the dedication of the tabernacle and its vessels is in Exod. xl. 9, 10, where Moses is commanded to take the anointing oil, and to anoint the tabernacle and all that is therein, and to hallow it, and all the vessels thereof. So that our Writer is probably referring to some traditional account, which added to this anointing with oil, the sprinkling with blood. And this is not merely a hypothesis. For Josephus,

Acts xiii 44. ²² τισεν, ²² καὶ ¹ σχεδὸν ⁸ ἐν αἵματι πάντα ^t καθαρίζεται ^{ACDKL}
^{xix 26 only†.} ² κατὰ τὸν νόμον, καὶ ^u χωρὶς ^v αἵματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ^{PN a b c}
^{2 Macc. i 2} ^{only} ^{27, 28} ἄφεσις. ²³ ἀνάγκη οὖν τὰ μὲν ^y ὑποδείγματα τῶν ἐν ^{d e f g h}
^{s = Matt. xii.} ^{xiv. 1 al.} ^{t ver. 14} ^{u ch. viii 4. ver 19} ^{Acts xxii. 12 al.} ^{v here only†. see 3 Kings xviii 28.} ^{w absol., = Mark iii.}
^{29 (Luke iv. 19 bis) only.} (ch. x 18 al) ^{x ver. 16} ^{y ch. iv 11 reff} ^{viii. 5.}

Antt. iii. 8. 6, gives the following remarkable account, agreeing with ours almost verbatim: Μωυσῆς δὲ . . . ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν τεθυμένων τὴν τε στολὴν τοῦ Ἱερῶνος καὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς παισὶν ἔβραινεν, . . . ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον αὐτοὺς τε καὶ τὰς στολὰς ἐθεράπευε, τὴν τε σκηνὴν καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτὴν σκεύη ἐλάφ τε προθυμωμένῳ καθὼς εἶπον, καὶ τῷ αἵματι τῶν ταύρων καὶ κριῶν σφαγέντων καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐνδὸς κατὰ γένος. In Levit. viii. 30, from which the account of anointing Aaron and his sons is taken, distinct mention is made of sprinkling on them, and on their garments, the blood which was on the altar. It was a natural addition, to extend that sprinkling to the tabernacle and its vessels: especially as (Levit. ver. 15) the altar was already to be touched with the blood. Philo, Vita Mos. iii. 18, vol. ii. p. 158, cited by Carpzov and others as asserting the same as our text, does not do so, as Bleek has pointed out. He merely exactly reproduces the directions of Levit. viii. 10, 30, **22.]** and almost (one may say that) (the *σχεδὸν* belongs, not to the *πάντα*, nor to the *ἐν αἵματι* (Bengel, Böhme), nor to the *καθαρίζεται* (as Chrys., Ec., Thl., διὰ τὸ τὸ σχεδὸν προσέθηκε; διότι ἐκεῖνα οὐκ ἦν καθαρισμὸς τέλειος), but to the whole assertion, *ἐν αἵματι πάντα καθαρίζεται, καὶ χωρὶς αἵμ. κ.τ.λ.* In the two other places where *σχεδὸν* is used in the N. T. (reff.: both, observe, in St. Luke), it is closely joined with *πᾶς* in blood all things are purified (there is a combination throughout of the ideas of the inheritance by testament, whereof the death is a condition, and the purification by covenant, whereof the death is the efficient cause. The combination is not a rhetorical figure in the mind of the Writer, but a deep truth in the verity of God. The same Death which purifies us from guilt, makes us partakers of the kingdom of glory: the same Blood which cleanses us from sin, seals the testament of our inheritance. The fact that *almost* in all cases the law purified by blood, provides for such exceptions as Exod. xix. 10: Levit. xv. 5 ff.; xvi. 26, 28; xxii. 6: Num. xxxi. 22—24) according to the law (i. e. receive legal purification), and (*σχεδὸν* still rules the sentence: see above) *apart from shedding of blood (αἵματεκχυσία* seems to be a word

coined by the sacred Writer to express his meaning. There has been a question, whether it imports the shedding of blood in the slaughter of the victims, or the pouring out of the blood at the foot of the altar, so often enjoined in the ordinances of legal sacrifice. On this question I give the substance of Delitzsch's remarks. "For the second of these meanings it may be alleged, 1. that the mere *shedding* of blood (ἡψῆς) is an expression in the O. T. ritual by no means confined to sacrificial rites properly so called, in which the catching of the blood by the priest is the first step: 2. that ἐκχέειν τὸ αἷμα (παρὰ or ἐπὶ τῇ βάσει τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) is the ordinary LXX expression for the usual ἡψῆς (pouring out of the blood) in sin-offerings, while for the usual ἡψῆς (sprinkling) in expiatory, peace, and whole burnt-offerings we have usually *προσχέειν τὸ αἷμα* (ἐπὶ or πρὸς τὸ θυσιαστήριον),—once *περιχέειν*, 2 Chron. xxix. 22, once at least ἐκχέειν, 4 Kings xvi. 15 Ed-vat. (*προσχ. AB*), and once *προσεκχέειν*, Exod. xxix. 16 Ald. (*προσχ. AB*) . . . But still it is to me more probable that the Writer here has the *shedding of blood* in mind. It would not by any means follow, that he treats this blood-shedding as a propitiation. He does not directly call it the *medium* of forgiveness, he says only, that apart from it there was no remission, that it is the indispensable means to obtain the expiatory *שֶׁנֶהָרָא*, life's blood. . . . That however which determines me to refer the *αἵματεκχυσία* to the *shedding* of blood, is not entirely the usage, as Bl., but the *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐκχυνόμενον* of the institution of the Lord's Supper in Luke xxii. 20 (cf. xi. 50),—at all events the close parallel in word and in thought to that. It is hardly probable that the Writer would mean an ἐκχέειν (-χύνειν) αἷμα of which that so called on Christ's part is not the antitype; not to say that since ver. 13, αἷμα and θάνατος have been ideas most closely connected." See this followed out much further in Delitzsch's note) there cometh not (taketh not place) remission (viz. ἁμαρτιῶν: an expression occurring eight times in St. Luke and the Acts to once in St. Matt. and twice in St. Mark. As to the fact, Levit. xvii. 11 sufficiently proves it: and the Rabbis deduced from that pas-

τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τούτοις ¹καθαρίζεσθαι, αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ ²ἐπουράνια ³z ch. iii. 1 reff.

23. καθαρίζεται D¹ 67² copt.

sage an axiom almost verbatim the same as our text: *הַיָּמִין לֹא יִצְרָךְ אִישׁ*, "non est expiatio nisi per sanguinem." The case of the poor man, who cannot afford the animal victim, Levit. v. 11—13, which seems to present an exception and to justify the application of the *σχεδόν* to this clause, is not counted as one by Delitzsch, but as merely a negative expression of the need of reconciliation. But I do not see how this can be said: see ver. 13 there).

23.] There (was) (more probably than 'is,' seeing that he was before speaking, not of the renewed cleansing year by year, but of the solemn inauguration: and much more, now that he is coming to speak of the heavenly sanctuary, must he be asserting a necessity where it of continually renewed cleansing, but of a past one, once for all) necessity therefore (this first inference follows from the facts just mentioned: and is introduced only to lead the way to the second, αὐτὰ δὲ κ.τ.λ., which itself is a conclusion from the analogy between type and antitype, and is the converse of the 'a fortiori' proposition of vv. 13, 14) that the delineations not, "patterns:," at least not in the present acceptance of that word. The heavenly things themselves would be the patterns, or antitypes. See on ch. viii. 5) of the things in the heavens (i.e. of the heavenly tabernacle with its contents: see below) should be purified (for the *ἐγκαθαρσις* was in fact not only an inauguration, but a purification likewise; and the proposition of ver. 22,—'wherever there is *ἄφεσις*, there is *αἵματεκχυσία*,'—will bear converting,—wherever there is a sprinkling with blood, there is remission, and consequently, purification) with these (i.e. not the various purifications mentioned up to this time, the ashes of the red heifer included, as Lünem., al.; for these last were never used to purify the tabernacle or its vessels: nor again, "blood and the like," e.g. the oil which was used with it, as De Wette, al.; for this has not been mentioned: nor, "talibus, nempe rebus Leviticis," as Böhme, which is far too vague. It is the blood, and that only, which is meant: the plural being used most probably to indicate the animals slain, the *πράγαι κ. μόσχοι*), but the heavenly things themselves (i.e. heaven and the things therein: cf. *εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν* in the next verse, of which Bleek well remarks, that the junction to this by γάρ can only then be valid when those words refer to the same as our αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια. But it has appeared difficult to Commentators to understand, how heaven

itself should need this cleansing. Consequently various expedients have been adopted: and various meanings given, either to τὰ ἐπουράνια or to the verb. Luther, Calvin, Beza, Grot., Le Clerc, Ebrard, Lünem., al. (not Bleek, as Ebr.) would understand καθαρίζεσθαι to be applied only by zeugma to the second member of our sentence, and would get out of it the idea *ἐγκαθαρσις*, or "aditum pati," or something of the kind. But to this we may answer, with Delitzsch, that every kind of inauguration, or patefaction, passed upon the heavenly things themselves by means of blood, must mean an inauguration or patefaction by means of propitiatory purification: so that the difficulty remains where it was. Thos. Aquinas ("Mundantur caelestia, quatenus homines mundantur a peccatis"), Bengel ("i.e. usus redditus sanctus respectu nostri"), Tholuck, al. understand it of our being purified to inherit or enter heaven: which Delitzsch properly calls, after the difference which has been already in the text indicated between the purification of person and of the tabernacle, a precarious "quid pro quo." Still less can we accept the interpretations given in the ancient expositors, e.g. Chrys. (αὐτὰ τὰ ἐπουράνια, τούτέστι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν τὴν παρ' ἡμῖν, τοὺς ἐκεῖ κεκλημένους), CEC. (τούτέστι, τὰ τῆς νέας (διαθήκης)), Thdr. (οὐράνια δὲ τὰ πνευματικὰ κέκληκεν, οἷς ἡ ἐκκλησία καθαίρεται), Thl. (τούτέστι, τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ ἡμέτερα): so also Primasius, Ayimo, Psuedo-Anselm. See this view well met in Justiniani. More literally, some have interpreted it with a view to the expulsion of Satan from heaven spoken of Luke x. 18: John xii. 31, and especially Rev. xii. 7—9: see also our ch. ii. 14. So Akersloot, and Bleek. But this does not meet the requirements of the case. There would thus be no cleansing, as far as the relations of God and men are concerned: none, to which the propitiatory effect of blood would in any way apply. We must therefore rest in the plain and literal sense: that the heaven itself needed, and obtained, purification by the atoning blood of Christ. And if we enquire how this could be, we may find an answer in reflecting on the consequence of man's sin on the mind and aspect of God towards him. That unclouded benignity wherewith the Creator contemplated his creation, Gen. i. 31, had become overcast by the divine anger on account of sin, but was again restored by Him in whom the Father εὐδόκησεν, the

a ch. i. 4. ^{ref.} ^{ab} κρείττοσιν ^{bc} θυσίαις ²⁴ παρὰ ταύτας. ^d οὐ γὰρ εἰς ^e χειρο- ^{ACDKL}
 b ch. xii. 24. ^{PN a b c}
 c = ch. i. 4. ^{d e f g h}
 ii. 7, 9. ^{k l m n}
 iii. 3 al. ^{o 17. 47}
 d ver. 11. ^{ref.}
 e = ch. i. vii. 2
 f 1 Pet. iii. 21 only +
 g ch. vii. 2. ^{ref.}
 h = Matt. xxiii. 53 John xiv
 = Matt. xviii. 10. Luke i. 76. Acts
 21, 22. (Acts xxiii. 15 al. 4) only. Exod. xxxiii. 13.
 ii. 19. 2 Thess. i. 9 1 Pet. iii. 12, from Ps. xxxiii. 16

24. rec *αγια* bef *εισηλθεν*, with CDKL rel [Nyss, Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt A[P]N
 17 [Euthal-ms], *προσηλθεν αγια* m. rec ins o bef *χριστος*, with C³D²⁻³KL[P] rel
 Ath₁ Ps-Ath₁ [Nyss,] Chr Thdrt Damasc: om AC¹D¹N¹ 17 [arm Euthal-ms Cyr-p].

darkness being by His blood turned into light, the frown into an eternal smile. So Delitzsch beautifully: "If I see aright, the meaning of the Writer is, in its ground thought, this: the supernal holiest place, i. e., as ver. 24 shews, αὐτὸς ὁ οὐρανός, the uncreated eternal heaven of God, although in itself untroubled light, yet needed a καθαρίζεσθαι in so far as the light of Love towards man was, so to speak, out-flared and obscured by the fire of wrath against sinful man; and the heavenly tabernacle, i. e. the place of God's revealing of His majesty and grace for angels and men, needed a καθαρίζεσθαι, in so far as men had rendered this place, which was destined for them from the beginning, unapproachable by reason of their sin, and so it must be changed into an approachable place of manifestation of a God gracious to men") **with sacrifices** (categoric plural of an abstract proposition: not therefore implying that the sacrifice was repeated: applicable in its reality, only to the one Sacrifice of the body of Christ once for all, and most emphatically designating that *as a sacrifice*) **better than** (see on ch. i. 4) **these**.

24.] He now reasserts, under the fuller light which has since been cast upon it, that which was enounced in vv. 11, 12, and by it shews at what the word *ἐπουράνια* above pointed. In fact, as Delitzsch observes, the proposition of vv. 11, 12, has been in course of elucidation ever since: in vv. 13, 14 he explained διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, in vv. 15—23 the ἀρχιερεὺς τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, and now the εἰσῆλθεν ἐπάπαξ εἰς τὰ *αγια*. For (resumption of τὰ ἐπουράνια above) not into holy places made with hands (such as those into which the Jewish high priests entered: see above, ver. 11: and the two expressions Acts vii. 48; xvii. 24) did Christ enter, counterfeits of the true (holy places) (ἀντίτυπος, correspondent to the τύπος; either, as in this case, *copies from* a pattern, viz. the τύπος shewn in the mount, however understood, ch. viii. 5, also Rom. v. 14, ὅς (Ἀδάμ) ἐστὶν τύπος τοῦ μελλόντος,—or the *reality* corresponding to a previously shewn figure (τύπος), as baptism in ref. 1 Pet., where Baptism is the ἀντίτυπον to the flood of

Noah: and which latter is our more usual English sense of antitype. The ancients mostly take ἀντίτυπα here as = *τύπους*. So Chrys., Thl. (τούτέστι, τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἦσαν τύπος), not Ec., Jac. Cappellus, Schlicht., al. A copious collection of the senses and examples of ἀντίτυπος may be found in Suicer, sub voce. The Sacraments were often designated by this epithet, as representing to us Christ: and indeed Baptism in both the senses here given: thus Caesarius, Quæst. Ult. p. 208 (cited by Suicer, but not to be found in Edn. Migne), calls Baptism ἀντίτυπον of Circumcision; while Cyril-jerus., Catech. xx. 6, p. 313, calls it τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ παθμάτων ἀντίτυπον. Several of the Fathers speak of the Eucharistic elements as ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ. The true, genuine *holy places* are those in heaven, where God's presence is manifested. See below), but into the heaven itself (αὐτὸς ὁ οὐρανός,—none of the οὐρανοί, all of which the Lord διελήλυθεν, ch. iv. 14,—but the very holiest place, where God peculiarly reveals Himself, and which is uncreated. Delitzsch quotes from Seb. Schmidt, "Cœlum in quod Christus ingressus est, non est ipsum cœlum creatum, quodcunque fuerit, sed est cœlum in quo Deus est etiam quando cœlum creatum nullum est,—ipsa gloria divina." Hence what follows), now (in the present dispensation: almost = henceforth. It is an anticipation of the οὐδ' ἵνα πολλάκις κ.τ.λ. of the next verse) to be manifested (first, as to the *tense*. Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 368, says that the aorist forbids the enduring "henceforth" sense of νῦν. But there can be no doubt that he is wrong. The infinitive of *purpose* is often expressed in the aorist when duration is distinctly implied, but, I believe, only in those cases where the commencement of the fulfilment of the purpose is contemporaneous with the act narrated whereby the purpose is to be served: so εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μέναι σὺν αὐτοῖς, Luke xxiv. 29: ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν, Matt. xxiv. 45,—in these cases the μέναι and the δίδου, as here the *εμφανίζεσθαι*, beginning with the act related. It is obvious that these remarks

t = ver 15 reff^t ἐπὶ ὡ συντελεῖα τῶν αἰώνων εἰς ὡ ἀθέτησιν ἁμαρτίας διὰ ACDEKL
u elsw in N. T. αἰών, w. αἰώνος, PN a b c
d e f g h
Matt xiii 39, 40, 49. xxiv. 3 xxviii 20 only. Deut xi 12 Dan xii. 4, 13 v plur, ch 1. 2 xi 3.
w ch vi 18 only. x = 1 Pet i 20 1 John i. 2 iii 5, 8 (see note) y ch iii 3. vii. 20 only. o 17. 47
z Luke xix. 20. Col. i. 5. 2 Tim. iv. 8 only. Gen. xlix. 10 Job xxxviii. 23 2 Macc. xii. 45 only.

Damasc: txt ACN[P m 47] Orig₁ Chr₁ [Euthal-ms]. ins της bef αμαρτίας
A[P]N¹⁷ [coptt. αμαρτιων D¹-gr Aug₁ (Orig₁)].

heaven was, to offer, present, himself often to God, then, as a condition of that frequent presentation, there would be an antecedent necessity for Him to *suffer* often: because that self-presentation is in fact the bringing in before God of the Blood of that his suffering: and if the one was to be renewed, so must the other be likewise. So that the meaning is not, that Christ must again and again have descended on earth and died. To such a descent there is no allusion, as there is none to a renewed entrance into the ἔγρια in heaven. That entrance Christ has effected once for all: this lies, as a 'fait accompli,' at the ground of the hypothesis. But the rejected hypothesis is, that *once being in* the celestial ἔγρια, Christ intended to renew often his oblation of Himself. And in that case, says our Writer, it would be necessary that he should often suffer, often die: because each such oblation necessitated as its condition a corresponding παθεῖν. When, as in the case of the Jewish high priests, the αἷμα was ἀλλότριον, such repetition was possible (see Levit. xvi. 14, 15): but not so, when the blood was τὸ ἴδιον. Thus, in the main, Delitzsch; and Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 311. Cf. also Thl., ἐπεὶ, εἰ ἐμελλε, φησὶν, πολλάκις προσενεγκεῖν, ἔδει αὐτὸν καὶ πολλάκις ἀποθανεῖν, διὰ τὸ τὸ ἴδιον αἷμα ὀφείλειν προσάγειν) since the foundation of the world (why this addition? Not, as often understood, e.g. by Bengel ("pro peccatis ab initio mundi commissis"), Böhme, Thol., Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., so as to bring under the merits of the Suffering, all the sins of mankind past as well as future,—which thought, arising from the erroneous view of a frequently-repeated entrance into heaven being supposed, has nothing whatever to do with the argument: but, inasmuch as the theatre of Christ's sufferings is of necessity this present world, pointing out that those supposed repeated sufferings must necessarily in that case take place within the temporal limits indicated by ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου: that such sufferings would be spread over the space of time from the καταβολὴ κόσμου till He entered into the presence of God, each oblation of Himself there being the sequel of, and conditioned by, one such παθεῖν since the

world has been. I may mention, that no parenthesis is here admissible. The words ἐπεὶ . . . κόσμου are strictly and indispensably a link in the argument): now, however (νυνί, not temporal, but = 'ut res se habent'), once (for all, without need of renewal) at (as close upon, put in immediate contiguity with, 'sub finem mundi': see Winer, edn. 6, § 48, c: superimposed, as an event, on its period as a substratum: see above on ver. 15) the end of the ages of time (i. e. when the whole period above indicated by ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου is gathered up and brought to an end. Between the first and second coming of Christ, the N. T. Scriptures know of no intermediate interposition of the divine dealings with men: in Him we are τελειοί, and at His appearing, our αἰῶνες had their συντέλεια. All these centuries which have been since, are merely the lengthening out of the time in the mercy of God. The first Christians universally spoke of the second coming of the Lord as close at hand, as indeed it ever was and is: the σιτιστά are τεθυμένα, and all is ready: but the long-suffering of God waits while the guests are being gathered in: or, in the other view of His coming, while the ark is a preparing) hath He been manifested (viz. at His first coming in our flesh: the φανερωσις ἐν σαρκί, spoken of 1 Tim. iii. 16: 1 Pet. i. 20. On the other meaning given, see below) for the putting away of sin (on ἀθέτησις see ch. vii. 18 note: putting away, i. e. abrogation, "quæ fit, quum peccato omnis vis et potestas adimitur. Quod dupliciter factum est: tum quatenus nullam vim habet ad homines condemnandos: tum quatenus vim non habet ad eosdem sub jugo suo retinendos. Utrumque enim ut fieret, Christus apparuit: tum ut homines a peccatorum reatu et poenis, tum ut eosdem ab ipsis peccatis liberaret." Schlichting) by means of His sacrifice (i. e. in the sense, 'the sacrifice of Himself,' but not here so expressed: 'had the Writer intended αὐτοῦ to express ἐαυτοῦ, he would have so written it, as in ver. 25. By very many expositors, the construction of this verse is differently taken. Some understand πεφανερωται of His appearance before God—the ἐμφανισμός above mentioned. So Jac. Cappellus, Grot., Heinrichs, Schulz, al. But this

κεῖται τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ^a ἅπαξ ἀποθανεῖν, μετὰ δὲ τοῦτο ^{a = ch x 27}
^a κρίσις, ²⁸ οὕτως καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ^b ἅπαξ ^{b ver 14.} προσενεχθεὶς ^c εἰς ^{c constr, ch vii 25 reff.}

28. rec om καί, with b : ins ACDKL[P]X rel latt syrr coptt [æth arm Chr Euthal-ms

cannot be for a moment maintained. The analogy of the reff. is wholly against it, and so is the ἐκ δευτέρου δόθησεται below: not to mention that had it been so, we should certainly have had ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, or some such qualification, added. But more, keeping the right sense of πεφανέρωται, join διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ with it. So a gloss in Ec.: διὰ τῆς θυσίας πεφανέρωται, τουτέστιν, μετὰ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: so Böhme, Tholuck, al. But none of the passages whereby this is defended, is applicable: neither vv. 12, 14 (διὰ), nor Rom. ii. 27: 1 John v. 6: and for this reason, that θυσία, as Delitzsch observes, is not a continuing state, nor an accompanying circumstance, but an act, by which ἀθέτησις ἁμαρτίας, the scope of the whole, is brought about). 27, 28.] It is shewn by a comparison with our human lot in general, of which Christ, Himself man, is partaker, that this often suffering (dying) and often offering Himself, has no place: that as in our case, we die once only, and after that comes the judgment, for us who are to be judged, so for Him there was one death from sin, and after that no repetition of it, but the judgment, for Him who is to judge. But in this latter member of the comparison, the bright and saving side only is put forward (see below): it is not said he shall appear to judge the world, but He shall appear without sin (and therefore with no more purpose to expiate sin) to them that wait for Him, unto salvation: these last words carrying with them a hortatory force, that the readers might thus wait for Him. 27.] And inasmuch as (not = καθώς, but bearing with it not only a comparative, but also a ratiocinative force, seeing that Christ is not only a fit object of comparison with man, but is man) it is appointed (ἀπόκειται properly of things laid aside for future use: hence, of those things which are laid up as our appointed lot by a higher Power: so Plato, Locr. p. 104 D, κολάσεις ἀπαράλητοι ἀπόκεινται δυσδαίμοσι νεπέροις: Dion. Hal. v. 8, ὅσα τοῖς κακοῦργοις ἀπόκειται παθεῖν: see reff., and many other examples in Bleek) to men (all men: τοῖς generic) once (and no more) to die (see numerous illustrations of the sentiment from the classical authors in Wetstein), and after that, judgment (not necessarily here to be taken on its unfavourable side: the word is perfectly general, and anathrous: nor is there, as Böhme

imagined, any opposition between τοῖς ἀνθρώποις here and τοῖς ἀπεκδεχομένοις αὐτόν below. Such opposition indeed would mar the whole context, which has a totally different object, and deals with the general and inevitable fate of all men indiscriminately. Nor again must the question, whether judgment is spoken of as immediately to follow death, or after an interval, be imported into the consideration of the text. The indefinite μετὰ τοῦτο does not admit of any such question being raised. Next to death, with no more like events between, comes judgment: this is the fact contemplated—the appointed destiny of man, according to which that of the man Christ Jesus also, as far as it is applicable to Him, is apporportioned): 28.] so also the Christ (not χριστός, anathrous, which would seem to point to some one contrasted with, or at all events merely compared with, οἱ ἄνθρωποι: but ὁ χριστός, that man who was God's Christ—the Christ, it being plain and palpable to all that ὁ χριστός belongs to the category of ἄνθρωποι. Cf. the anathrous χριστός in ver. 24, where the case is different) once (for all) having been offered (not = 'having offered himself:' for it might well have been προσενέγκας ἑαυτόν. The form and the meaning are both passive; and the reason of this is I believe to be found in the fact that it is in this verse not so much the agency, as the destiny of Christ, that is spoken of; that which, though the expression itself is avoided with regard to Him, ἀπόκειται for Him as for us. And this consideration removes from us all necessity of supplying an agent for this προσενεχθεὶς, as ὑπ' ἑαυτοῦ (Chrys.) or ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (al.), which as Delitzsch remarks would not be correct; Christ might be δοθεὶς or παραδοθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, but not προσενεχθεὶς. Nor would ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων express the right agency; for it was no conscious act of mankind, willing its sin to be atoned for, that offered up Christ: but if an agent must be supplied, it would be = διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου as in ver. 14,—the divine submission of our Lord subjecting Himself to the external force which was exerted against Him,—that force being in some sort the agent, but not without His own will co-operating. It is hardly necessary to mention, that the very terms of the context here necessitate the understanding this προσενεχθῆναι of the death of Christ,—not as in ver. 25, where the context, as

d ch. u. 10 reff. τὸ ^d πολλῶν ^e ἀνενεγκεῖν ἁμαρτίας ^f ἐκ δευτέρου ^g χωρὶς
 e ch vii. 27.
 = 1 Pet. ii. ^h ἁμαρτίας ^h ὁφθήσεται τοῖς αὐτὸν ⁱ ἀπεκδεχομένοις εἰς
 12 Isa. liii.
 f Matt xxvi
 42. John ix.
 34. Acts x 15 xi 9 Josh. i. 2 g ch iv 15. h = Acts xiii. 31. xxvi 16. 1 Cor xv 5, &c.
 1 Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25. 1 Cor. i. 7. Gal v. 5. Phil. iii. 20 1 Pet. iii. 20 only t.
 σωτηρίαν.

Thdrt Damasc]. απεκδεχομενοι C¹: εκδεχομενοις D¹. aft απειδεχ. ins δια πιστεως
 m o(omg εις) arm; aft εις σωτηριαν A[P 47] hal flor syr [Euthal-ins] Damasco-comm.

there insisted, confines it to His offering of Himself to God in the heavenly sanctuary) to bear the sins of many (a plain allusion to ref. Isa., αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνεγκεν: and here, as there, importing the "bearing," "carrying on Himself;" Heb. נָשָׂא, cf. also in Levit. xxiv. 15, "Whosoever curseth his God shall bear (λήψεται LXX) his sin:" Num. v. 31, "the woman shall bear (λήψεται) her iniquity:" xiv. 34, "each day for a year shall ye bear (λήψεσθε) your iniquities, even forty years." And so in id. ver. 33, "shall bear your whoredoms," where the LXX have ἀνοίσουσιν. The Heb. word may also have the sense of *auferre*, which many (e. g. Luth., Schlicht., Grot., Limb., Bl., Lünem., Hofm.) have wished to give it here: but not so ἀνεγκαι. The sense given by Syr., "sacrificed" ("immolavit") the sins of many," and defended also by Chrys., Ec., Thl., would introduce a new and irrelevant idea, and cannot be maintained; so Michaelis also, taking however ἁμαρτία for a sin-offering, which it never means. Besides which, it is here πολλῶν ἁμαρτίας, which would at all events preclude that meaning. On πολλῶν, and its supposed contrast to πάντων (Chrys., διὰ τί πολλῶν εἶπε, καὶ μὴ πάντων: ἐπειδὴ μὴ πάντες ἐπίστευσαν: so Ec., Thl., and Thdrt., drawing from it the inference that Christ only διέλυσε the sin of believers), see above, ch. ii. 10, and Schlichting's true distinction, "Multi non opponuntur h. l. omnibus, sed tantum paucis." πολλῶν is, as Del. says, the qualitative designation of πάντων: all men are many in number. There is reference in it to ἀπαξ: He was offered, One, for all ("Multos uni opponit," Calv.: and once for all), shall appear (ὁφθήσεται, the usual verb of the appearances of Christ after his resurrection) a second time (reff.) without (separate from) sin (in order to understand this, we must remember what it is that the Writer is proving: viz. that Christ's death, the repetition of which would be the condition of a repeated offering of Himself in heaven to God, admits of no such repetition. It was a death in which He bore the sins of many—but He shall appear the second time χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας, with no sin upon Him, and consequently the whole work of

atonement done and accomplished by that first offering. So that there is no need of any far-fetched explanation, either of ἁμαρτίας, or of χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας. We need not say with Storr, that it is without an offering for sin: nor with Klee, that it is without punishment of sin: nor with Bleek, without meeting with sin (so Thdrt., οὐκέτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας κρατούσης, ἀντὶ τοῦ χάραν οὐκέτι ἐχούσης κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῆς ἁμαρτίας: and an explanation mentioned by Ec., ἐκ δευτέρου ἐρχόμενος οὐχ ἤξει πάλιν διὰ τὰς ὑμῶν ἁμαρτίας ὀφείλων ἀποθανεῖν): nor with Ebr., that He will have no more concern with sin: nor, with De Wette, without contact with sin: nor, with Lünem., free from all reference to sin. As distinguished from all these, we take, with Delitzsch and Hofmann, the simple sense of the words, and apply it to the argument in hand. At His first appearance in the world He came with sin, not in him, but on him: He was made to be ἁμαρτία: but this sin has been once for all taken away by his bearing it as our Sacrifice: and at his second appearance He shall appear without, having done with, separate from, sin. Theodore of Mopsuestia, though he has not exactly and clearly struck the right note, is yet very near it, when he says, νῦν, φησὶν, ὁφθεῖς, ὅτε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κρατεῖν συνέβαιεν, ἀναγκαίως τὸν διὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κρατοῦντα θάνατον ἐδέξατο, τότε δὲ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὡς εἰκὸς λελυμένης, ἀνάγκη καὶ αὐτὸν ἀπαθῶς ὁφθῆναι τὸ γὰρ χωρὶς ἁμαρτίας τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι μὴ κρατούσης ἔτι τῆς ἁμαρτίας οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς ἕξω παντὸς ἀνθρωπίνου πάθους ὁφθήσεται τότε) to them that wait for Him (see reff.)—unto (to bring in: for the purpose of) salvation (these last words belong to ὁφθήσεται, not, as Primas., Faber Stap., Camer., Wolf, al., to τοῖς ἀπεκδεχομένοις. This latter notion has led to the curious insertion of the words διὰ πίστεως in A al. The object of Christ's second appearance shall be, to bring in salvation: this is the bright and Christian side of His appearing, the side which we, who ought to be ἀπεκδεχόμενοι αὐτόν, should ever look upon. As Chrys. beautifully says, πῶς ὁφθήσεται: κολλάζων, φησὶν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἶπε τοῦτο, ἀλλὰ τὸ φαιδρόν).

Frag.
Mosq.
των μελ-
λωντων.
ACD KL
F8 Frag.
Mosq.
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17, 47

X. 1^k Σκιὰν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν¹ μελλόντων ἀγα-^k ch vii 5
θῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν^m εἰκόνα τῶνⁿ πραγμάτων, ὁ κατ' ὅνι-¹ ch xi 11 see
αὐτὸν ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις^p αἷς^q προσφέρουσιν^r εἰς τὸ^r δι-^{m=2} Col 1 v 5
15. Gen. v. 1 (see note) n = ch vi 1 o ch. ix. 25 1 eff p attr, ch
vi. 10 1 eff q ch. v. 1 1 eff r ch. vii 3 1 eff

ΣΗΜ. X. 1. aft θυσίαις ins αυτων [P]N.

rec (for ais) as, with CD³K[P]N rel

ΣΗΜ. X. 1—18.] SOLEMN CONCLUSION OF THE ARGUMENT: 1. *Christ's voluntary self-offering, as contrasted with the yearly offerings of victims under the law, is the carrying out of God's real will* (vv. 1—10): 2. *Christ's priestly service, in contrast to the daily repeated service of the priests of the law, is for ever perfected by one High-priestly act, which has issued in His Kingly exaltation and waiting till His foes be subdued under Him* (vv. 11—14): 3. *Christ's finished work is the inauguration of that new covenant before referred to, in which, the law being written on the heart, and sin put away and forgotten, there is no more need for sin-offering* (vv. 15—18). And so, as Delitzsch observes, in this passage the leading thoughts of the whole argument are brought together in one grand finale, just as in the finale of a piece of music all the hitherto scattered elements are united in an effective whole. 1—10.] See above.

1.] For (γάρ connects with the whole passage ch. ix. 24—28: hitherto has been shewn the impossibility of Christ's offering being repeated as were those of the law: now is to be shewn its absolute perfection as compared with those of the law) the law, **having** (as it has; the participle has a ratiocinative force, which passes on upon what follows) a shadow (or, 'the shadow,' which in sense would be much the same. The putting forward of the word to the beginning of the sentence would render it anarthrous. I prefer, however, 'a shadow,' because of the meaning of σκιά, presently to be treated of: see below) of the good things to come (viz. the same good things of which, in ch. ix. 11, Christ is said to be the High Priest,—which belong to the μέλλων αἰών of ch. vi. 5, whose δυνάμεις are working in the present dispensation, —and to the completion of the οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα of ch. ii. 5: the good things which are still future to us as they were to those under the law, but are now made sure to us in and by Christ), **not the very image of the things** (every representation of μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν must be an εἰκόν, whether it be in words, or in types, or in any other method of representation. The full description and entire revelation of the things thus designated will be αὐτὴ ἡ εἰκὼν τῶν πραγμάτων: which we possess

in the gospel covenant: the very setting-forth and form of the heavenly realities themselves. So that the gen. πραγμάτων is the 'genitivus substantiæ,' as in Col. iii. 10, τὸν ἀνακαινούμενον . . . κατ' εἰκόνα τοῦ κτίσαντος αὐτόν, and Rom. viii. 29, συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ,—ὁ κτίσας in the one and ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ in the other, being and furnishing the εἰκόν. But the law had no such εἰκὼν constructed out of the heavenly realities themselves, "ipsas res, certa sua forma et effigie præditas," as Stier: it had merely σκιά, merely a rough sketch or outline: so Chrys., not however to my mind entirely apprehending the identity of the εἰκὼν with the πράγματα which furnish it,—σκιά τούτέστιν οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. ἔως μὲν γὰρ ἂν ὥς ἐν γραφῇ περιάγῃ τις τὰ χρώματα, σκιά τις ἐστίν· ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἄνθος ἐπαλεῖψῃ τις καὶ ἐπιχρίσῃ τὰ χρώματα, τότε εἰκὼν γίνεται. See also Thdrt. and Ec.), year by year with the same sacrifices (most Commentators assume some inversion of arrangement in constructing the words κατ' ἐνιαυτόν: some (Calvin, Erasmus, Schmid, Wolf, Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, Stuart, al.) joining them with αἷς προσφέρουσιν, others (Lünem., al.) with ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, others (Carpzov, al.) with τοὺς προσερχομένους. But there is no need to disturb the plain order of the sentence, in which κατ' ἐνιαυτόν belongs to all that follows, viz. to the verb, οὐδέποτε δύναται, with its instrumental clause, ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις αἷς κ.τ.λ. And so Ebrard, Hofmann, and Delitzsch. "This," says Del., "is more accordant with the sense of the Writer: for he does not say, that the law by means of the offerings which were always the same year by year never was able to perfect, &c.,—but that the law, year by year, by the repetition of the same offerings, testified its inability to perfect, &c., viz. on the day of atonement, on which the same expiatory offerings were always repeated, being necessary, notwithstanding the many offerings brought throughout the year, and after which the same round of offerings again began anew." It will be evident that ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις must refer, not to the daily offering, but to those of propitiation on the great day of atonement) **which they** (the ministering priests, not οἱ προσερχό-

s ch. ii. 10 reff. *ηνεκές οὐδέποτε δύναται τοὺς προσερχομένους ὁ τελειῶσαι.* ACDKL
 t const., Luke v 4. Acta v. 42 vi. 13. 2 ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο ὁ προσφερόμεναι, διὰ τὸ μηδεμίαν PN Frag.
 Eph. i. 16 ἔχειν ἔτι ὁ συνείδησιν ἁμαρτιῶν τοὺς ὁ λατρεύοντας ὁ ἅπασι Mosq.
 al. Gen. xi. 6. 3 κεκαθαρισμένους; 3 ἀλλ' ἐν αὐταῖς ὁ ἀνάμνησις ἁμαρτιῶν a b c d e
 u ch. ix. 9 reff. const., 1 Pet. ii 19 διὰ f g h k l
 7. συνείδησιν τοῦ μύσους εἰς μανίαν περίεστη, Diod. Sic. iv. 65 y absol., ch. ix. 9 Phil. ii 3
 w ch. vi 4 reff. x ch ix. 14 reff. y (=) 1 Cor. xi. 24, 25 || L only Lev xxii. 7. Num. x. 10 in n o 17. 47

[Chr. Damasc]: om A 17 [47 syrr arm]: txt D¹(L?) Frag-mosq k D-lat Chr-ms [Euthal-ms(appy)] Thdrt. (ins ai bef ουδεποτε A² [syrr arm].) *δυναται* ACD²
 [P]N a² b¹ d¹ f¹ l¹ m n o 17 [47] (Syr) Chr-2-mss [Euthal-ms] Damasc (Thdrt Thl):
 om k. for *τελειῶσαι, καθαρίσαι* D¹(and lat).

2. elz om ουκ, with Frag-mosq¹ a c vulg-ed(with [demid] hal harl² F-lat) syrr
 Primas: ins ACDKL[P]N rel Frag-mosq²(appy) am(with fuld harl¹ [tol]) copt arm
 Chr [Euthal-ms Thdrt] Damasc Thl Ec. om ετι D¹(and lat) Chr: ετι bef εχειν
 a. aft τους ins δε D¹-gr]. rec κεκαθαρισμένους, with L rel Chr Thdrt Damasc
 Thl Ec: txt DK[P]N m 17, κεκαθαρισμένους AC.

3. αυτοῖς Frag-mosq.

μενοι, as Hofmann ii. 1. 314, which would be against all the terminology of the Epistle, in which *προσφέρειν* is without exception confined to priests. We have the same distinction as regards the *προσερχόμενοι* in ch. vii. 25) offer continually (Hofmann would join this with what follows, alleging that *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* does not mean continually but continuously. And so Lachmann punctuates. But against such a construction I conceive it to be decisive, that thus *αἱ προσφέρουσιν* would be in the last degree flat and unmeaning, and that the verb *δύναται* would have two qualifying adverbial predicates, *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές* and *οὐδέποτε*. I do not imagine that any one accustomed to the style of our Epistle would tolerate such a sentence. And with regard to *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, granting the meaning to be continuously, why may not that meaning be applicable here? Hofmann says that it is not applicable to a continually repeated act, but only to a continuously enduring agency. But why should not the offering of these sacrifices be looked upon as continuous, being unbroken from year to year? When I say, 'The celebration of the day of atonement continued unbroken till the destruction of Jerusalem,' I use the same method of expression, and might express my meaning in Greek by *διηνεκής ἦν, ἔως* never (not even at any time) is able to perfect (see on ref., where I have entered into the meanings of *τελειῶν* in our Epistle) those who draw near (to God, by means of them. Tholuck well remarks that this threefold κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, ταῖς αὐταῖς θυσίαις, *εἰς τὸ διηνεκές*, graphically sets forth the ever recurring cycle of the yearly sacrifices for sin).

2.] For (if it were so, if the law were able to perfect the worshippers) would they (αἱ αὐταὶ θυσίαι) not have ceased being offered, on account

of the worshippers (the servers in the service of the tabernacle, used here in a wide sense, including priests and people) having no longer any conscience of sins (for construction, see ref.: = guilt of sin on the conscience, consciousness of the guilt of sin), if once (for all) purified? That this sentence is to be read *ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἔν, and* as a question, is pretty universally agreed. Some, as Thdrt. (apparently: *διὰ τοῦτο τέλος ἐκεῖνα λαμβάνει*), D-lat. ("nam nec cessassent offerri"), Beza (edd. 1, 2, "alioqui non desissent offerri"), Whitby, Valcknaer, read *οὐκ, and* yet no question; understanding, "for then they would not have ceased to be offered," viz. on the coming in of the N. T. dispensation. But this is surely hardly worth refutation. The rec. not reading *οὐκ*, might indeed be well thus rendered, "for in that case they would have ceased to be offered." But then *ἀλλά* comes in awkwardly, which, when as here without any emphasis, more naturally follows a negative sentence. The taking our verse interrogatively is as old as Ec.: *ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐπαύσαντο κατ' ἐρώτησιν ἀνάγνωθι*. So also Thl. 3.] Which cessation is far from being the case, as is the having no more conscience of sin:—But (on the contrary: *ἀλλά* opposes the whole question of ver. 2, in both its clauses) in them (the sacrifices: not in the fact of their being offered, but in the course of their being offered on the day of atonement, see below) there is a recollection ('recalling to mind; the usual meaning of *ἀνάμνησις*: better than "public mention," as vulg., "commemoratio," Calv., Bengel, al.: so also Schlichting, Grot., Jac. Cappel., al., thinking on the solemn confession of the sins of Israel made by the high priest, Levit. xvi. 20 f. But the other is simpler, and suits the context better. Where sins are continually called to mind, there clearly

ο κατ' ^ο ἐνιαυτόν, ⁴ ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα ^a ταύρων καὶ ^a τρά- z ch. vi 4 reff
a ch ix 13.
γων ^b ἀφαιρεῖν ^b ἁμαρτίας. ⁵ διὸ ^c εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν ^c κόσ- b Rom xi, 27,
from Isa.
xxvii 9 Sir
xlvii 11. (Jer
xi 15.)
μον λάγει ^d Θυσίαν καὶ ^e προσφορὰν οὐκ ^f ἠθέλησας, σῶμα c ch i 6 John i. 9. xii 46. 1 Tim i. 15.
xxi. 26 xlvii. 17. Eph. v. 2 only l.c. Sir. xiv. 11.
7. Ps. i. 16 (18). d Ps. xxxix. 6. e vv. 8, &c ch i 1, 3 Acts
f constr. Matt ix. 13 & xii. 7, from Hos vi.

at end ins γιγνεται D¹ (and lat) o vulg [F-lat arm (Tischdf)].

4. [transp ταυρ. and τραγ. N m basm arm-zoh.] αφελειν L 73. 106-8 B^r Chr-ms :
so N¹ (appy) but corrd eadem manu.

the conscience is not clear from them. Several passages occur in Philo closely resembling this: e. g. De Plant. Noë, 25, vol. i. p. 345, βωμοὶς γὰρ ἀπύροις περὶ οὓς ἀρεταὶ χορεύουσι γέγηθεν ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' οὐ πολλὰ πυρὶ φλέγουσιν, ὅπερ αἱ τῶν ἀνιέρων ἄθυτοι θυσίαι συνανέφλεξαν, ὑπομνήσκουσαι τὰς ἐκάστων ἀγνοίας τε καὶ διαμαρτίας. καὶ γὰρ εἰπέ που Μωσῆς (Num. v. 15, θυσία μνημοσύνου ἀναμνήσκουσα ἁμαρτίαν) θυσίαν ἀναμνήσκουσαν ἁμαρτίαν: De Victim. 7, vol. ii. p. 244, εὐθες γάρ, τὰς θυσίας μὴ λήθην ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν αὐτῶν κατασκευάζειν: and Vita Mos. iii. 10, p. 151, εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀγνώμων καὶ ἄδικος, ἄθυτοι θυσίαι, καὶ ἀνιέροι ἱεουργαί, καὶ εὐχαὶ παλίμφοι, παντελὴ φθορὰ ἐνδεχόμεναι. καὶ γὰρ ὅποτε γίνεσθαι δοκοῦσιν, οὐ λύσιν ἁμαρτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνησιν ἀργάζονται) of sins year by year: 4.] And

that on account of inherent defect in the sacrifices themselves: for it is impossible, that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin (the Writer by no means denies the typical virtue of the O. T. sacrifices, but asserts that which the schoolmen explained by saying that they wrought remission of sin not 'propria virtute,' but 'per accidens,' viz. by means of the grace of the true Propitiation which was to come, and of faith directed to it. And thus only is it said, Levit. xvii. 11, that the blood upon the altar makes an atonement for the soul: it was shed, as Ebrard well observes, not as the instrument of complete vicarious propitiation, but as an exhibition of the postulate of vicarious propitiation). 5—10.]

Christ's voluntary self-offering shewn to be the perfect fulfilment of the will of God.

5.] Wherefore (seeing that the animal sacrifices of the O. T. had no power to take away sin, and that for that end a nobler sacrifice was wanting) coming into the world he saith (first, on the citation from Ps. xl. That Psalm, which is inscribed "A Psalm of David," seems to be a general retrospect, in some time of trouble, of God's former mercies to him, and of his own course of loving obedience as distinguished from mere expression of outward thankful-

ness by sacrifice and offering. Thus understood, there will be no difficulty in the direct application of its words to Him, of whose sufferings and of whose obedience all human experiences in suffering and obeying are but a faint resemblance. I have entered on this subject in speaking of the Messianic citation in ch. ii., and need not lay down again the principles there contended for, further than to say, that the more any son of man approaches, in position, or office, or individual spiritual experience, the incarnate Son of God, the more directly may his holy breathings in the power of Christ's Spirit be taken as the utterances of Christ Himself. And of all men, the prophet-king of Israel thus resembled and out-shadowed Him the most. The Psalm itself seems to belong to the time of David's persecution by Saul; and the sentiment of this portion of it is, as Delitzsch observes, an echo of Samuel's saying to Saul in 1 Sam. xv. 22, "Hath the Lord as great delight in burnt-offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord?" Next, what is εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον? It expresses, I believe, the whole time during which the Lord, being ripened in human resolution, was in intent devoting himself to the doing of his Father's will: the time of which that youthful question "Wist ye not that I must be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου?" was one of the opening announcements. See also Isa. vii. 16. To refer these words thus to his maturing purpose, seems far better than to understand them as Erasmus, "veluti mundum ingressurus," from the O. T. point of time:—or as Grot., with whom are Bleek and De W., "cum e vita privata egrediens nomine Dei agere cœpit cum populo," for that would more naturally require εἰσελθών, besides being liable to the objection, that it is not of Christ's declaration before the world, but of his purpose as regards the Father, that our text treats:—or as Lünem., "in intent to enter into the world," by becoming man: or "nascendo," as Böhme, and similarly Hofmann: for thus it could hardly be said, σῶμα κατηρτίσω μοι, Sacrifice (of slain animals) and offering (of any kind: see reff.) thou

g = ch xi. 3. δὲ ὁ καταρτίσω μου ἡ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ ἰπερὶ ἁμαρτίας
 Rom. ix. 22. οὐκ κ ἡνδόκησας ὧ τότε εἶπον Ἰδοὺ ἦκω (ἐν ἰm κεφαλίδι
 (see Matt. iv. 21 ch xiii. 21) Ps. lxxii. 15. m βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ) ὡ τοῦ ὁ ποιῆσαι, ὁ θεός, τὸ
 b Mark xii 33 only. (pl. l. c. A. ὀλοκαύτωμα B N) Exod. x. 25. i = Rom viii. 3. and ellips., Num. viii. 8. Lev. v. 11 vii. 27 (37). k constr. = Matt. xii. 18. Gen. xxiii. 10. Job xiv 6 Lev xxvi 34, 41 al.
 l here only. Ebra vi 2. m Ezek ii. 9 iii. 1, 2, 3. n constr., Matt. xiii. 3. Acts xviii. 10. xxvi. 18. Gal. iii. 10 al Winer, edn 6, § 44. 4. o Matt. vii. 21. John vii 17. ver. 36 ch. xiii. 21 al.
 p voc., ch. i. 8 reff.

6. ολοκαύτωμα D. (ἡνδοκησας, so ACD¹[P] Frag-mosq m o[: also AD¹P m in ver 8].)

7. aft ἰδου ins εγω D¹[-gr] Syr: ego ecce D-lat. om ἡκω N¹(ius N-corr¹).
 [aft γεγρ. ins γαρ D¹.]

wouldest not (similar declarations are found frequently in the O. T., and mostly in the Prophets: see Ps. l. 7—15; li. 16 f.: Isa. i. 11: Jer. vi. 20; vii. 21—23: Hosea vi. 6: Amos v. 21 ff.: Micah vi. 6—8), but a body didst thou prepare for me (יִצְרֵה לִי בָּנִים, “mine ears hast thou opened,” “fodisti,” “concavas reddidisti,” i. e. to hear and obey Thee. The idea of there being any allusion to the custom of boring through the ear of a slave who voluntarily remained subject to his master, Exod. xxi 6 and Deut. xv. 17, seems to be a mistake. Neither the verb יִצְרֵה nor the plural substantive בָּנִים, will bear it without forcing: in Exod. i. c., the subst. is singular, and the verb is יִצְרֵה. See Bleek, vol. ii. p. 633, note. The difficulty is, how such a clause can be rendered by σώμα καταρτίσω μοι, as it is in the LXX. Some (e.g. Bleek, Lünem., after Usher de LXX Int. Vers. p. 85 sq., Semler, Michaelis, Ernesti, al.) have supposed a *misreading*, owing to the last letter of the foregoing word ἡβέλησα preceding ὅτι, the TI being mistaken for M. The reading ὅτι is now found only in one ms. of the LXX (Holmes, 39), ὅτι in two (Holmes, 142, 156): it is the rendering of Theodotion, of the Quinta and Sexta in Origen, of Jerome (‘‘aures autem perfecisti mihi’’), of Eusebius (comm. in loc. Bleek, ii. p. 631, note, τὰ δὲ μου καὶ τὴν ὑπακοὴν τῶν σῶν λογίων καταρτίσω), of the Psalterium San-Germanense (in Sabatier: ‘‘aures perfecisti mihi’’), and Irenæus (Interp. iv. 17. 1, p. 248), which two last Delitzsch suspects, but apparently without ground, of being corrections from the vulgate. Over against this hypothesis, of the present LXX text having sprung from a misreading, we may set the idea that the LXX have chosen *this expression* σώμα καταρτίσω μοι *by which to render the Hebrew*, as being more intelligible to the reader. This is the hypothesis adopted by Delitzsch, and that which was maintained with slight variation by Jac. Cappellus (‘‘quia rem, ut alias sæpe, spectarunt magis quam verba’’), Wolf (whose note gives all the literature of the passage at his own time. His view is that

the σώμα of our Lord was the μορφή δούλου, and thus answers to the ‘‘perfossio auris’’), Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, al. Others again suppose that the Writer of this Epistle has altered the expression to suit better the prophetic purpose. So an old Scholiast in the Lond. edn. of the LXX, 1653: τὸ ὅτι δὲ καταρτίσω μοι ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος εἰς τὸ σώμα μεταβαλὼν εἰρηκεν, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν τὸ Ἑβραϊκόν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον σκοπὸν τοῦτω χρησάμενος. I would leave the difficulty an unsolved one, not being satisfied by either of the above views, and having no other to propound. As Christian believers, our course is plain. How the word σώμα came into the LXX, we cannot say: but being there, it is now sanctioned for us by the citation here: not as the, or even a proper rendering of the Hebrew, but as a prophetic utterance, equivalent to and representing that other): 6.] whole burnt-offerings (δλοκαύτωμα, a subst. from the Alexandrine form ὀλοκαυτώω (-τέω. in Xenoph. Cyr. viii. 3. 11: Anab. vii. 8. 3 al.), is the ordinary LXX rendering for the Heb. הֵזֶן, an offering of a whole animal to be burnt on the altar. See Winer, Realw. art. Brandopfer) and (sacrifices) for sin (in the LXX also we have the same ellipsis: see reff.) thou didst not approve (it is probable that our Writer had εὐδοκήσας in his ms. of the LXX. He repeats it again below; and Cyr.-alex., even where he expressly cites the Psalm, has it. Possibly it may have come in here from the similarity to Ps. l. 16 (18), δλοκαυτώματα οὐκ εὐδοκήσεις: it is also possible, as Bl. suggests, that our Writer may have used the word, as a stronger one than ἦψας or ἐξήψας, with reference to that well known passage. The construction of εὐδοκέω with an accus. is not unfrequent in the LXX and Hellenistic Greek: see reff. εὐδοκεῖν τιμὴν or ἐν τιμῇ is more usual: Polyb. uses both): 7.] then I said (viz. when Thou hadst prepared a body for me), Behold, I am come, in the volume of the book it is written concerning me, to do, O God, thy will (the connexion and construction are some-

..θελήμα^ο σὸ θέλημά σου. ⁸ ἄνωτερον λέγων ὅτι θυσίας καὶ ^ε προσ-
 σὸν. φαρὰς καὶ ^η ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ ^ι περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ^ι ἠθέλη-
 AC DK L. σαs οὐδὲ ^κ ἐνδόκησας, ^ς αἵτινες ^τ κατὰ [τὸν] νόμον ^υ προσ-
 PN a b c φέρονται, ⁹ τότε εἶρηκεν Ἰδοὺ ἤκω ^η τοῦ ^ο ποιῆσαι τὸ ^ο θέ-
 d e f g h λημά σου. ^ν ἀναιρεῖ τὸ πρῶτον, ἵνα τὸ δεύτερον ^ω στήσῃ.
 k l m n ¹⁰ x ἐν ^φ θέληματι ^{xy} ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν διὰ τῆς ^z προσφορὰς
 o 17. 47

16. Luke xiii. 2. xxiii. 32. Acts ii. 23 al.) τοὺς μὲν ἀναιρεῖ τῶν νόμων, τοὺς δὲ καταλείπειν, Ἄσχ. in
 Ctes p 82 39 w = Rom iii 31. Gen vi. 18 xxvi. 3. 1 Macc x. 54. x Rom.
 xv. 16 John xvii. 17, 19. 1 Cor. i. 2. ver. 29 Isa. x. 17. y ch. ii. 11. z ver. 5 reff.

8. rec *θεσιν* κ. *προσφοραν*, with D³KL³ rel syr [æth Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damas]:
 txt ACD¹[P]N¹ 17 latt Syr coptt [arm] Cyr₁ [Orig-int.] *ἁμαρτιων* D. (A def.)
 om τον ACN m 17 [47 Euthal-ms] Chr Cyr₁ Thdrt: ins (*the usage of this*
Epistle) DKL[P] rel Damas [Thl Ec].

9. rec aft *ποιησαι* ins ο *θεος*, with L³ rel vulg Syr syr-w-ast [Chr, Euthal-ms Thdrt
 Damas]: aft το *θέλημα σου* b [arm Damas]: om ACDK[P]N¹ 17 [harl] coptt æth
 Chr, [Cyr₁].

10. Steph aft *εσμεν* ins οι (*mistake arising from the termn σμενοι of precedg word*),

what differently given from those in the LXX. There it stands, *τότε εἶπον Ἰδοὺ ἤκω, ἐν κεφαλίδι βιβλίου γέγραπται περὶ ἐμοῦ, τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὁ θεός μου, ἡβουλήθη, καὶ τὸν νόμον σου ἐν μέσῳ τῆς καρδίας μου*: where *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* depends on *ἡβουλήθη*. And so in the Hebrew: see E. V. As our text stands, *τοῦ ποιῆσαι* depends on *ἤκω*, and ἐν κεφ. τ. βιβ. γέγρ. περὶ ἐμοῦ is parenthetical: see ver. 9. *κεφαλῆς* is the LXX rendering of *ἡρῶ*, a roll, or volume, as also in reff. Suid., *κεφαλῆς βιβλίου, ὅπερ τινὲς ἐλημά φασι*. *κεφαλῆς* appears to have got this meaning from signifying the heads or knobs which terminated the cylinder on which the mss. were rolled, and which were called in Latin *umbilici*. On *ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου*, Thl. says, *θέλημα δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ πατρὸς τὸ τὸν υἱὸν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κόσμου τυθῆναι κ. δικαιωθῆναι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους οὐκ ἐν θυσίαις ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ*: and Chrys., *τοῦ ἐμαυτὸν φησιν ἐκδούναι, τοῦτο τοῦ θεοῦ θέλημα*).

8.] The Writer now proceeds to expound the prophecy; and in so doing, cites it again, but in a freer form, and one accommodated to the explanation which he gives. **Saying** (as he does) **above** (the present participle is used, not *εἰπών*, because it is not the temporal sequence of the sayings, so much as their logical coherence, that is in the Writer's thoughts. Similarly we say, "Holding as I do that, &c., I have ever maintained, &c." The speaker is our Lord: cf. above, ver. 5, *εἰσερχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον λέγει*), that (mere particle of recitation: cf. reff.) **sacrifices and offerings, and whole burnt-offerings, and sacrifices concerning sin** thou wouldst **not, nor yet didst approve** (observe that the two distinct clauses of the previous citation are now combined, for the sake of

throwing into contrast the rejection of legal sacrifices and the acceptable self-sacrifice of the Son of God), **of such sort as (αἵτινες does not, like the simple relative αὐ, identify, but classifies, the antecedent) are (habitually) offered according to (in pursuance of the commands of) the** (whether the article is or is not retained, the English rendering will be the same; the *νόμος* according to which they were offered being not any general one, but the particular ordinance of Moses. If we say "according to law," we mean the same, but transfer ourselves to the standing-point of a Jew, with whom 'the law' was 'law') **law**,—

9.] then (more logical than chronologically; but used probably in allusion to that *τότε* above, in the passage itself), **hath he said, Behold I am come to do thy will. He** (Christ again) **taketh away** (for *ἀναιρεῖν*, 'tollere,' see reff. and add Xen. Cyr. i. 1. 1, *δοαι μοναρχίαι δοαι τε ἀλγαρχίαι ἀνιρηται* ἤδη ὑπὸ δῆμων: Demosth. p. 246. 4, *τὰ τῶν προγόνων κατὰ κ. δίκαια ἀναιρεῖν*) **the first, that he may set up** (establish, see reff.) **the second** (*ποῖόν ἐστι τὸ πρῶτον*; αἱ θυσίαι. *ποῖόν τὸ δεύτερον*; τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός. Thl. It is a mistake to understand with Peirce, *θέλημα* after *πρῶτον* and *δεύτερον*: the contrast is between that which God wills not, and that which He wills. This is very plain both on other grounds, and on account of the *ἐν φ̄ θέληματι* in the next verse).

10.] **In** (the course of, the fulfilment of: not properly "by," which belongs more to the *διὰ* below) **which will** (viz. the will and purpose of God towards us by Christ: the will which He came to fulfil. There is no real difference, or alternative to be chosen, as Ebrard maintains, between the will of God to redeem us by the sufferings

a ch. vii 27 reff. τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ^a ἐφάπαξ. ¹¹ καὶ πᾶς μὲν ACD KL
 b 1. hron. ^b ἄρχιερεὺς ^b ἔστηκεν ^c καθ' ^c ἡμέραν ^d λειτουργῶν, καὶ τὰς FN a b c
 xxii 30 d e f g h
 Ps. cxxxiii 1. k l m n
 see Deut x 8. o 17. 47
 xvii 7 Judg. xx. 28 c ch. vii 27 reff. d Acts xiii. 2. Rom xv. 27 only. Num. xviii. 2.

with D³KL rel Damasc Thl Ec: om ACD¹[P]N^a k 17 [47 Euthal-ms Cyr₁] Chr₂ Thdr̄t. for *σωματος, αιματος* D¹(and lat). rec ins *του bef ιησου*: om ACID

KL[P]N^a rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr₁ Thdr̄t Damasc Ec].

11. rec (for *αρχ.*) *ιερευς*, with DKL^a rel copt Chr₂ [Euthal-ms] Thdr̄t(appy) Damasc; *sacerdos* latt(but in viii. 3, where *αρχ.* does not vary, D-lat has *sacerdos* though vulg reads *pontifex* there and in ix. 7; in ix. 7 D-lat has *summus sacerdos*): txt AC[P] a b¹ f g k m Syr syr-w-ast [basm arm] æth Cyr₁ [Thdr̄t-txt]. Λεϊτ.
 bef καθ' ημ. N¹. om 2nd και D¹(and lat).

and death of Christ, and the will of God as fulfilled by Christ's obedience: the one includes the other: the latter was the condition of the former. Justiniani inclines to understand ἐν τῷ θελήματι of the will of Christ, as expressed above: and so Calvin (quoting 1 Thess. iv. 3, "Hæc voluntas est Christi, sanctificatio vestra"), Schöttgen, and Carpzov. But clearly this cannot be so) **we have been sanctified** (see on the word ἀγιάζω, and on the use of the present and past passive participles of it, note on ch. ii. 11. Here the perfect part. is used, inasmuch as it is the finished work of Christ in its potentiality, not the process of it on us, which is spoken of: see ver. 14, τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διπλεκὲς τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους: which final completion is here indicated by the perfect part.) **through the offering of the body** (the reading αἷματος would, besides losing the reference to the σῶμα κατηρίσσω μοι, introduce an inaccuracy into the typology. It is by the Blood of Christ that we are reconciled to God, but by the offering of His Body that we are made holy. The one concerns our acceptance as acquitted from sin; the other our perfection in holiness by union with Him and participation in His Spirit. Thus we distinguish the two in the Communion Service: "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood") **of Jesus Christ, once for all** (it may seem doubtful to which ἐφάπαξ belongs, whether to τῆς προσφορᾶς, or to ἡγιασμένοι ἐσμέν. For the former, may be said, that the *once-for-all-ness* of the offering of Christ is often insisted on by our Writer, cf. ch. vii. 27; ix. 12, 26, 28; vv. 12, 14. Against it, that thus we should seem to require the article τῆς before ἐφάπαξ. But this last is not needed, and no argument can be founded on its absence. Rather should we argue from the context, and say that the assertion is not mainly of our being sanctified once for all, though that does come in in ver. 14 as a consequence of the μία προσφορά, but of our sanctification having taken place by means

of a final efficacious sacrifice, which does not, as those legal ones did, need repeating. I should therefore be disposed to join ἐφάπαξ with προσφορᾶς, with Syr., Ec., Thl. (διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος τοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς ἐφάπαξ γενομένης), Schlichting, Jac. Cappell., Limborch, Stein, al., and against Bleek, Lünem., Hofm., Delitzsch, and most of the best Commentators). 11—14.] See summary at ver. 1.

11.] And (καὶ introduces a new particular of contrast: 'and besides') **every high priest** (much has of late been said by Delitzsch against the reading ἀρχιερεὺς, as bringing in an inaccuracy which our Writer could not be guilty of, seeing that the *high* priests did not officiate in the daily sacrifice. But all such arguments are worthless against preponderating evidence, and rather tend the other way, viz. to shew how natural it was to alter ἀρχιερεὺς to ἱερεὺς, on account of this very difficulty. So that on the "procliviori præstat ardua" principle as well, we are bound I conceive to retain ἀρχιερεὺς. And with regard to the alleged inaccuracy, I really think that if closely viewed, it will prove rather to be a fine and deep touch of truth. The High-priesthood of our Lord is to be compared with that of the Jewish legal high priests. On the one side is Jesus, alone in the glory of his office and virtue of his sacrifice; on the other is the Jewish high-priesthood, not one man but many, by reason of death; represented in all its acts, personal or delegated, by its holder for the time, by πᾶς ἀρχιερεὺς, offering not one, but many sacrifices. This ἀρχιερεὺς is the representative of the whole priesthood. Whether he ministered in the daily service of the temple himself or not, it is he who embodies the acts and sufferings of Israel in his own person. How Delitzsch can say that such an idea is foreign alike to the Bible and the Jewish mind, I am at a loss to understand, considering the liberation at the death of the high priest, not to insist on the ceremonies themselves at the day of

αὐτὰς πολλάκις ^a προσφέρων θυσίας, ^s αἵτινες οὐδέποτε ^e Acts xxvii. 21, 40. 2 Cor. xii. 1 only = 1 Chion. xxi. 8. Zeph. iii. 15. περιελείν ἁμαρτίας. ¹² ^f οὗτος δὲ μίαν ^g ὑπὲρ ^g ἁμαρτιῶν ^a προσενέγκας θυσίαν ^h εἰς τὸ ^h διηνεκὲς ⁱ ἐκάθισεν ⁱ ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ, ¹³ ^k τὸ λοιπὸν ¹ ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως τεθῶ-
^h ἀνθρώπων τὰς πανουργίας ἀπάσας, Dem. p. 942. 29. ^f see ch. iii. 3. vi. 4.
^h ch. vii. 3 reff. ⁱ ch. i. 3 reff. ^k = Matt. xxvi. 45 ||. Heb., here only.
 only ‡. (ch. xi. 10 reff.) Polyb. iii. 45. 6 al.

12. rec αὐτος (see note), with D³KL rel Cyr-jer, Thdr̄t [Damasc] Thl (Ec: txt AC D)[P]Σ k 17 [47] Chr₂ [Euthal-ms] Cyr₁. ^εκ δεξιῶν A 31; ^εκ δεξιά (sic) N¹, ad dexteram harl.

atonement, when he was clearly the centre and representative of the priesthood, and indeed of all Israel. In treating of the Head of so compact a system as the Jewish priesthood it is clearly allowable, if any where, to bring in the principle, "qui facit per alterum, facit per se." See ch. vii. 27, where the very same καθ' ἡμέραν is predicated of the ἀρχιερεὺς standeth (see reff. No priest nor other person might sit in the inner court of the temple, except the king. There is perhaps more than a fortuitous contrast to ἐκάθισεν below. So Ec. and Thl., aft. Chrys.: ἅρα τὸ ἐστάναι σημεῖόν ἐστι τοῦ λειτουργεῖν, τὸ δὲ καθῆσθαι, ὥσπερ ὁ χριστὸς ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ πατρὸς, σημεῖόν ἐστι τοῦ λειτουργεῖσθαι ὅλα θεὸν ὄντα. The vulgar rendering, "præsto est," is clearly wrong) day by day ministering (see note, ch. viii. 2), and (καὶ brings out that in the λειτουργία, which the Writer wishes most to emphasize) often offering the same sacrifices, the which (i. e. of a sort which, such as) can never take away (lit. 'strip off' all round: so of a ring, Gen. xli. 42: Esth. iii. 10: Jos. Antt. xix. 2. 3: Ælian V. H. i. 21: Herod. iii. 41: of clothes from the body, Gen. xxxviii. 14: Deut. xxi. 13: Jonah iii. 6: 2 Macc. iv. 38. See reff.: and many more examples in Bleek. And such a word is peculiarly fitting to express the removal of that of which it is said, ch. v. 2, αὐτὸς περιλείπει ἁσθένειαν, and which is called, ch. xii. 1, ἡ εὐπερίστατος ἁμαρτία. The sacrifice might bring sense of partial forgiveness: but it could never denude the offerer of sinfulness—strip off and take away his guilt) sins:

12.] but He ('this (man),' or, (priest): but such rendering should be avoided if possible, as should all renderings which import a new generic idea into the text, as always causing confusion: cf. for a notable example, 1 Cor. ii. 11 and in E. V.) having offered one sacrifice for sins (on the punctuation, see below) for ever (εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς may be joined either with the preceding or with the following

words. If with the preceding, as Thl. (θυσίαν . . . εἰς τὸ δ. ἀκοῦσαν ἡμῖν, and so Ec.), Luther, Castellio, Beza b, Chr. F. Schmid, Bengel, Böhme, Stein, al., we observe the usage of the Epistle, which is to place εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς after that which it qualifies (reff.): we have μία θυσία εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς opposed to τὰς αὐτὰς θυσίας πολλάκις; and we keep the propriety of the sense, according to what follows, τὸ λοιπὸν ἐκδεχόμενος ἕως κ.τ.λ., and according to 1 Cor. xv. 28, where we are expressly told, that the session of our triumphant Saviour will have its end as such. If we join the words with the following, as Syr., D-lat., Faber Stap., Erasmus, Calvin, Schlichting, Grot., Wolf, al., Schulz, De Wette, Bleek, Lunem., Ebrard, Hofmann, Delitzsch, al., we more thoroughly satisfy the construction, in which εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς seems to refer better to an enduring state than to a past act, or at all events not to this last without a harsh ellipsis, "having offered one sacrifice (the virtue of which will endure) for ever:?" we preserve the contrast between ἔστηκεν καθ' ἡμέραν and εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἐκάθισεν: we preserve also the balance between the clauses ending προσφέρων θυσίας, and προσενέγκας θυσίαν: and we are in full accordance with the ἱερὸς εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα so often insisted on. And to this latter arrangement I incline, not however laying it down as certain. The objection taken above, as to the change in the nature of Christ's session at the end, when all things shall have been put under His feet, may be met by saying that such change, being obviously included in His ultimate state of reception into God's presence in heaven, does not here count as a change, where the question is of renewal of sacrifice, with regard to which that session is eternal) sat down on the right hand of God, 13.] henceforth waiting (this sense of ἐκδέχομαι is said to belong exclusively to later Greek: but not altogether accurately, cf. Soph. Phil. 123, κείνον ἐνθάδ' ἐκδέχου. It is, however, much more frequent in the later classics. We have ἐκδέχ. ἕως ἄν

m Ps. cx. 1. ¹σιν οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτοῦ ^m ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ. ¹⁴ ^{μῖα} ^{ACD¹KL}
 ch. i. 13 reff. ¹⁵ γὰρ ⁿ προσφορὰ ^o τετελειώκεν ⁿ εἰς τὸ ^h διηνεκὲς τοὺς ^p ἄγια- ^{PN a b c}
 n ver. 5 ¹⁶ μαρτυρεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ ⁱ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ^{d e f g h}
 o ch. ii. 10 reff. ¹⁷ μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι ¹⁶ ^t Αὕτη ἡ διαθήκη ἦν ^u διαθήσο- ^{k l m n}
 p ver. 10. ¹⁸ ^v πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετὰ τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκεῖνας, λέγει κύριος, ^{o 17. 47}
 q ch. vii. 8 reff. ¹⁹ διδοὺς νόμους μου ἐπὶ καρδίας αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ^w διά-
 r ch. iii. 7 reff. ²⁰ νοιαν αὐτῶν ^w ἐπιγράφω αὐτούς. ¹⁷ καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν
 s ver. 26. ²¹ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ^x ἀνομιῶν αὐτῶν οὐ μὴ μνησθήσομαι ἔτι.
 Matt. xxvi. ²² ^{||} Mk. ²³ ^{||} Luke xii. 5. ²⁴ ^{||} Acts xix. 21
 Luke xii. 5. ²⁵ ^{||} Acts xiv. 8 al
 Acts xix. 21 ²⁶ ^{||} Acts vii. 12 (from l. c.) only
 t ch. vii. 10
 JER. xxxviii.
 (xxxix.) 33, 34
 u ch. vii. 10
 v = Acts vii
 25. Exod. xxiv. 8 al
 vii. 12 (from l. c.) only
 w ch. viii. 10 (reff.).
 x plur., Rom. iv. 7 (from Ps. xxxi. 1). ch

15. for γὰρ, δε D¹. rec προεῖρηκεναι, with KL rel [arm] Thdrt Damasc [Cec]:
 txt ACD[P]N c 17 [47 syrr coptt æth Euthal-ms] Chr Thl, dixit latt.

16. aft αυτη ins δε D¹ vulg Ambr¹. rec (for την διανοιαν) των διανοιων, with
 D² ³KL rel vulg-ed (with demid) syrr coptt [arm] Chr Thdrt [Damasc]: txt ACD¹[P]N
 17 [47] am (with fuld harl¹ tol F-lat) [æth].

17. om 1st αυτων D¹ 17 latt Ambr¹. rec μνησθω (corrⁿ to LXX and ch viii. 12,
 where μνησθω occurs with hardly any var: 17 alone has -θησομαι), with D³KL[P]N³
 rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc]: txt ACD¹N¹ 17 [Euthal-ms].

in Dion. Hal. vi. 67) until his enemies be placed as footstool of his feet (the *ἕως* construction is adopted for the sake of preserving the words of Ps. cx. 1. I cannot see how Bleek and Lunem. can find any real discrepancy between this passage and 1 Cor. xv. 23—26. If this seems to date the subjection of all to Christ *before* the second advent, and that places it *after* the same event, we may well say, that the second advent is not here taken into account by the Writer, whose object is the contrast between the suffering and triumphant Christ, as it is by St. Paul, who is specially giving an account of the resurrection which is so inseparably bound up with that *παρουσία*. The second advent is no break in Christ's waiting till his enemies be subdued to him, but it is the last step but one of that subjection; the last of all being the subjection of Himself, and his mystical body with him, to Him that did put all things under him. For among the enemies are His own elect, who *were* enemies: and they are not thoroughly subject to Him, till He with them is subject to the Father, the mediatorial veil being withdrawn, and the One God being all in all). 14.] And He need not renew his sacrifice: For by one offering (we might read also *μία γὰρ προσφορά*, nominative: and Bengel prefers this, from the fact that in ver. 11 the sacrifices are the subject, *ἀλλ' ἵνα οὐδέποτε δύναται κ.τ.λ.* But here more probably Christ is the subject throughout, and therefore the dative is better: there being no relative to connect with *θυσίαν*, as there) He hath perfected for ever them who are being sanctified ("The Writer says not τοὺς τελεωμένους, but τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους.

Sanctification, i.e. the imputed and implanted purification from sins (for both these are alike contained in the idea), is the way whereby the objective perfection already provided in the self-sacrifice of Christ gradually renders itself subjective in men." Delitzsch). 15—18.] See summary at ver. 1. The prophetic word testifies the same, making absolute and final forgiveness of sins a characteristic of the new covenant. 15.] Moreover the Holy Spirit also testifies to us (Christians in general: and ἡμῖν is the dat. commodi, *μαρτυρεῖ* being used absolutely—testifies the fact which I am maintaining. Raphael, Wolf, al. regard ἡμῖν as signifying merely the Writer, and take the dat. as in Polyb. xviii. 11. 8, *μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις . . . τὸ τέλος τοῦ πολέμου*: but the other is far better): for after having said (then the citation proceeds much as in ch. viii. 10 ff. with some differences, noticed below. On the common points, see notes there). 16.] This is the covenant which I will make with them (in ch. viii. 10, *τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ*. Here the prophecy is taken out of its national limits and universalized) after those days, saith the Lord: giving my laws into their hearts (ch. viii. 10, *εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν*), and on their mind (ἐπὶ καρδίας, ch. viii. 10) will I inscribe them:— 17.] Now comes the apodosis of the *μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰρηκέναι*, then, —καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεὸν κ.τ.λ., and καὶ οὐ μὴ διδάξωσιν κ.τ.λ., ch. viii. 10, 11, being omitted (see below), he further says: and their sins and their transgressions will I remember no more (it has been generally held since Beza and Camerarius, that the apodosis is introduced by λέγει κύριος, all that follows belonging to it.

18 ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκ ἔτι ^aπροσφορά ^bπερὶ ^cἁμαρτίας.

19 ἔχοντες οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ^cπαρῆρσιν εἰς τὴν ^dεἰσοδὸν

d = 2 Pet. i. 11 only. (Acts xiii. 24 reff.)

18. om τούτων **N**¹ [arm(Tischdf)].

The reason for this, alleged by the later Commentators, is, the harshness of understanding ὅστερον λέγει, or the like, inserted in some unimportant mss. at the beginning of ver. 17, as inconsistent with the concinnity of our Writer's style. But as against this objection, may fairly be alleged the still greater harshness of breaking διαθήσασθαι from its qualifying διδοῦς, and the improbability that the words λέγει κύριος, which occur in the passage cited, should be taken by the Writer as his own. But still more cogent reasons for making the apodosis begin at ver. 17 are, 1. that there the εἰρημένον ends, not at λέγει κύριος: there a hiatus in the citation occurs, and the Writer first passes on to that which is said after: 2. that ver. 17 itself carries the whole burden of the citation with it. This is the object of the citation, to prove that there needs no more sacrifice for sins. And the previous portion of it is added to shew that this, τῶν ἁμαρτ. αὐτ. κ. τῶν ἁνομ. αὐτ. οὐ μὴ μνησθήσασθαι ἔτι, does form an integral part of the prophecy of the introduction of the new and spiritual covenant. So that both construction and sense are troubled by the modern idea of breaking at λέγει κύριος. With regard to any supposed harshness in the ellipsis at ver. 17, I may remark that our Writer frequently uses καί in a kindred sense, as adding new quotations: see ch. i. 5; ii. 13 bis; iv. 5; ver. 30. The break at ver. 17 is adopted by several cursive mss. (see Scholz), by Primasius, Clarius, Zeger, Schlichting, Estius, Jac. Cappellus, Grotius, Limborch, Carpzov, Heinrichs, Stuart, al.: the other, at λέγει κύριος, by Beza, Camer., al., and almost all the recent Commentators). 18.] But (or, 'now': it is the 'but' of the demonstration, referring to a well-known axiomatic fact as contrasting with the contrary hypothesis) where there is remission of these, there is no longer offering concerning sin.

"Here ends the finale (x. 1—18) of the great tripartite arrangement (vii. 1—25; vii. 26—ix. 12; ix. 13—x. 18) of the middle portion of the Epistle. 'Christ a High Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedek,' this was its great theme, now brought to a conclusion. That the Priesthood of Christ, as Melchisedekite, is as high above the Levitical as God's heaven is above the

earth,—that Christ, with His One High-priestly self-sacrifice, has accomplished that which the Levitical priesthood with its sacrifices was unable to accomplish,—that henceforth, both our present possession of salvation, and our future completion of salvation, are as certain to us as that He is with God, ruling as a priest and reigning as a king, once more to appear, no more as a bearer of our sins, but in glory as a Judge;—these are the three great fundamental thoughts, now brought to their full development. What it is, to be a High Priest after the order of Melchisedek and not of Aaron, is set forth, ch. vii. 1—25. That Christ however as High Priest is Aaron's antitype, ruling in the true holy place by virtue of His self-sacrifice here on earth,—and Mediator of a better covenant, whose essential character the old covenant only shadowed forth and typified, we learn, vii. 26—ix. 12. And that the self-sacrifice of Christ, offered through the eternal Spirit, is of everlasting power, as contrasted with the unavailing cycle of legal offerings, is established in the third part, ix. 13—x. 18: the second half of this portion, x. 1—18, being devoted to a reiterated and conclusive treatment of the main position of the whole,—the High-priesthood of Christ, grounded on His offering of Himself,—its Kingly character, its eternal accomplishment of its end, confirmed by Ps. xl., Ps. cx., Jer. xxxi." Delitzsch.

19—XIII. 25.] THE THIRD GREAT DIVISION OF THE EPISTLE: OUR DUTY IN THE INTERVAL OF WAITING BETWEEN THE BEGINNING AND ACCOMPLISHMENT OF OUR SALVATION. And herein, x. 19—39, exhortation to enter boldly into the holiest place, 19—22: to hold fast our profession, 23: to stir up one another, 24, 25: in consideration of the fearful punishment which awaits the rejecters of Christ, 26—31: and in remembrance of the previous sufferings which they underwent when first converted, 32—34. Finally, exhortation not to cast away confidence, for the time until His coming is short, and during that time, faith is the life of the soul.

There has been no exhortation, properly speaking, since ch. vii. 1, i. e. during the great doctrinal argument of the Epistle. Before that, argument and exhortation were rapidly alternated. But so

e = ch. viii. 2. ^c τῶν ἁγίων 'ἐν τῷ αἵματι Ἰησοῦ, ²⁰ ἣν ^ε ἐνεκαίνισεν ἡμῖν ACD KL
^{gen}, ch. ix. P R a b c
⁸. d e f g h
^f = Eph. iii. 12. ὁδὸν ^h πρόσφατον καὶ ⁱ ζῶσαν, διὰ τοῦ ^k καταπετάσματος, k l m n
^g ch. ix. 18. o 17. 47
^(reiff.) only. h (see note.) here only. (-τως, Acts xviii. 2.) Deut. xxxii. 17. Sir. ix. 10.
ⁱ = 1 Pet. i. 3 reff. k ch. vi. 19 reff.

20. om και D¹.

exquisite is the skill of arrangement and development, that the very exhortation with which he closed the former portion of the Epistle where first he began to prepare the way for his great argument, ch. iv. 14—16, is now resumed, deepened indeed and expanded by the intervening demonstration, but in spirit and substance the same: *προσερχόμεθα μετ' ἀληθινῆς καρδίας ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πίστεως* here, answering to *προσερχόμεθα μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος* there, and *κατέχουμεν τὴν ὁμολογίαν* here to *κρατῶμεν τῆς ὁμολογίας* there.

19.] **HAVING** (*ἐχόντες*) is placed first as carrying the emphasis: 'possessing, as we do . . .') therefore (as above proved: *οὐδὲν* collects and infers), **BRETHREN** (see on ch. iii. 1), **CONFIDENCE** (see on ch. iii. 6. *παρρησία* here as well as there is not justification, right (*ἐξουσίαν* Hesych.) to enter, but purely subjective, *confidence*, boldness) **AS REGARDS THE** (our, see below) **ENTERING INTO THE HOLY PLACES** (for construction, see reff. καὶ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ ἀπέθυσαν ἡμῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, παρρησίαν ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸ εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς τὰ ἅγια, τούτεστιν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Thl. *ἡ εἰσόδος* is our entering, not *Christ's* entering, as Heinrichs and Dindorf: see ch. iv. 16, *προσερχόμεθα μετὰ παρρησίας τῷ θρόνῳ τῆς χάριτος*) in the blood of Jesus (the *ἐν* introduces that wherein the confidence is grounded: cf. reff., *ἐν ᾧ ἔχομεν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ [τὴν] προσαγωγὴν*. He having once entered in with His blood as our High Priest, and thereby all atonement and propitiation having been for ever accomplished, it is in that blood that our boldness to enter in is grounded. To understand *ἐν*, with Bleek and Stier, as in ch. ix. 25, *εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὰ ἅγια . . . ἐν αἵματι ἀλλοτρίῳ*, is in fact to make us, as priests, renew Christ's offering of Himself. "We enter," says Stier, "with the blood of Jesus, even with the same, wherewith He entered before us:" which is very like a contradiction in terms, and is at all events inaccurate theology. We do not take the blood of Christ with us into the presence of God: it is there already once for all, and our confidence of access is therein grounded, that it is there. See note on ch. xii. 24),

20.] **WHICH** (entrance: so Ec. (below), Thl. (below), and most Commentators. Some, as Est., Erasm., Calv., Beza,

refer the relative to *αἵματι*, making it attracted into the fem. by *ὁδόν*. Some again, as Seb. Schmidt, Hammond, al., and D-lat., refer it to *παρρησίαν*. The vulg., "quam initiavit nobis viam novam," will bear either) He initiated (first opened: better than E. V., "consecrated," which seems as if it existed before: so Ec., *ἣν εἰσόδον τῶν ἁγίων νῦν νεωστὶ ἔτεμε*: and Thl., *ἦντινα εἰσόδον τῶν ἁγίων αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ὁδὸν ἐνεκαίνισε, τούτεστι νέαν ὁδὸν ἐποίησεν, αὐτὸς ταύτης ἀρξάμενος, καὶ αὐτὸς ταύτην βαδίσας πρῶτος*. On the word, see note, ch. ix. 18) **FOR US** (as) **A WAY** (*ὁδόν* is predicative, 'to be a way') recent (*ὡς τότε πρῶτον φανεῖσαν*, Thdrt.: cf. Rom. xvi. 25, 26, *μυστηρίου χρόνους αἰώνιους σεσιγημένον, φανερωθέντος δὲ νῦν κ.τ.λ.*), and ch. ix. 26. "On the use of *πρόσφατος*, see esp. Wetst. h.l. and Lobeck on Phryn. p. 374 f. The original meaning is 'slain before,' from *πρό* and *σφάω* or *σφάττω*; and thus, *just before, recently, slain or killed*: so Il. ω. 757. According to usage, it means 'fresh,' *recens*, in contrast to *παλαιός*, old or antiquated: and is used not only of recently slain meat (*Hippocr.*), or a fresh corpse, *νεκρὸς πρόσφατος* (Herod. ii. 89, 121), but also *ιχθύς, αἷμα, πόμα, σταφυλή* (Dioscorid. v. 12: Num. vi. 8), *ἄλφιτον, φύκος, ἄνθος, ἔλαιον, ἔλκος, χιών* (Polyb. iii. 55. 1), *μάρτυρες* (Aristot. Rhet. i. 15), *νίκη* (Plutarch), *ἀτύχημα* (Polyb. i. 21. 9), *εὐεργεσία* (id. ii. 46. 1), *δικαί* (Æschyl. Choeph. 800), *ὀργή* (Lys. p. 151. 5: Jos. Antt. i. 18. 3), *φθόνος* (Plut. Themistocl. p. 124 a), Demosth. p. 551. 15, *ἐκαστος, ὃν τι συμβῇ, πρόσφατος κρίνεται* (see also reff.): and Eccles. i. 9, *ὅτι ἐστὶ πᾶν πρόσφατον ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον*." Bleek. Others, as Passow, derive the word from *πρό*, and *φένω*. But *πρόσφατος* has not, as Ebrard would make it, the meaning of "ever fresh:" only that of *new*, 'of late origin.' "None before Him trod this way: no believer under the O. T. dared or could, though under a dispensation of preparatory grace, approach God so freely and openly, so fearlessly and joyfully, so closely and intimately, as we now, who come to the Father by the blood of Jesus, His Son." Stier) **AND LIVING** (as contrasted with the mere dead ceremony of entrance into the earthly holy place. This entrance is a real, living

¹ τούτέστιν τῆς σαρκος αὐτοῦ, ²¹ καὶ ἱερέα ^m μέγαν ⁿ ἐπὶ τοῦ ¹ οἴκον τοῦ θεοῦ, ²² ^p προσερχώμεθα ^p μετὰ ^q ἀληθινῆς καρ- ¹ ch. vii. 5 reff
^o = 1 Tim. iii. 15. 1 Pet. iv. 17. see 1 Pet. ii. 5. ^m ch. iv. 14
^{reft.}
ⁿ see ch. iii. 6. ^{reft.}
^p ch. iv. 16. ^q = John
^{21, 23.}
^{iv. 37. xix. 35 ul.} Job ii. 3.

ins δια bef της D¹.

22. προσερχώμεθα D[-gr] KL[P] c d g h k o: txt ACX latt [Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc. μετ (for μετὰ) C Damasc.]

and working entrance; the animated substance of what is imported, not the dead shadow. And so Lünemann and Delitzsch: and very nearly, Ebrard and Stier. Most Commentators make ζῶσαν = ζωοποιούσαν, producing, or leading to life: so Faber Stap., Schlichting, Grot., Peirce, Wetst., Böhme, Kuinoel, De Wette, Olshausen. Others, as Bl., interpret it, “everlasting:” and so Chrys., οὐκ εἶπε ζωῆς, ἀλλὰ ζῶσαν αὐτὴν ἐκάλεσε, τὴν μένουσαν οὕτω δηλῶν: (Ec., εἰς ζωὴν ὄντως φέρει, ὅτι καὶ αὕτη ζῇ καὶ διακονίζει. πρόσφατον εἰπὼν, ἵνα μὴ τις εἴπῃ οὐκοῦν εἰ πρόσφατος, καὶ παυθήσεται γηράσκουσα γὰρ καὶ παλαιουμένη καὶ αὕτη, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης καταλυθήσεται οὐ μὲν οὖν, φησίν, ἀλλὰ πρόσφατος οὕσα ἀεὶ νεάζουσα καὶ ζῶσα ἔσται, οὐδέποτε ἐπιδεχομένη θάνατον καὶ κατάλυσιν) through (διά here in its primary local meaning, ‘through,’ not in its derived instrumental one. But no οὕσαν or ἔχουσαν need be supplied, as Bleek: διά follows directly upon ἐνεκαλίσιν) the veil, that is, his flesh (on καταπέτασμα, see *note, ch. vi. 19. The Flesh of Christ is here spoken of as the veil hung before the holiest place; that weak human mortal flesh was the state through which He had to pass before He could enter the holiest in heaven for us, and when He put off that flesh, the actual veil in the temple was rent from top to bottom, Matt. xxvii. 51. And so in the main, the great body of interpreters: the Greek Commentators however, not quite accurately: e. g. Chrys., ἡ γὰρ σὰρξ αὕτη ἔτεμε πρώτη τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῷ ἐκείνῃ, ἣν καὶ ἐγκαινίσαι λέγει, τῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἀξιώσαι διὰ ταύτης βαδίσαι· καταπέτασμα δὲ εἰκότως ἐκάλεσε τὴν σάρκα· ὅτε γὰρ ᾤρεθῃ εἰς ὕψος, τότε ἐφάνη τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. And similarly Thl. and Ec., the latter however giving an alternative, καὶ ὅτι ἐκρυπτεν ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὴν θεότητα· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον καταπέτασματος. Thdrt. understands it of the body of the Lord partaken in the Holy Communion: no less strangely than erroneously: for it is not the Body, but the Flesh of Christ which is the veil: and what our Writer means by that expression is evident from ch. v. 7, where ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις

τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ points to the time of His suffering Humanity),— 21.] and (‘having:’ τὸ ἔχοντες ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, Ec.) a great Priest (i. e. a great High Priest; but here his Priesthood, not his High-priesthood, is more brought into prominence. Do not suppose that μέγας ἱερεὺς imports ‘High Priest,’ as δ ἱερεὺς δ μέγας in the LXX and Philo: our Writer always uses ἀρχιερεὺς for it, and in ch. iv. 14, calls our Lord ἀρχιερέα μέγαν. He is ἱερεὺς μέγας, because He is a Priest on his throne, a “sacerdos regius et rex sacerdotalis,” as Delitzsch quotes from Seb. Schmidt) over the house of God (this substitution of the preposition of motion for that of rest, is indicative of a later phase of a language, and requires the supplying of τεταγμένον, or some similar word, to make it good Greek: so Ξενοκλέα ἔταξεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἱππεῖς, Xen. Cyr. iv. 5. 19. The οἶκος θεοῦ here need not be more limited in meaning than in the similar passage ch. iii. 2: οἶκον δὲ θεοῦ τοὺς πιστοὺς προσηγόρευσεν, Thdrt., Ec., Estius, al. But it is alleged that the expression here must mean the heaven: Thl. having mentioned the other, says, ἡ, ὅπερ οἶμα μᾶλλον, τὸν οὐρανόν· ἐκείνον γὰρ καὶ ἁγία καλεῖ, καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ λειτουργεῖν τὸν ἱερέα λέγει, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐντυγχάνοντα: and so many Commentators. But Delitzsch well observes that the one meaning, the narrower, need not exclude the other, the wider. It is hardly probable, to begin with, that our Writer should in two places describe Christ as set ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ, in meanings entirely different from each other. Clearly, the heavenly sanctuary is regarded by him as also including the earthly, the Church above as the home of the Church below: see ch. xii. 22 ff.), 22.] let us approach (προσερχέσθαι, see reft., = ἐγγιζέιν τῷ θεῷ ch. vii. 19, and is a word belonging to worship. So that the participial clauses which follow are best regarded as both belonging to προσερχώμεθα, since they also describe requisite preparations for worship: see this further treated below, on ver. 23) with a true heart (χωρὶς ὑποκρίσεως, Chrys. So Hezekiah pleads, Isa. xxxviii. 3, ἐπορεύθην ἐνώπιόν σου μετὰ ἀληθείας ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀληθινῇ) in full assurance

τ ch. vi. 11. *διὰς ἐν ᾧ πληροφορία πίστεως ὁ βεραντισμένοι τὰς καρδίας*
 Col. u. 2. *ἀπὸ ὧν συνειδήσεως πονηρᾶς καὶ ἡλεουμένοι τὸ σῶμα*
 1 Thessa. i. 5 only.
 s ch. ix. 13 reff.
 t = Acts xvi. 33. Sir xxxi. (xxxiv.) 25. u so, but w. ἀγαθ., Acts xxiii. 1. 1 Tim i. 5, 19. 1 Pet iii. 16.
 21. see ch ix. 9 reff. v John xiii. 10. Acts ix. 37. xvi 33. 2 Pet ii. 22. Rev. i. 5 only. Levitic. xvi. 4.

rec *εβραντισμενοι*, with D³KLN³ rel: *εβαντ.* [m] 17: txt ACD1[P]N¹. *λελουσ-*
μενοι D¹[P]N³ 39. 46. 73.

(*πληροφορία*, subjective, as in ch. vi. 11: see note there) of faith (with no doubt as to the certainty of our access to God by the blood of Jesus), **having our hearts sprinkled from** (pregnant construction for 'sprinkled, and by that sprinkling cleansed from') **an evil conscience** (a conscience polluted with the guilt of sin: for "if a man's practice be bad, his conscience, in so far as it is the consciousness of that practice, is *πονηρά*:" see Delitzsch, *Biblische Psychologie*, p. 163) and **having our body washed with pure water** (both these clauses refer to the legal purifications of the Levitical priests, which took place by means of blood and water. At their first dedication, Aaron and his sons were sprinkled with blood, their bodies and their clothes, Exod. xxix. 21: Levit. viii. 30. And so are we to be as God's priests, having access to Him, sprinkled with blood, not outwardly with that of the ram of consecration, but inwardly with that of the Lamb of God: the first could only produce *καθαρότητα τῆς σαρκός* (ch. ix. 13), but the second, pureness of heart and conscience in God's sight. The washing with water also (Exod. xxix. 4) was to be part of the cleansing of Aaron and his sons: not only so, but as often as they entered the holy place or approached the altar, they were to wash their hands and feet in the brazen laver, Exod. xxx. 20; xl. 30—32: and the high priest, on the day of atonement, *λούσεται ὕδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ*, Levit. xvi. 4. There can be no reasonable doubt that this clause refers directly to Christian baptism. The *λουτρὸν τοῦ ὕδατος* of Eph. v. 26, and the *λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας*, Titus iii. 5, are analogous expressions: and the express mention of *σῶμα* here, as distinguished from *καρδίας* before, stamps this interpretation with certainty. This distinction makes it impossible, with Calvin, Limborch, Owen, Bengel, Ebrard, and the old Socinians, Schlichting, al., to spiritualize away the meaning into "Christi spiritus et doctrina, seu spiritualis illa aqua, qua suos perfundit Christus, ipsis etiam sanguine non excluso" (Schlichting); for *σῶμα* confines the reference to an outward act. And so Thl. (*τῷ τοῦ βαπτίσματος* *τοῦ σώματος ἕνεκα παραλαμβάνεται*

τὸ ὕδωρ διττῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἡμῶν, διττῇ καὶ ἡ καθαρισι), Thdrt., Ec., al. Böhme, Kuin., Thol., De W., Bleek, Lünem., Delitzsch, and the majority of Commentators. Still in maintaining the externality of the words, as referring, and referring solely, to Baptism, we must remember, that Baptism itself is not a mere external rite, but at every mention of it carries the thought further, viz. to that spiritual washing of which it is itself symbolical and sacramental. Notice here that the word is *τὸ σῶμα*, and not *τὴν σάρκα*, as ch. ix. 13: our whole natural life, and not the mere outside surface: that in which our soul dwells and works, the seat of the emotions and desires: this also must be purified in those who would approach God in Christ. So that I would understand with Delitzsch (whose note here by all means see), that the *sprinkling the heart from an evil conscience* is, so to speak, intra-sacramental, a spiritual application of the purifying Blood, beyond sacramental rites, and the *washing the body with pure water* is purely sacramental, the effect of baptism taken in its whole blessed meaning and fulfilment as regards our natural existence. The end of his note is very beautiful: "As priests we are sprinkled, as priests we are bathed: sprinkled so that our hearts are freed from an evil conscience, and thus from self-condemnation, sprinkled with Christ's Blood, to be sprinkled with which and to be certain of and joyful in justification before God is one and the same thing,—washed in Holy Baptism, whose pure water penetrates with its saving power not only into the depths of our self-conscious life, but also into the very foundation of our corporeity, and thus sanctifies us not only in the flesh, but in the body and in the spirit: so bringing us, in our whole personal existence, through the Blood speaking in the Sanctuary, through the Water welling forth out of the Sanctuary, into so real a connexion, so close an union with the Sanctuary itself, that we are at all times privileged to enter into the Sanctuary, and to use, in faith, the new and living way." On the further details of the passage see Hofmann, *Weissagung u. Erfüllung*, ii. 234: *Schriftbeweis*, ii. 2. 161. The perfect participles shew that a

.. παρ-
οξύμω-
να C.
ADKLP
N a b c d
e f g h k
l m n o
17. 47

^w ὕδατι ^w καθαρώ· ²³ ^x κατέχωμεν τὴν ^y ὁμολογίαν τῆς ^z ἐλ-
πίδος ^a ἀκλινῇ, ^b πιστὸς γὰρ ὁ ^c ἐπαγγειλάμενος· ²⁴ καὶ
^d κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους εἰς ^e παροξυσμὸν ἀγάπης καὶ
^f καλῶν ^f ἔργων, ²⁵ μὴ ^g ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ^h ἐπισυναγω-
ν Num. v. 17. Ezek xxxvi. 25. x ch. iii. 6 reff y = ch. iii. 1 reff. z = ch. iii. 6 reff. a here only + Job xli 14 b so 1 Cor i. 9. x. 1 Thess. v. 24 2 Thess. iii. 3 al. c see note Tit i. 2. James i. 12 ii 5. 1 John ii 25. f Matt v 16 xxi 10 John x. 32, 33 1 Tim. iii. 1 al. Tit ii 7 al. 1 Pet. ii 12 only g Matt xxii 46 || Mk. from Ps. xxi 1. 2 Cor iv 9 2 Tim. iv. 10, 16 ch. xiii. 5. Wisd. x. 13. h 2 Thess. ii 1 only + 2 Macc. u. 7 only. (see note)

23. της ελπ. bef την ομολ. D vulg [aft ακλινη 47]. aft ελπ. ins ημων N¹(N³ dis-
approving) [vulg F-lat Syr æth].

25. εγκαταλιποντες N c l Chr-3-mss, -λειποντες [D³] ο: καταλιπ. D¹.

state is spoken of introduced by one act the effect of which is abiding): 23.]

(First we must treat of the punctuation and connexion. I have stated above the ground for attaching καὶ λελουμένοι κ.τ.λ. to the foregoing, with Syr., Primas., Faber Stap., Luther, E. V., Estius, Seb. Schmidt, Cramer, Michaelis (paraphr.), Wolf, Baumgarten, Storr, Kuin., De Wette, Bleek, Delitzsch,—not to κατέχωμεν with Erasm., Beza, Erasm. Schmid, Bengel, Peirce (and Michaelis as Peirce), Griesb., Knapp, Heinrichs, Schulz, Böhme, Lachmann, Tholuck, Tischdf. (edn. 2), Ebrard, Lünemann. Besides, 1. the ground there alleged, it may be further urged, 2. that the λελουμένοι has no imaginable connexion with κατέχωμεν κ.τ.λ., whereas it continues to describe the condition in which we are to approach God: and, 3. that by joining this participial clause with what follows, the rhythm of the sentence (agst. Lünem.) is entirely broken up. Then, thus much being determined, our next question is, what stop to set after καθαρώ. Bleek prefers a period, Delitzsch a comma only. I believe a colon, as after ἐπαγγειλάμενος, would best give the form of the sentence, in which the three verbs, προσερχόμεθα . . . κατέχωμεν . . . καὶ κατανοῶμεν, are correlative) let us hold fast (= κρατῶμεν, ch. iv. 14: let us hold with full and conscious possession: see ch. iii. 6, 14) the confession (see on ch. iv. 14: subjective, but in a pregnant sense,—that which we confess, held in our confession of it) of our hope (see ch. iii. 6: and bear in mind that ἐλπίς is used also for the object of hope subjectivized: our hope (subj.), as including that on which it is fixed) so that it may be without wavering ("Valcknaer compares ἔχειν ἀκλινῇ τὸν λογισμόν, 4 Macc. vi. 7." Del. The adjective predicates that which the confession becomes by being held fast: = βεβαίαν, ch. iii. 14. The word itself is late Greek, found in Ælian, V. H. xii. 64: Lucian, Encom. Demosth. 33: Philo, al): for He is faithful that promised (viz. God, see reff.: and ch. vi.

13: xi. 11; xii. 26, as referring to Him the title ὁ ἐπαγγειλάμενος. Thl. interprets it, ὁ χριστὸς ὁ εἰπών, ὅτι "Ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγώ, καὶ ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔσται, and similarly (Ec., al., but not so accurately):

24.] and ("How beautifully does this chain of exhortations of our Writer fall into a triple division, according to St. Paul's trias of the Christian life, 1 Cor. xiii. 13: 1 Thess. i. 3; v. 8: Col. i. 4 f. Next to an exhortation to approach God in full assurance of faith, follows one to hold fast the confession of hope, and now comes one to emulate one another in love." Delitzsch. On the connexion, see above: we are still dependent on ἔχοντες οὖν above) let us consider one another (all of us have all in continual remembrance, bearing one another's characters and wants and weaknesses in mind. This is far better than the merely one-sided explanation given by Chrys., Thl. (τοντ-έστιν, ἐπισκοποῦμεν εἰ τις ἐνάντιος, ἵνα τοῦτον μιμώμεθα οὐχ ἵνα φθονῶμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα παροξυνώμεθα μάλλον εἰς τὸ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκείνῳ καλὰ ἔργα ποιεῖν), Thdrt., Primas., Michaelis, Bleek (who endeavours to unite both views): κατανοεῖν has already been noticed, ch. iii. 1) with a view to provocation (usually we have παροξυσμός in a bad sense, as our word provocation: so in reff. The verb is sometimes used in the classics in a good sense: e. g. Xen. Mem. iii. 3. 13, φιλοτιμία, ἥπερ μάλιστα παροξύνει πρὸς τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἔντιμα: Æcon. 13. 9, αἱ φιλότιμοι τῶν φύσεων καὶ τῷ ἐπαίνῳ παροξύνονται: Thuc. vi. 88, παρελθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἀλκιβιάδης παρῶν τε τοὺς Λακεδ. κ. ἐξώρμησε, λέγων τοιαύδε. And thus the subst. must be taken here: "provocatio amoris et bonorum operum, cui," says Bengel, "contraria provocatio odii") of (tending to produce: or we may say that it is a παροξυσμὸς ἀγάπης, the love itself being thereby excited) love and good works;

25.] not deserting the assembling together of ourselves (the word ἐπισυναγωγῇ, as its verb ἐπισυνα-άγειν, belongs to late Greek: Bleek gives

¹ John xii. 40. ¹ καθὼς ^{1k} ἔθος ¹ τιςίν, ἀλλὰ ^m παρακαλοῦντες, ^{ADKLP}
^{see 1 Macc.}
^{x 89.} καὶ ⁿ τοσοῦτῳ ^m ᾧ μᾶλλον ⁿ ὅσῳ ^o βλέπετε ^p ἐγγίζουσιν ^q τὴν ^{8 a b c d}
^{2 Macc. xiii.} ἡμέραν. ^{26 r} ἐκουσίως γὰρ ἀμαρτανόντων ^h ἡμῶν ^{1 m n o} μετὰ τὸ ^{17. 47}

for εαυτων, αυτων N¹.

aft εθος ins εστιν D¹ vulg Chr-ms.

οσον KN¹ [c].

examples from Polyb., Plut., Phædrus. The LXX use the verb many times, of gathering in a hostile sense (Micah iv. 11: Zech. xii. 3; xiv. 2: Ps. xxx. 14 AN: 1 Macc. iii. 58; v. 9) and of God gathering His people together (Ps. ci. 23 A (συναγ. BN); cv. 47; cxlvi. 2: 2 Macc. i. 27; ii. 18). And so in N. T. (Matt. xxiii. 37; xxiv. 31: Mark xiii. 27: Luke xiii. 34). In the only place (ref.) where the substantive occurs, it is of our gathering together to Christ at His coming, just as the verb in the above-cited places of the Gospels. Here, the question is whether it is to be understood of the congregation of the faithful generally, the Church,—as the word congregation has come from the act of assembling to signify the body thus assembled,—or of the single acts of assembling and gathering together of the various assemblies of Christians at various times. The former is held by Primasius (“congregationem fidelium”), Calvin, Justiniani (“Ego malim de tota ecclesia hæc verba Pauli intelligere, ut hortetur Hebræos ad retinendam fidem, utque a cætu fidelium non recedant”), Jac. Cappell., Böhme, Bretschneider, al. But the other is held by most Commentators, and seems far more appropriate here. Thus Chrys. (οἶδεν ἀπὸ τῆς συνουσίας κ. τῆς ἐπισυναγωγῆς πολλὴν οὖσαν τὴν ἰσχύν), Ec. (τὸ γὰρ αἰετὶ συνήχθαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἀγάπης ἐστὶ γεννητικόν), Thl. (similarly), Beza, Camero, Schlichting, Limborch, Schöttgen, Wolf, al., and Tholuck, De Wette, Ebrard, Lünem., Hofm., Delitzsch, al. Del. suggests that our Writer may have used ἐπισυναγωγῆς, not συναγωγῆς, to avoid the Judaistic sound of this latter. Otherwise the use would be accountable enough, ἐπισυναγωγῆς being a συναγ. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, and thus pointing more at the several places where the assemblies were held), as is the habit with some (this καθὼς ἔθος τιςίν pretty plainly shews that not formal apostasies, but habits of negligence, are in the Writer’s view. How far these might in time lead to the other, is a thought which no doubt lies in the background when he says κατανοῶμεν ἀλλήλους, and παρακαλοῦντες: and is more directly suggested by the awful cautions which follow. Grot., al. compare Ignatius, ad Polycarp.

4, p. 721, πυκνότερον συναγωγὰ γενέσθωσαν: and Ad Eph. 13, p. 656, σπουδάζετε οὖν πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν θεοῦ κ. εἰς δόξαν ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε, καθαιρουνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ σατανᾶ, κ. λύεται ὁ ὄλεθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως), but exhorting (supply not τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν, as Ec. (τίνα; τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν, τουτέστιν, ἀλλήλους: ἀπὸ κοινοῦ γὰρ τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ληπτέον), Hofmann, al., but ἑαυτοῦς, out of the ἑαυτῶν just preceding. See ch. iii. 13, ἀλλὰ παρακαλεῖτε ἑαυτοὺς καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν. An alternative in Ec. supplies τοὺς ἀσθενεστεροὺς: but it is an unnecessary limitation: all would need it); and so much the more (this τοσοῦτῳ μᾶλλον is better taken as belonging to the two preceding participial clauses only, to which it is syntactically attached, than as belonging to the whole from κατέχωμεν), as (= ὅσῳ μᾶλλον, ‘the more;’ must be joined with βλέπετε, not with ἐγγίζουσιν, ‘the nearer ye see’) ye see (this βλέπετε, in the second person, is unexpected in the midst of the ‘oratio communicativa.’ It appeals at once to the watchfulness and discernment of the readers as regards the signs of the times. That Day indeed, in its great final sense, is always near, always ready to break forth upon the Church: but these Hebrews lived actually close upon one of those great types and foretastes of it, the destruction of the Holy City—the bloody and fiery dawn, as Delitzsch finely calls it, of the Great Day) the day (this shortest of all designations of the day of the Lord’s coming is found only in reff. “It is the Day of days, the ending-day of all days, the settling-day of all days, the Day of the promotion of Time into Eternity, the Day which for the Church breaks through and breaks off the night of this present world.” Delitzsch) approaching. 26–31.] Caution, arising from the mention of that day,—which will be not a day of grace, but a day of judgment,—of the fearful peril of falling away from Christ. The passage finds a close parallel in ch. vi. 4 ff., and much of what was there said will apply here. 26.] For if we willingly sin (contrast to ἀκουσίως ἀμαρτάνειν, in reff. and the ἐκουσίως ἀμαρτανόντες to the ἀγνοούντες

λαβεῖν τὴν ^u ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ^u ἀληθείας, οὐκ ἔτι ^v περὶ ^t ἁμαρτιῶν ^w ἀπολείπεται θυσία, ²⁷ * φοβερὰ δέ ^y τις ^z ἐκδοχῇ ^{t Rom. i. 28. Eph. i. 17. 2 Pet. i. 2, 3, 8. ii. 20. Prov. ii 5. w = ch. iv. 9. y w. adj., Acts viii. 9. φοβερόν}

u = 1 Tim. ii. 4. 2 Tim. ii. 25. iii. 7. T4. i. 1. see 1 Tim. iv. 3.
6 ref. x ver 31. ch. xii 21 only. Deut. i. 19 al
τι θέαμα, Lucian, Philopat. 8. z here only t.

v ver 6.

w = ch. iv. 9.

y w. adj., Acts viii. 9. φοβερόν

26. τῆς ἐπιγνωσίου (sic) N¹ (τῇ N³ : -σιν N-corr¹). οὐκετι περιλείπεται θυσίαν
περί ἁμαρτιῶν προσενεγκν D¹, jam non restat peccatis hostia offerre D-lat. [The verse,
except μετα . . . ἀληθείας is in Coisl-LXX-marg.]

κ. πλανώμενοι, ch. v. 2. The sin meant by ἁμαρτάνειν is sufficiently defined by the connexion (γάρ) with the preceding exhortations, and by the description of one who has so sinned in ver. 29. Neglect of assembling together, and loss of mutual exhortation and stimulus, would naturally result in (as it would be prompted by an inclination that way at first) the ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ θεοῦ of ch. iii. 12; the παραπεσεῖν of ch. vi. 6. It is the sin of apostasy from Christ back to the state which preceded the reception of Christ, viz. Judaism. This is the ground-sin of all other sins. Notice the present, not the aor. part. 'If we be found wilfully sinning,' not 'if we have wilfully sinned,' at that Day. It is not of an act or of any number of acts of sin, that the Writer is speaking, which might be repented of and blotted out: but of a state of sin, in which a man is found when that day shall come) after the receiving (having received) the knowledge ("It is usually said that γνώσις is the weaker word, ἐπίγνωσις the stronger: or, the former the more general, the latter the more special: or, the former the more quiescent, the latter the more active: the truth in all these is, that when ἐπίγνωσις is used, there is the assumption of an actual direction of the spirit to a definite object and of a real grasping of the same: so that we may speak of a false γνώσις, but not of a false ἐπίγνωσις. And the Writer, by the use of this word, gives us to understand that he means by it not only a shallow historical notion about the Truth, but a living believing knowledge of it, which has laid hold of a man and fused him into union with itself." Delitzsch. It is most important here to keep this cardinal point distinctly in mind: that the ἐκουσῖος ἁμαρτάνοντες are not mere professors of religion, but real converts, or else ver. 29 becomes unintelligible) of the truth (the truth of God, as so often in St. Paul and St. John), there is no longer left remaining (see on ch. iv. 6) a sacrifice for sins (for there is but One true sacrifice for sins: if a man, having availed himself of that One, then deliberately casts it behind him, there is no second left for him. It will be observed that one thing is not, and

need not be, specified in the text. That he has exhausted the virtue of the one sacrifice, is not said: but in proportion to his willing rejection of it, has it ceased to operate for him. He has in fact, as Del. observes, shut the door of repentance behind him, by the very fact of his being in an abiding state of willing sin. And this is still more forcibly brought out when, which Del. does not notice, the scene of action is transferred to the great day of the Lord's coming, and he is found in that impenitent state irreparably. This verse has been misunderstood, 1. by the Fathers, who apply it to the Novatian controversy, and make it assert the impossibility of a second baptism: so e.g. Thl., οὐ τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀναιρῶν λέγει ταῦτα, ὥς τινες παρενόησαν, ἀλλὰ δείκνυσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δεύτερον βάπτισμα: διὸ οὐδὲ δεύτερος θάνατος τοῦ χριστοῦ. θυσίαν γὰρ τοῦτον καλεῖ, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς κάτω. μᾶ γὰρ θυσία τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκές: τὸ γὰρ βάπτισμα ἡμῶν τὸν θάνατον εἰκονίζει τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὥσπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνος εἰς οὕτω καὶ τοῦτο ἐν. And similarly Chrys., Cc., and Augustine, Inchoat. Exposit. Ep. ad Rom. 19, vol. iii. pt. ii., al. 2. By Theodore of Mopsuestia and others, who interpret it only of those in a state of impenitence, understanding that on penitence they will again come under the cleansing influence of the blood of Christ: οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος βίου τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀναιρεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι τότε συγχώρησιν λαβεῖν τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ πταίειν ἐνταῦθα μεμενηκότα, καὶ μηδεμίαν ἐπὶ τὸ πταίειν δεξάμενον αἰσθήσιν, ἀλογία τινὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ἡδονῆς ἐπιτελούντα ἁμάρτημα; 27.] but (there is left remaining: ἀπολείπεται is common to both clauses) a certain (this attaching of τῆς to an adjective is an elegance belonging to the more polished style of our Writer, and often found in the classics: e.g. ἐπίγονόν τινα βίον, Diod. Sic. v. 39: ὅτι μικρόν τι μέρος εἴη στρατηγικῆς τὰ τακτικά, Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 14: καὶ Κύρῳ δὲ μεγάλῃν τινὰ δοκῶ ἡμᾶς χάριν ὀφείλειν, ibid. vi. 4. 7: see also ref. Acts, and cf. Winer, § 25. 2. c. Bernhardt's account of the usage, Syntax, p. 442, seems to be the true one, that it has the power of a doubled adjectival sense, and generalizes the quality predi-

a ch. ix 27 ^a κρίσεως, καὶ ^{bc} πυρὸς ^{bc} ζήλος ἐσθίειν μέλλοντος τοὺς ADKLP
 b Isa. xxvi. 11 ^{bd} ὑπεναντίους. ²⁸ ^e ἀθετήσας τὶς νόμον Μωυσεῶς χωρὶς ^{8 a b c d}
 c Zeph. i. 18. ^f οἰκτιρμῶν ^e ἐπὶ ^f δυσὶν ἢ ^f τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ^e ἀποθνήσκει ^{1 m n o}
 u i s. see Ps ^f Rom. 17. 47
 lxxviii 5 al.
 d Col. ii. 15
 only.
 e = Mark vii 9 Luke vii 30. 1 Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21 al Isa. xxiv. 16 (-τησις, ch. vii 28.) f Rom.
 xii. 1 2 Cor. i. 3. Phil. iii. 1. Col. iii. 12 only P. H. 2 Kings xxiv. 14. g Deut. xvi. 6. ^f ἐπὶ = ch.
 ix. 17.

28. aft οἰκτ. ins και δακρυων D¹(and lat) syr-w-ast.

cated, indicating *some one* of that kind, it may be *any one*. This is exemplified where numerals, or the like of numerals are joined with *τις*,—e. g. *pās tis, ἕκαστός τις, οὐδείς τις, τισὶν οὐ πολλοῖς* (Thuc. vi. 94), *τινὲς δύο νῆες* (id. viii. 100), *ἐκατόν τι* (Arr. Ind. 7), *ταύτας τινὰς τρεῖς* (Plato, Rep. x. p. 601 D), as Cicero, “tres aliqui.” So here, some one *φοβερά ἐκδοχή* out of all that might befall various men and dispositions. The indefiniteness makes the declaration more awful) fearful (objective,—‘tremendus,’ not ‘timidus,’ *furchtbar*, not *furchtſam*: fearful to think of, frightful. No figure of hypallage must be thought of, as if *φοβερά ἐκδοχή κρίσεως* = *ἐκδοχή κρίσεως φοβεράς*, as Jac. Cappellus, Heinrichs, al., and Wolf, alt.) reception (i. e. *need, doom*: not, as I believe universally interpreted without remark, *expectation*. No figure of hypallage never to have this sense, and this is the only place where it occurs in the N. T. Its meanings are, 1. *reception*, principally by succession from another: e. g. *Æschin. παραπρεσβ. p. 32. 18, οὐκ ἄνουν κατ’ αὐτοῦ λέγειν Φιλίππου, ἐπιτιμῶν δτι τὴν ἐκδοχὴν ἐποίησατο πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τοῦ πολέμου*: *Æschyl. Agam. 299, ἤγειρεν ἄλλην ἐκδοχὴν πόμῃ πυρὸς*: *Eur. Hippol. 866, νεοχμὸν ἐκδοχαῖς ἐπεισφέρει κακόν*: 2. peculiar to later Greek, and principally found in Polybius, *interpretation*, acceptance, e. g. of the sense of a sentence: so *καθάπερ ἐποιοῦντο τὴν ἐκδοχὴν οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι*, Polyb. iii. 29. 4: *ἐξ ὧν ἀνάγκη ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἐκδοχὴν δτι κ.τ.λ.*, “quibus ex rebus intelligi debet” &c., id. xii. 18. 7. And so Origen, comm. in Joann. tom. v. 4, vol. iv. p. 98, *διὰ τὴν πρόχειρον αὐτῆς (τῆς γραφῆς) ἐκδοχὴν*. But of the subjective sense, derived from the later meaning of *ἐκδέχομαι*, I find no hint or example, except the mere assertion in our N. T. lexicons, that it has that meaning in this place. From what follows, it is much better to take it objectively; all which *ἀπολείπεται* is, the reception of the doom of judgment, and the *πῦρ* (ζήλος, &c.) of judgment (i. e. by the *context*, unfavourable judgment), and *fervour of fire* (the stress is on *πῦρ*, and *πῦρ* is personified. It is the fire of God’s presence, identified with Himself, exactly as in ch. xii. 29, *ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκων*:

and it is the zeal, the fervour, the exandescence of this consuming fire, which awaits the apostate from Christ. *τὸ πῦρ ἐκεῖνο, καθάπερ τις ὑπὸ ζήλου κεντούμενος, ὃν ἂν ἐπιλάβηται, οὐκ ἀφήσιν, ἀλλὰ τρώγει καὶ δαπανᾷ*. Chrys. *ὅρα*, says Thl., *πᾶς οἶον ἐψύχωσε τὸ πῦρ*) which shall (in μέλλοντος the Writer transfers himself again to the present time: q. d. the fire which is destined to . . .) devour (οὐκ εἶπε φαγεῖν μόνον ἀλλ’ ἐσθίειν, αἰδίως δηλαδὴ). Thl. The same expression is found in II. ψ. 182, *τοὺς ἔμα σοι πάντας πῦρ ἐσθίει*) the adversaries (some have supposed the sense of *secret* enemies to be conveyed by *ὑπεναντίους*. But as Bl. remarks, the word is good Greek, and is constantly found, without any such further sense, representing merely *an enemy*, e. g. Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 38, where *ἐξαπατᾷ τοὺς πολέμους* and *ἐξαπατᾷ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους* are used as synonymous: Herod. iii. 80, where *τὸ ὑπεναντίον τούτου* is simply ‘the opposite of this’: see Lexx. The *ὑπό* is simply what may be called the ‘sub-junctio rei secundariæ’: the prime agent is ever supposed to be highest, and his accidents come up from beneath: thus *ὑπέρχεται μοι τι*,—cf. *ἴνα σφι γένεα ὑπογίγηται*, Herod. iii. 159, &c. It is probable that the Writer has throughout this clause had in his mind ref. Isa., *ζήλος λήψεται λαὸν ἀπαίδευτον, καὶ νῦν πῦρ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ἔδειται*). 28, 29.] *Argument* ‘a minori,’ to shew how grievous will be the punishment of the apostate from Christ. There is a very similar inference in ch. ii. 2, 3; xii. 25. 28.] *Any one having set at nought the* (not, ‘a;’ see ch. vii. 18, 19, both for *ἀθετεῖν*, and for the difference between *νόμος* and *ἐντολή*) *law of Moses* (we must not take this as a general assertion, as true of whoever in any way broke the Mosaic law: but as an alleging of a well-known fact, that in certain cases a breaker of that law was subject to the penalty following. The form of the sentence might be changed thus, ‘If Moses’ law could attach to violations of it the inexorable doom of death,’ &c. For the logical purpose of the ‘a minori ad majus,’ the greater punishment includes the less. The reference is especially to Deut. xvii. 2—7, where the punishment of death is at-

29^h πῶς δοκεῖτε ⁱ χείρονος ^k ἀξιωθήσεται ^l τιμωρίας ὁ τὸν ^h ἑλσ. w. ^μ μᾶλλον ^{ch. ix. 14 al.}
 υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ^m καταπατήσας, καὶ τὸ ⁿ αἷμα ^o τῆς ^p διαθή- ^{i 2 Pet. ii 20}
 κης ^o κοινὸν ^p ἡγησάμενος ^q ἐν ^q ᾧ ^r ἡγιασθή, καὶ τὸ ^s πνεῦμα ^{k constr., ch}
 δ' Εὐρυδύκην... ἐκρίνε μείζονος ἀξιώσαι τιμωρίας, Diod Sic. xix. 11. ^{iii. 3 reff ἤν}
 xix. 29 al. ^{m Matt. v 13. vii. 6. Luke vii. 5. xii 1 only. Job xxxix 15 al. 1 here only. P.}
 xxvi. 28. ch. ix 20 (from Exod xxiv. 8). xiii. 20. Zech ix. 11. ^{n Matt.}
 x. 14, 28. xi. 8 Rom xiv 14 bis. 1 Macc. i. 47, 62. ^{p = Acts xxvi. 2. Phil. ii. 25. ch. xi. 11.}
 26. 1 Pet. i. 13 al. Job xlii. 6. ^{q Rom. xv. 16. ver. 10 al.} ^{r ch. ii. 11.} ^{s Zech.}
 xii 10.

29. om εν ω ηγιασθη A Chr-3-inss.

tached to the same sin as is here in question, viz. apostasy: ἐὰν εὐρεθῇ . . . ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνὴ ὅς ποιήσει τὸ πονηρὸν ἐναντίον κυρίου τ. θεοῦ σου, παρελθεῖν τὴν διαθήκην αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλθόντες (ἀπελθόντες A) λατρεύσωσιν θεοῖς ἑτέροις κ.τ.λ.) dies (the normal present) without benefit of (χωρίς, apart from: not implying that no one felt compassion for him, but that such compassion, be it what it might, could not affect his doom) mercies (the merciful feelings of any who might be interested for him. οἰκτιρμός, see on ref. Rom., says Bleek, is a purely Alexandrine word, and in the LXX and N. T. is generally in the plural, answering to the Hebrew צַרְחָה, bowels. χωρίς οἰκτιρμῶν, φησί, ὥστε οὐδεμία συγγνώμη οὐδὲ ἔλεος ἐκεῖ. Chrys.) before two or three witnesses (ἐπὶ, as in ch. ix. 17, 'in the case of;': his death is an event contingent on, added to, the fact of two or three witnesses appearing. As to the sense, cf. Thl., *τουτέστιν, ἐὰν ὁμολογηθῇ ὑπὸ δύο ἢ τριῶν μαρτύρων ὅτι παρέβη τὸν νόμον*. The allusion is to Deut. as above, where it is said, *ἐπὶ δυσὶν μάρτυσιν ἢ ἐπὶ τρισὶν μάρτυσιν ἀποθανέται*): 29.] of how much worse punishment (though τιμωρία does not elsewhere occur in the N. T., we have the verb, Acts xxii. 5; xxvi. 11), think ye (δοκεῖτε stands separate from the construction, and forms an appeal to the judgment of the readers themselves), shall he be found worthy (viz. by God. The participle is in the aor., as pointing to the single fact of the doom, not to a continued estimate), who trampled under foot (aor. part. as spoken at that day, and looking back upon this life. τί δέ ἐστι καταπατήσας; *τουτέστι καταφρονήσας ὥσπερ γὰρ τῶν καταπατομένων οὐδένα λέγον ἔχοντες, οὕτω καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ μηδένα λόγον ἔχοντες οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ ἀμαρτάνειν ἐρχόμεθα*. Thl. See reff., and cf. John xiii. 18. Stier remarks, "Some of us remember the cry, 'Ecrasez l'infame!'" the Son of God (the higher title of the Mediator of the new covenant is used, to heighten the enormity of the crime), and accounted common the blood of the covenant (the αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, being the τιμιόν αἷμα of Christ Himself, far

above all blood of sprinkling under the old covenant. Even that (Levit. xvi. 19) had hallowing power: how much more this. But the apostate κοινὸν ἡγήσατο this blood—accounted it mere ordinary blood of a common man, and if so, consented to its shedding, for then Christ deserved to die as a blasphemer. And this, of that holy Blood, by which we have access to God! So that we have quite enough for the solemn sense, by rendering κοινόν *common*, without going to the further meaning, *unclean*. Chrys. gives both meanings: κοινόν, τί ἐστι; τὸ ἀκάθαρτον, ἢ τὸ μηδὲν πλέον ἔχον τῶν λοιπῶν: Ἐε., κοινόν, τὸ μηδὲν τῶν ἄλλων διαφέρειν, οἷον λέγουσιν οἱ φάσκοντες αὐτὸν ψιλὸν ἄνθρωπον οὗτοι γὰρ οὐδὲν τοῦ ἡμετέρου διαλλάττον εἰς τιμὴν λέγουσιν αὐτό: Beza compares 1 Cor. xi. 29, *μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*: and Bretschneider quotes Justin Mart. Apol. i. 66, p. 83, *οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν*. Cf. Acts x. 28, *ἐμοὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν μηδένα κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον*, where the two are distinguished. Syr. has "hath counted the blood of the covenant of him by which (whom?) he hath been sanctified as that of every man." The reader will recall our Lord's own τὸ αἷμα τὸ τῆς κ. διαθήκης, cf. ref. Matt. || Mark. See also our ch. xiii. 20) in which (as sprinkled with which; as his element and condition of sanctification) he was sanctified (see Levit. xvi. 19 LXX, and our ch. xiii. 12 and ix. 13. He had advanced so far in the reality of the spiritual life, that this blood had been really applied to his heart by faith, and its hallowing and purifying effects were visible in his life: which makes the contrast the more terrible. And Delitzsch finely remarks, as against the assertors of mere shallow supralapsarianism, that without former experience of grace, without a life of faith far more than superficial, so irrecoverable a fall into the abyss is not possible. It is worthy of remark how Calvin evades the deep truth contained in the words ἐν ᾧ ἡγιασθή: "Valde indignum est sanguinem Christi, qui sanctificationis nostrae materia est, profanare: hoc vero faciunt, qui desciscunt

t here only +
w acc., Jos.
Antt. i. 8 l
v. 8 12.
usy. w dat.,
see Bl.
u Ditt. xxxii
35 see note.
v Luke xvi.
7, 8, xxi 22.
Acts vi 24 Rom xii. 19, from l. c. 2 Cor. vii. 11. 2 Thess. i. 8. 1 Pet. ii. 14 only Ezek. xxv. 14. w Luke
xvi. 14 bis. Rom. xi. 3. xxi. 19. 2 Thess. i. 9. 2 Thess. i. 6 P. H. Isa lxiii. 7. x ch. i. 8 tell
y Ditt. xxxii. 36. Ps. cxlvi. 14. = ch. xii. 4. 2 ver. 27. a Matt. xii 11 Luba vi. 39. t
36. 1 Tim. ii. 6, 7. v. 9 only 2 Kings. xlv. 14 1 Chron xxi 13 Suu ii 18. b ch ii 12 i eff
c & constr, Mark (xi. 21) xiv 72. 1 Cor. iv. 17. 2 Cor. vii. 15 (2 Tim. i. 6) only Num v 15.

30. om λεγει κυριος D¹[P]N¹ 17. 23¹. 67² latt Syr copt aeth-rom Ambr, Primas.
aft παλιν ins οτι (as in Deut xxxii. 36 : Ps cxxxiv. 14) D latt aeth-pl[(Tischdf) Euthal-
ms Antch,] Thdr̄t, (om₁). rec κυριος bef κρινει, with L[P]N³ rel copt Chr Thdr̄t₁;
txt ADKN¹ 17 latt syrr aeth [arm Euthal-ms Antch,] Thdr̄t₁ Primas.

a fide :” thus making ἡγιασθη into ἀγια-
ζόμεθα. Lightfoot’s idea, that *Christ* is
the subject of ἡγιασθη, is hardly worth
refutation (Hor. Hebr. in 1 Cor. xi. 29) :
as neither is that of Claudius, in Wolf, that
διαθήκη is the subject, and insulted
(ἐνυβρίζω, in prose, belongs to later Greek :
but is found in the poets, e. g. Eur. Electr.
68, ἐν τοῖς ἐμοῖς οὐκ ἐνυβρίσας κακοῖς :
Aristoph. Thesm. 719, τάχ’ οὐ χαίρων
ἴσως ἐνυβρίσει : Soph. Philoct. 342, with
an accus. as here, πρᾶγμα ὅτω σ’ ἐνυβρίσαν.
In prose it is found in Ælian, Polybius,
Herodian, Josephus, principally with a
dative of the object) the Spirit of grace
(for τὸ πν. τῆς χάριτος, see ref. No two
things can be more opposed, as Del. re-
marks, than ὕβρις and χάρις. And this
remark guides us to the answer to the
question whether χάριτος here is a gen.
objective or subjective: whether it is the
πνεῦμα which belongs to χάρις, so that it
is the gift of the divine χάρις (so Grot.,
Schlicht., De W., Bleek, Lünem., and most
of the moderns), or χάρις which belongs
to πνεῦμα, so that it is the gift of and the
character of the πνεῦμα. The latter is
adopted by Calv., Estius, a-Lapide, Jus-
tiniani (altern., but prefers it. He gives
the alternative very neatly put by Pseudo-
Anselm : “ Spiritui sancto gratis dato, vel
gratiam danti”), Beza, Owen, al., Böhme,
Von Gerlach, Delitzsch, al., and is much
the more probable, both on account of the
prophecy which is referred to, ἐκχεῶ . . .
πνεῦμα χάριτος κ. οἰκτιρμοῦ,—and on ac-
count of ἐνυβρίσας, which is most natu-
rally referred to a Person as its object.
Chrys. strikingly says, ὁ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν
μὴ παραδεχόμενος, ὕβρισε τὸν εὐεργετή-
σαντα. ἐποίησέ σε υἱόν σὺ δὲ θέλεις
γενέσθαι δοῦλος : ἤλθε κατασκευάσαι πρὸς
σε· σὺ δὲ ἐπεισάγεις σαντῶ πονηρῶς
λογισμούς. He does not hold with any
definiteness that apostasy is here meant,
but applies the whole text homiletically
to wilful sin of any kind. Thl., in repro-
ducing Chrys.’s sentence, puts τὸν διά-

βολον for πονηρῶς λογισμούς) ? 30,
31.] And this ἐκδοχή κρίσεως and πυρὸς
ζῆλος are certainties, testified to by God
Himself. 30.] For we know Him
who said, To me belongeth vengeance,
I will repay, saith the Lord (the citation
is from Deut. xxxii. 35, and is given
not in agreement with the Hebrew text
(נִשְׁפַּח נַפְשִׁי לִי, “To me (belongeth) ven-
geance and recompense”) nor with the
LXX (ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἐκδίκησεως (i. e. “ν” οὐκ), as
is read in the Samaritan Pent.) ἀνταπο-
δώσω, so also Philo, Leg. Alleg. iii. § 34,
vol. i. p. 108), but, remarkably enough,
in verbal accordance with St. Paul’s cita-
tion of the same text, Rom. xii. 19, even
to the adding of the words λέγει κύριος,
which are neither in the Heb. nor the
LXX. Two solutions of this are possible :
1. that the expression had become a
common saying in the Church ; 2. that
our Writer takes it from St. Paul’s cita-
tion. A third alternative is of course
open ; that it is St. Paul himself, who
quotes here as there. For a solution, see
Prolegg. on the authorship of this Epistle) :
and again, The Lord will judge His
people (no doubt quoted primarily from
the passage where it primarily occurs,
in ref. Deut. The κρινεῖ there expresses
another function of the judge from that
which is adduced here. There, He will
judge for rescue and for defence : here, for
punishment and for condemnation. But
the office of Judge, generally asserted by
κρινεῖ, involves all that belongs to a judge :
and if there it induces the comforting of
those whom He εἶδεν παραελυμένους, κ.
ἐκλειποῦστας ἐν ἐπαγωγῇ, κ. παρεμένους,
here the same general office of judgment
also induces the punishment of the wilful
sinner and apostate. 31.] Axiomatic
conclusion of these solemn warnings. It
is a fearful thing to fall into the hands
of the living God (yet in ref. Kings,
1 Chron., David says, ἐμπεσοῦμαι δὴ εἰς
χεῖρας κυρίου, ὅτι πολλοὶ οἱ οἰκτιροῦν
αὐτοῦ. σφόδρα, εἰς δὲ χεῖρας ἀνθρώπου

Frag.
Mosq.
υπεμε-
νατε...
ADKL
PN
Frag.
Mosq.
a b c d e
f g h k l
m n o
17. 47

σκεσθε δὲ τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς ^d φωτισθέντες πολλὴν ^d ἄθλησιν ^e ὑπεμείνατε ^e παθημάτων, ^h τοῦτο μὲν ⁱ ὀνειδισ-
μοῖς τε καὶ θλίψεσιν ^k θεατριζόμενοι, ^h τοῦτο δὲ ^l κοινωνοὶ
τῶν οὕτως ^m ἀναστρεφόμενων γεννηθέντες. ³⁴ καὶ γὰρ τοῖς
^{xiii 7. ch. xii 2, 3 James i. 12 Wisd xvi. 22} ^{2 Tim iii. 11 al +}
^{only. classics, passim} ^{1 Rom. xv 3. 1 Tim iii 7 ch xi. 26 xiii 13 only. P.H. Isa. xlii 28}
^{k here only +. = ἐκθεατρίζειν, Polyb iii 91. 10 al.} ^{12 Cor. i. 7 al. Isa. i. 23.}
^{xvii. 23 2 Cor. i. 12 ch xiii. 18 al. Josh. v. 5. Ezek xix. 6.} ^{m Matt.}

32. τὰς προτ. ἡμεραις D¹.
proving) [m 17 copt].

for ἡμερας, αμαρτίας N¹.—add υμῶν N¹ N² disap-

33. for θεατρ., ονιδίζομενοι D¹.

οὐ μὴ ἐμπέσω: and in ref. Sir. we have ἐμπεισοῦμεθα εἰς χεῖρας κυρίου, καὶ οὐκ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων ὥς γὰρ ἡ με-γαλωσύνη αὐτοῦ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ. But the two sentiments are easily set at one. For the faithful, in their chastisement, it is a blessed thing to fall into God's hands: for the unfaithful, in their doom, a dreadful one. On ζῶν, as a characteristic of θεός, see on ch. iii. 12. Here, the idea of life and energy, attached to the name of God, brings vividly out the ζῆλος with which He will consume His adversaries). 32—34.] As in ch. vi.

9—12, so here, the Writer turns from solemn exhortation and warning to encouragement arising from the conduct of his readers in the past. This their firmness did not look likely to end in apostasy: and accordingly by the memory of it he now cheers and invigorates them. φησὶν οὖν ὅτι μὴ ἄλλους τινὰς μιμήσασθε, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς ἑαυτούς. ὅρα δὲ πνευματικὴν σοφίαν πρότερον κατασείσας αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς διὰ τοῦ τῆς γέννησιν ἀναμνησθαι, νῦν μαλαττεῖ δι' ἐγκωμίων, οὐ κολακεύων, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῶν τούτων προτροπόμενος ἀξιοπιστότερος γὰρ ὁ συμβουλευὼν τινὲς ἑαυτὸν μιμήσασθαι καὶ ἃ προειργάσατο ἔργα. Thl.: and Thdrt., κεράννυσσι τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ αὐστηρὸν τῇ μνήμῃ τῶν ἡδὲ κατωρθωμένων. οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως εἰς προθυμίαν διεγείρει ὥς τῶν οἰκείων κατωρθωμάτων μνήμη. 32.] But (in contrast to these fearful things which have been spoken of) call ever to mind (ἀναμνήσκασθε, stronger than the simple verb—call over in your minds, one by one: this meaning seems legitimate when a plural follows: and present, as implying a constant habit. The verb may be indicative, but is from the whole cast of the sentence, much more likely imperative) the former days (the accus. after ἀναμνήσκομαι is as good Greek as the gen.), in which when (first) enlightened (see on φωτίσω, note, ch. vi. 4), ye underwent (scil. with fortitude: which though not implied in the word, signifying mere endurance, yet often is in the context: cf.

Xen. Hiero 7. 4 (Bl.), ὥστε ἐμοὶ μὲν εἰκότως δοκεῖτε ταῦτα ὑπομένειν, ἃ φέρετε ἐν τυραννίδι, ἐπεὶ περ τιμᾶσθε διαφερόντως τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων) much ('multum magnumque': πολλὸς when used with words whose sense admits intensifying, strengthens, as well as repeats, the idea) contest (ἀθλησις tells its own meaning, from ἀθλος, ἀθλέω, as 'certamen,' a struggle or contest: and in this sense it occurs in ref.) of sufferings (the gen. may be either subjective, implying that your contest consisted of sufferings; or objective, that it was waged with sufferings, as the foe to be contended against: the former perhaps is the more probable from what follows: cf. συνεπαθήσατε, ver. 34), 33.] (the nature of these sufferings is now specified) partly (see ref.) being made a spectacle (the theatre being the place where conspicuous punishments were inflicted, on account of the multitudes there assembling. See Acts xix. 29. The word θεατρίῳ may therefore be literally taken, if (see Prolegg. § ii. and § iii. 3) the Epistle was written to Rome, after the Neronian persecution. See ref., and cf. 1 Cor. iv. 9, θέατρον ἐγενήθημεν τῷ κόσμῳ. Thl. says, θεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτέστιν ὥσπερ ἐπὶ θέατρον παραδειγματίζόμενοι, καὶ ταῦτα τυχεὶν παρὰ εὐτελεῶν καὶ εὐδαιμόνων. And Chrys., οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἶπεν, ὀνειδισμοῖς, ἀλλὰ . . . μετ' ἐπιτάσεως πολλῆς θεατριζόμενοι φησὶν ὅταν μὲν γὰρ τις ὀνειδίζηται καθ' ἑαυτὸν, λυπηρὸν μὲν, πολλὰ δὲ πλέον, ὅταν ἐπὶ πάντων) in reproaches (ὀνειδισμός is a word of later Greek. The dat. is one of manner in which) and tribulations; partly also (see above), having become (there is something of purpose in γεννηθέντες, almost a middle sense, 'having made yourselves.' It is a fine encomium on their Christian sympathy and love) partakers with them who were thus living (viz. ἐν ὀνειδισμοῖς τε κ. θλίψεσιν: so Eccl. and Thl. Some would give ἀναστρεφόμενων an ethical sense: "who walk," have their Christian walk and conduct, "in this way," viz. as he exhorts them to endure, manfully and firmly. So

n ch xiii. 3
 ieff
 o ch iv 15
 (ieff) only
 p Matt. xxiii.
 25 Luke
 xi 30 only.
 Isa iii 14
 q Matt. xix. 21
 Luke xi 21.
 s ch. xi 35
 16, 2 Cor. iii. 11
 ch xii 17
 1 Pet. i 23, 25,
 from Isa. xl 8.
 24 BN. Isa i 30.
 Jer lvi 2 compl.
 Gen. xiv. 59
 t ch. i 4 reff.
 r Matt. xiii. 20
 Phil. i 3
 u Acts. i 45 only
 2 Chron. xxxv. 7
 w Mark x. 50 only
 Prov. xxviii.
 y ch viii. 5 reff.
 1 Chiron. lxxix. 22
 2 Chron. xxxv. 7
 w Mark x. 50 only
 Prov. xxviii.
 y ch viii. 5 reff.

ADKL
 PN
 Frag.
 Mosq.
 a b c d e
 f g h k l
 m n o
 17. 47

ⁿ δεσμοῖς ^o συνεπαθήσατε, καὶ τὴν ^p ἄρπαγὴν τῶν ^q ὑπαρ-
 χόντων ὑμῶν ^r μετὰ χαρᾶς ^s προσεδέξασθε, γινώσκοντες
 ἔχειν ἑαυτοῖς ^t κρείσσονα ^u ὑπαρξιν καὶ ^v μένουσαν. ³⁵ μὴ
^w ἀποβάλλετε οὖν τὴν ^x παρῥησίαν ὑμῶν, ^y ἥτις ἔχει μεγάλην

34. rec (for δεσμοῖς) δεσμοῖς μου (see note), with D³KL[P]N rel [æth Orig.] Clem,
 Euthal.; *vinculis eorum* D-lat: txt AD¹ h 17 [47] vulg syrr copt [arm Euthal-ms
 Antch.] Chr., γινώσκον (sic) N. rec ins εν bef εαντ., with d e g k [Antch.]:
 om ADKL[(P)]N rel [Chr. Isid. Thdrt Damasc].—εαντους AN Frag-mosq [copt] Clem
 (Orig) [Euthal-ms: vos latt]. rec κρειττονα, with DKL[P] rel [Clem Orig Euthal-
 ms Isid Antch.]: txt AN 17 [Chr.], rec aft υπαρξιν ins εν ουρανοῖς, with D³KL
 [P]^{N3} Frag-mosq² rel syrr [æth-pl arm] Orig, [Chr Isid. Euthal-ms Thdrt Antch,
 Damasc]: om AD¹N¹ Frag-mosq¹ 17 latt copt æth[-rom] Clem, Chroni, Primas.
 35. for αποβαλῃτε, απολυῃτε D¹. rec μισθαπ. bef μεγαλην, with KL rel Chr Thdrt
 Damasc: txt AD[P]N Frag-mosq m 17 (latt) Clem, Orig, Eus, [Euthal-ms].

Kypke, Kuinoel, al. But I prefer the other as more in accord with N.T. usage: cf. reff.). 34.] *Illustration*, in reverse order of the two particulars mentioned in ver. 33. For ye both (better than 'also,' seeing that this sentence is not additional to, but illustrative of the last in both its members) sympathized with (see on συμπαθεῖν, ch. iv. 15) them who were in bonds (first as to the reading. The mere diplomatic evidence is given in the var. read. Estius appears to be right when he says, "Porro facillimum fuit, Græca mutari unius literulæ ablatione, ut scriberetur δεσμοῖς pro δεσμοῖς, cui lectioni deinde addiderunt pronomen μου, eo quod Paulus alibi sæpe vinculorum suorum mentionem faciat." It is not easy on the other hand to explain how δεσμοῖς should ever have been substituted for δεσμοῖς μου. The idea that συμπαθεῖν requires a person and not a thing as its object, which is supposed by some to have caused the alteration to δεσμοῖς, is not likely to have influenced a Greek copyist, seeing that it is wholly unfounded in Greek. We have συμπαθεῖν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις, ch. iv. 15; συμπτ. καὶ ταῖς μικραῖς ἀτυχίαις, Isocr. p. 64 B, and δεσμοί are, after all, the state of the captive person. δεσμοῖς is held to be the original by Grot., Beng., Wetst., Griesb., Scholz, Kuapp, Lachm., Tischendorf, and is rejected, out of critical editors, only by Matthæi and Rink, who read δεσμοῖς μου, and Mill and Nösselt, who omit μου. Of commentators, the rec. is defended by Wolf, Carpzov, Michaelis, al. A full account is given of all the testimonies each way by Bleek: see also Delitzsch's note), and ye took (προσδέχομαι not only of expectation, but of reception: so in reff., οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν. So Chrys. and Thl.

here, τὸ προσεδέξασθε τὴν ἐκούσιον αὐτῶν ὑπομονὴν δηλοῖ) with joy the plundering of your goods (so reff.: in Luke viii. 3, we have τὰ υπάρχοντά τι. Bleek quotes ἀρπαγὰς ὑπαρχόντων from Polyb. iv. 17. 4), knowing that ye have for yourselves (ἑαυτοῖς dat. commodi) a better possession (reff.: a word of St. Luke's) and abiding (τί ἐστι μένουσαν; βεβαίαν, οὐχ οὕτως ἀπολλυμένην ὥστερ ταύτην [cf. Matt. vi. 20]). 35—39.] *Hortatory conclusion*, enforced by (ver. 36) the need of endurance, which itself is recommended by the assurance of the speedy coming of the Lord, and the knowledge that we are not of the number of the backsliders, but of those who live by that faith by which our hope is substantiated.

35.] Cast not away therefore (it is better to keep the active, intentional sense of ἀποβάλλω, to cast away, than to take the accidental and involuntary sense, 'lose not,' with the vulg., "nolite amittere." This latter sense is common enough, e.g. Herod. viii. 65, τὸν ναυτικὸν στρατὸν κινδυνεύουσι βασιλεῖς ἀποβαλεῖν: see many more examples in Bleek: and Dio Chrys. (in Wetst.) xxxiv. p. 425, εἰάν γὰρ ἀλόγως ἐνίοτε ἐγκαλεῖν δόξητε καὶ τις ὑμῶν περιγένηται, . . . δέδοικα μὴ τελέως ἀποβάλλητε τὴν παρῥησίαν. But seeing that we have such expressions as κατέχειν τὴν παρῥησίαν, ch. iii. 6, it is more probable that the other meaning is intended. So in reff. Mark: so Ælian, Var. Hist. x. 13, τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀπέβαλλεν, &c.) your confidence (on the subjective sense of παρῥησία, see ch. iii. 6, note), the which (ἥτις, not ἥ. The simple relative would predicate what follows of the one preceding individual antecedent only, whereas ἥτις predicates it of a whole class of which that antecedent is one. The Latin 'quippe

^zμισθαποδοσίαν. ³⁶^a ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ^b ἔχετε ^b χρεῖαν, ἵνα ^z ch. ii. 2. xi. 26 only. (δότης, ch. xi. 6.) ^a Luke viii. 15. Rom. ii. 7. Col. i. 11. ch. xii. 1. James i. 3. d ch. xi. 19 al. 2 Pet. i. 6. Rev. i. 9 al. Ezra x. 2. b ch. v. 12 reff. c ver 7. f ch. iv. 1 reff. g John xiii. 53. xiv. 19. h as above (g). Matt. xxvi. 39, 73. John xvi. 16—19. 1 Cor. xi. 1, 16 only. i Luke xxi. 20. 1 Hab. ii. 3, 4. o Rom. i. 17 & Gal. iii. 11, from Hab. ii. 4. n Matt. xxiv. 48. xxv. 5. Luke i. 21. xii. 45 only. Isa. xiv. 1 (xiii. 22).

36. χρεῖαν bef εχετε N¹.

κομισσασθαι (sic) N.

37. [for οσον οσον ο, οθεν D-gr.] χρονισει [D¹]N¹.

38. rec om 1st μου (see note), with D²KL[P] Frag-mosq² rel [syrr æth] copt Chr, [Eus, Euthal-ms Thdr̄t_L Damasc]: ins AN Frag-mosq² vulg arm Clem, Thdr̄t_i Sedul Primas, and (after πιστεως, as LXX-BN) D¹ syrr Eus.

qua expresses it well: 'being of such sort, as . . .') hath (*present*, although the reward is future: hath, set down over against it: possesses in reversion) great recompense of reward (see on *μισθαποδοσία*, ch. ii. 2, note; also reff.). 36.] For (justification of the foregoing *μη αποβάλῃτε κ.τ.λ.*) of endurance (*ὑπομονῆς*) is placed first, carrying the main emphasis. "Paulatim," says Bengel, "Apostolus ab hoc versu ad 38 prophetam inducit." For in Hab. ii. 2, 3, the whole passage runs thus: ἐὰν ὑστερήσῃ, ὑπόμεινον αὐτόν ὅτι ἐρχόμενος ἔξει καὶ οὐ μὴ χρονίσει. ἐὰν ὑποστείλῃται, οὐκ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ἐν αὐτῷ· δὲ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεώς μου (μου ἐκ πίστεως Α) (ῥησεται) ye have need, that ye may do the will of God and receive the promise (the aor. part., preceding an aor. verb, is often contemporary with it in time, and so requires to be rendered in English by a synchronous tense, as in the case of ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε, he answered and said. And thus it certainly ought to be taken here. No endurance or patience would be wanted, when they had done the will of God, to receive the promise; because such interval as should elapse between their ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ in this sense, and κομίσασθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, would be not here, but in the intermediate state. But that which they really do want ὑπομονήν for is that they may δοκιμάζειν τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον, and thus receive the promise: see ch. xiii. 21. ἐπαγγελία, as in reff., not the word of promise, but the substance of the promise, the promise in its fulfilment. κομίσσασθαι, reff., of gathering a reward, or a prize from a contest, see Eur. Hipp. 432, δόξαν ἐσθλὴν κομίσσεται: Thuc. iii. 58, σάφρονα ἀντὶ αἰσχρᾶς κομίσσασθαι χάριν). 37, 38.] Encouragement to this endurance, by the fact of the time being short, and at the same time further proof of the necessity of it by God's renunciation of him that draws back: all

from the same prophecy of Habakkuk.

37.] For yet a little little while (this expression is not in Habakkuk, but is found in ref. Isa., ἀποκρύβῃτε μικρὸν ὅσον ὅσον, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ἡ ὀργὴ κυρίου, to which the Writer probably alludes. μικρόν is the accus. neut.: some (Lün., Del.) say, an independent nominative, referring to John xiv. 19; xvi. 16; but neither of those places determines the case. ὅσον is often joined to adjectives and nouns, &c., which denote size, to give a certain definiteness to the idea: so μικρόν ὅσον, Lucian Hermot. 60; δλίγον ὅσον, ib. p. 62: and among other places in Wetst. and Loesner, we have the ὅσον repeated in ref.: in Arrian, Indic. 29, ὅλγοι δὲ αὐτῶν σπείρουσιν ὅσον ὅσον τῆς γῆς: cf. Hermann on Viger, p. 726: Winer, § 36. 3, note. It gives the sense of very small, "aliquantillum" as Hermann expresses it: τὸ δὲ ὅσον ὅσον τὸ πᾶν μικρὸν δηλοῦ, Thl.). He that is coming (the solemn prophetic δ ἐρχόμενος, 'He that is to come': see reff. There is no art. in the LXX, and ἐρχόμενος refers to the vision, or as αὐτόν and ἐρχόμενος in the masc. after θρασις, both are naturally referred to some one indicated by the θρασις; and ἐρχόμενος ἔξει, "coming it will come," is paraphrased into δ ἐρχόμενος ἔξει, 'He that is coming shall come.' So Bengel: "Apostolus, articulo addito, verba prophetæ eleganter flectit ad Christum") shall come, and shall not tarry. 38.] Continuation of the paraphrase: the two clauses of Hab. ii. 4 being transposed. In the original it runs as in E. V.: "Behold his soul (which) is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith:" or, an ambiguity extending to all three places where the saying is quoted, here, and reff. Rom., Gal., "The just by his faith, shall live." But the other is more probable: see, on all points regarding the Hebrew text, Delitzsch's note. The transposition is apparently made on

ῥ Acts xx. 20, 27. Gal. ii. 12 only. Job xiii. 8
 ζήσεται, καὶ ἐὰν ῥ ὑποστείλῃται, οὐκ ἂ εὐδοκεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου ...ψυχή μου
 ἂ ἐν αὐτῷ. 39 ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐκ ἐσμέν ῑς ὑποστολῆς εἰς ἂ π- Frag.
 ὠλειαν, ἀλλὰ ῑ πίστεως εἰς ῑ περιποίησιν ψυχῆς. Mosq. ADKLP
 XI. 1 ῑ ἔστιν δὲ πιστῖς ἐλπίζομένων ῑ ὑποστασις, ῑ πραγ- a b c d e f g h k
 xxii. 20. r here only. s gen., Luke ix. 55 ῑ ῥ Acts ix 2 ch. xii. 11. t Heb., here 17. 47
 only. = Rom. ix. 22 Phil i. 28. iii. 19 al u l Pet. ii. 9 reff. ῑ ch. iii. 14 reff.
 w = ch. vi 13. x l.

2nd μου bef η ψυχή D¹⁻³.

39. παλαιας N¹.

purpose, to prevent *ὑποστείλῃται* being understood to refer to *ἐρχόμενος* as its subject. But my just man (there is much controversy about μου, whether to insert it, and where to insert it. On the whole I agree with Bleek, that the position after *δικαίος*, which is found in the LXX-A, was most probably that adopted by our Writer. This, being different from many copies of the LXX, would naturally be altered: and St. Paul's citations not having μου, it would naturally be omitted from our copies here. Delitzsch's reason for omitting it, that because our Writer quotes as St. Paul in ver. 30, he probably does here also, is in fact a depriving of that fact of all its real interest. Placed as in our text, μου will point out that man who is just before God, who belongs to God's people) shall live by faith: and (this καὶ has no place in the LXX, the first clause, here put last, being there asyndetous) if he (i. e. the *δικαίος*, as Delitzsch very properly insists: not *τις* understood, nor *ἄνθρωπος* taken out of *δικαίος*, but, in the true spirit of this whole cautionary passage, the very man himself who was justified, and partakes of the Christian life, by faith. The possibility of such a fall is, as he observes, among the principal things taught us by this Epistle) draw back (cf. ref. Gal., note. The middle and passive of *ὑποστέλλω* have usually an accus. of the object of fear: so Dinarchus contra Demosth. p. 11, τῆς ἐξ ἀρείου πάγου βουλῆς οὕτε τὴν Δημοσθένους οὕτε Δημάδου δύναμιν ὑποστειλαμένης; Demosth. p. 630, μηδὲν ὑποστελλόμενον μηδ' αἰσχυρόμενον. But sometimes it is absolute, as here: so Eur. Orest. 606, ἐπεὶ θρασύνει κοῦχ ὑποστέλλῃ λόγῳ. See several more instances in Kypke), my soul (τίνος ἡ ψυχὴ; τοῦ θεοῦ, κατὰ τὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς γραφῆς, ὡς τό, τὰς ἐορτὰς ὑμῶν μισεῖ ἡ ψυχὴ μου (Isa. i. 14), ἡ τοῦ χριστοῦ. The former reference is doubtless right, not the latter, nor that given by Calvin, "Perinde accipiendum est, ac si ex suo sensu Apostolus proferret hanc sententiam") hath not pleasure in him (for construction see reff.). 39.] Here again he returns from that which is

threatening in appearance to that which is encouraging and reassuring. But we (emphatic; bringing with it, in its mention, all that we are as Christians and that God has made us: you and I, κλήσεως ἐπουρανίου μέτοχοι, ch. iii. 1) are not of backsliding (there is no ellipsis after *ἐσμέν*, as *υἱοί*, or *τέκνα*: the gen. of category is common enough: see Bernhardt, Syntax, p. 165, who gives many examples. *ὑποστολή* takes up *ὑποστείλῃται* above. The word is found in Josephus, in several places: Kypke quotes οὐδεμίαν ὑποστολὴν ποιοῦνται κακοηθείας, and λάθρα τὰ πολλὰ καὶ μεθ' ὑποστολῆς ἐκακούργησε: but both his references, as well as those given by Bleek, are wrong. He also quotes from Plutarch, Moral. p. 501, ὅτε μάλιστα δέχεται ὑπομονῆς κ. σωπῆς κ. ὑποστολῆς ὁ ἄνθρωπος) unto (as its result: so Rom. vi. 19 bis, εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, εἰς ἁγιασμόν) destruction (in St. Paul's sense: see reff.: the verb *ἀπόλλυμαι* is equally foreign to this Epistle, only occurring in the citation, ch. i. 11), but of faith unto (the) preservation of (the) soul (see on *περιποίησις*, note, 1 Thess. v. 9. But Delitzsch is right when he warns us against interpreting *περιποίησιν ψυχῆς* simply by *περιτ. ζωῆς* or *σωτηρίας*. "The soul (*ψυχὴ*) is the subject of life and salvation. Faith saves the soul, by linking it to God, the living One. The unbelieving man loses his soul: for not being God's, neither is he his own: all that his personality has in itself and round itself, is fallen under wrath and the powers of wrath").

CHAP. XI.]—We are of FAITH, concluded the last chapter. And now this great word comes before the mind of the Writer for its definition, its exemplification, its triumphs. By this, all the servants of God from the first have been upheld, and stimulated, and carried through their glorious course. By this exemplification the Writer evermore warmed and carried forward breaks out at last into a strain of sublime eloquence, in which he gathers together in one the many noble deeds of faith which time and space would not allow of his specifying severally. 1.] Now Faith is (the rec. text has a

μαίτων * ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων. 2^γ ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ ^z ἔμαρ- ^x here (2 Tim. iii. 16 v. r.) only. Job z pass., ch. vii. 8 reff.

xiii. 6.

y = 1 Tim. v. 10. 2 Cor. viii. 20.

z pass., ch. vii. 8 reff.

comma after *πίστις*, thus throwing the stress upon *ἔστιν*, and making it mean either, "Now there is a faith, which is" &c., or "Now faith really exists, being" &c. And the alleged ground for this arrangement is, that the ordinary rendering, "Now faith is," would require *πίστις δὲ ἔστιν*, or *ἡ δὲ πίστις ἔστιν*. But this argument is nugatory. *ἔστιν* at the opening of the sentence does, it is true, often indicate emphatically absolute existence, e. g. ch. iv. 13: Acts xiii. 15: 1 Cor. viii. 5; xv. 44 al. fr. (in Del.); but frequently it is the mere logical copula, with a certain emphasis on it, carrying a strong affirmation or negation of the truth of the subsequent predication. See Delitzsch here, and Winer, § 7. 3. So that our Writer does not say, 'There is a faith, which is . . . , nor 'Faith has a real existence, being . . . , but he describes that *πίστις* to which in ch. x. 39 he had stated us to belong. And this word 'describes' is perhaps more strictly correct than 'defines:' for the words which follow are not a definition of that in which faith consists, but of that which faith serves as and secures to us. A *definition* would approach rather from the side of the subjective phenomena of faith. Yet when speaking broadly and not strictly, we may well call this the definition of faith: and nearly so Thomas Aquinas (in Del.), "Respondeo dicendum, quod licet quidam dicant prædicta Apostoli verba non esse fidei definitionem, quia definitio indicat rei quidditatem et essentiam, tamen, si quis recte consideret, omnia, ex quibus potest fides definiri, in prædicta descriptione tanguntur, licet verba non ordinentur sub forma definitionis." Delitzsch compares several forms of similar definitions in Philo, e. g. *ἔστι δὲ στεναγμὸς σφόδρα καὶ ἐντεταμένη λύπη* (Leg. Alleg. iii. 75, vol. i. p. 129): *ἔστι δὲ εὐχὴ αἰτήσις ἀναβῶν παρὰ θεοῦ* (Quod Deus Immut. 19, p. 285): *ἔστι γὰρ φιλοσοφία ἐπιτήδευσις σοφίας, σοφία δὲ ἐπιστήμη θεῶν κ. ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτιῶν* (De Congr. Quær. Erud. Gr. 14, p. 530): and an appositional one of faith itself, De Conf. Ling. 9, p. 409, where it is said to be *ἡ ὀχυρωτάτη καὶ βεβαιωτάτη διάθεσις*, and, De Migr. Abr. 9, p. 442, he says of faith, *ἀρτηθείσα γὰρ καὶ ἐκκρεμασθεῖσα ἐλπίδος χρηστῆς, καὶ ἀνευδίαστα νομίσασα ἤδη παρῆναι τὰ μὴ παρόντα, διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὑποσχομένου βεβαιωτάτην πίστιν, ἀγαθὸν τέλειον, ἀθλον εὖρηται*. It was this passage apparently which led Jerome to make the remark which Grotius

quotes in his note on James ii. 23, "Quæ si quis recte consideret, inveniet optime concurrere cum eo quod Scriptor ad Hebræos, *Philoneum aliquid spirans* ut Hieronymo videtur, scripsit, *ἔστι δὲ πίστις κ.τ.λ.*" Notice that it is of *faith* in general, *all* faith, not here of faith in God in particular, that the Writer is speaking: and *πίστις* is anarthrous, as throughout the chapter) *confidence* (there has been much difference concerning the meaning of *ὑπόστασις*. The ancients for the most part understand it here as "substantia" (so vulg.), substance, the real and true essence: faith gives reality to things not yet seen, so that they are treated as veritably present. So e. g. Chrys., *ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίδι ἀνυπόστατα εἶναι δοκεῖ, ἡ πίστις ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῖς χαρίζεται* μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ χαρίζεται ἀλλ' αὐτὸ ἔστιν οὐσία αὐτῶν οἷον ἡ ἀνάστασις οὐ παραγέγονεν οὐδὲ ἔστιν ἐν ὑποστάσει, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλπίς ὀφίστησιν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ψυχῇ: Thdr., *δείκνυσιν ὡς ὕφεστώτα τὰ μηδέπω γεγεννημένα*: Ec., *πίστις ἔστιν αὐτὴ ἡ ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία τῶν ἐλπιζομένων πραγμάτων* ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἀνυπόστατά ἔστιν ὡς τῶς μὴ παρόντα, ἡ πίστις οὐσία τις αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπόστασις γίνεται, εἶναι αὐτὰ καὶ παρῆναι τρόπον τινὰ παρασκευάζουσα διὰ τοῦ πιστεῦναι εἶναι: Thl., *οὐσίωσις τῶν μῆπω ὄντων καὶ ὑπόστασις τῶν μὴ ὕφεστώτων*: Ambr. (De Pœnit. ii. 3 (15), vol. ii. p. 419), Aug. (In Joann. Tract. lxxix. 1, vol. iii. pt. ii.), Vatabl. ("rerum quæ sperantur essentia"), H. Steph. ("illud quod facit ut jam exstent, quæ sperantur"), Schlichting, Bengel, Heinrichs, Bisping, al. Others have rendered it "*fundamentum*:" so Faber Stap., Erasmus. (paraphr.), Calvin, Beza ("illud quo subsistunt"), Clarius, Stein, Sykes, Carpzov, al. On the other hand the majority of modern Commentators have preferred the meaning which *ὑπόστασις* bears in ch. iii. 14, where see note: viz. "confidence." So Luther, Camero, Grotius, Hammond, Wolf, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Stuart, Ebrard, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al. And there can be no reasonable doubt, that this is the true rendering here. Thus only do the two descriptions given correspond in nature and quality: and thus only does *ὑπόστασις* itself answer to what we might expect by *ἐλπιζομένων* being used and not some word like *ἀνυποστάτων*. The one being subjective in both these cases of parallel, it is but reasonable that the other should be also. Delitzsch, as usual when any psycho-

a = Matt xv. *τὴν ἠρώτησαν οἱ ἁ πρεσβύτεροι.* ³ Πίστει ^b νοοῦμεν ^c κατη-
 2. only.
 b = Matt xxiv.
 15. Rom. i. 20. 2 Tim. ii. 7. Prov. i. 2, 6. c = Rom. ix. 22. Ps. lxxiii. 16. lxxxviii. 37.

logical question arises, has gone into this matter at great length, and his note should by all means be read. He compares a very remarkable passage of Dante, *Paradiso*, xxiv. 52—81) of things hoped for (the old Latin versions were certainly wrong in rendering ἐλπιζομένων "*sperantium*." But, granting that it is neuter, a question arises as to the arrangement of the word *πραγμάτων*, whether it belongs to ἐλπιζομένων or to οὐ βλεπομένων. Chrys., Ec., the vulg., Calvin in his version, Estius, Böhme, al. join it with the former: Thl., Ambrose, Aug., Faber Stap., most of the Commentators, and, as Bleek believes, all the editions, with the latter. And for two reasons, this seems to be the right connexion. It preserves the rhythm better, which otherwise would halt, by the second clause being so much shorter than the first,—and it is more likely that *πραγμάτων*, indicating as it does rather material objective facts than objects of hope, should be joined with the objective οὐ βλεπομένων, than with the subjective ἐλπιζομένων), *demonstration* (another dispute has arisen, about *the meaning of ἔλεγχος. From ἐλέγχειν, to convict, or convince, of persons,—to prove or demonstrate, of things, comes ἔλεγχος, conviction, or proof: Aristot. *Rhet.* ad Alex. c. 14, ἔλεγχος δέ ἐστιν ὁ μὲν μὴ δυνατὸς ἄλλως ἔχειν ἄλλ' οὕτως ὥς ἡμεῖς λέγομεν. So the vulg. has rendered "*argumentum*,"—Aug., Prosper., Mutianus, "*convictio*,"—Calvin, "*demonstratio*" or "*evidentia*" ("evidence," E. V.), Hammond (and similarly Luther), "*firma persuasio*." Chrys. says, βαβαί, οἳ ἐχρήσατο λέξει εἰπὼν ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων ἔλεγχος γὰρ λέγεται ἐπὶ τῶν λαν ἀδῆλων (but the reading of the best mss. and of the Benedictine edn. is δῆλων) ἢ πίστις τοίνυν ἐστὶν ὕψις τῶν ἀδῆλων, φησί, καὶ εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖς δραμένοις φέρεται πληροφορίαν τὰ μὴ δρώμενα: Ec., ἀποδείξις τῶν οὐ βλεπομένων ἀποδείκνυσσι δὲ δρᾶτὰ τὰ ἀόρατα ἢ πίστις πῶς; τῷ νῷ καὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν δρᾶσα τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα: Thl., ἔλεγχος, τούτεστι δείξις καὶ φανέρωσις ἀδῆλων πραγμάτων ποιεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα βλέπεσθαι τῷ νῷ ἡμῶν ὥς παρόντα. The old Latin version in D renders most strangely, "*accusator non videndum*." The modern Commentators are divided: some have taken the subjective sense of conviction,—inward persuasion of the truth of: so Menken, Bleek, De W., Lünem. But, as Tholuck remarks, this sense of the word is hardly borne out by

usage. And therefore we seem driven back on the objective meaning as referred to things, viz. *proof*, or *demonstration*. This is adopted by Bengel, Böhme, Stier, Ebrard, Hofmann, al. As far as the *sense* is concerned, both come to the same in the end. It is faith, an act of the mind, which is this demonstration: it is therefore necessarily subjective in its effect,—is the demonstration to him who believes) of matters (see above) not seen (this πράγματα οὐ βλεπόμενα is a much wider designation than ἐλπιζόμενα, embracing the whole realm of the spiritual and invisible, even to the being and essence of God Himself: see below, ver. 6; and cf. Rom. viii. 24, where St. Paul's expressions differ slightly in form from these. There is no ground whatever for saying that our Writer makes faith identical with hope. Faith is the ὑπόστασις of ἐλπιζόμενα: Hope exists independently of it, but derives its reality, and is ripened into confidence, by its means. And faith is the demonstration to us of that which we do not see: cf. the beautiful words of Calvin: "Nobis vita æterna promittitur, sed mortuis: nobis sermo fit de beata resurrectione, interea putredine sumus obvoluti: justi pronuntiamur, et habitat in nobis peccatum: audimus nos esse beatos, interea obruimur infinitis miseriis: promittitur bonorum omnium affluentia, proluxe vero esurimus et stimus: clamat Deus statim se nobis adfuturum, sed videtur surdus esse ad clamores nostros. Quid fieri, nisi spei initeremur, ac mens nostra prælucente Dei verbo ac spiritu per medias tenebras supra mundum emerget?" 2.] For (q. d. 'and so high a description of faith is not undeserved, seeing that . . .') The γὰρ does not bring in any proof of the foregoing description, only shews that faith is noble enough to be dignified with the offices just named) in (not, "*by*," merely: but elemental; in the domain, or region, or matter, of: so ἐπαίνεσω ὑμᾶς ἐν τούτῳ, 1 Cor. xi. 22: and "*vituperari in amicitia*," in Cicero (Del.)) this (not αὐτῇ, "*it*:" but more graphic and encomiastic: in this it was, that . . .) the elders (i. e. not merely those who lived before us, but those ancients whom we dignify with the name of elders: cf. Philo de Abrahamo, § 46, vol. ii. p. 39, ὁ γὰρ ἀληθεῖα πρεσβύτερος, οὐκ ἐν μήκει χρόνου, ἀλλ' ἐν ἐπαίνετ' ὧν θεωρεῖται: and Thdrst., τούτεστιν οἱ παλαί γεγεννημένοι, οἱ πρὸ τοῦ νόμου καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ διαλάμπαντες ἄγιοι. Bleek cites Æschin. p. 20. 4, Ὁμήρου, ὃν ἐν τοῖς

τίσθαι τοὺς ^d αἰῶνας ^e ῥήματι θεοῦ, ^f εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ ^g φαινο- ^{d = ch. i. 2 reff. e ch. i. 3. f 2 Cor. xiii. 3. viii. 6. g κόσμος, τὸ τοῦ φαινομένου τοῦδε ἀρχέτυπον,}

προσβυτάτοις καὶ σοφωτάτοις τῶν ποιη-
τῶν εἶναι τάπτομεν. So also οἱ πατέρες,
see Rom. ix. 5: Heb. i. 1) were testified
of (so reff. In this absolute usage, it is
of course implied, that the testimony was
a good one. The usage is principally that
of St. Luke, Acts vi. 3; x. 22; xvi. 2; xxii.
12. There is no need with Bleek and
Lünem. to separate the verb from ἐν ταύτῃ,
and supply after 'hac in fide,' "*constituti*"
or the like: see on the construction above).

3.] The Writer now begins his
series of examples of the power of faith.
But instead of opening them with the
example of our first parents, which he
probably passes over as not sufficiently re-
corded in Scripture, he adduces the great
and primary postulate of faith which has
regard to a fact contemporaneous indeed
with them, and holding this first chrono-
logical place in the series: viz. the creation
of the world itself. By faith (πίστει is
the instrumental dative, nearly = διὰ
πίστεως, with which indeed it is inter-
changed in ver. 33) we perceive (see ref.
Rom., where the verb is used in the same
sense of intellectual perception, τὰ ἀόρατα
of God being the νοούμενα. The world
itself, and the things therein, καθορᾶται
by us: but the fact of its creation by God
νοεῖται, with our rational or spiritual
faculties) the ages (see note on ch. i. 2,
where I have maintained that the expres-
sion οἱ αἰῶνες includes in it all that exists
under the conditions of time and space,
together with those conditions of time and
space themselves, conditions which do not
bind God, and did not exist independently
of Him, but are themselves the work of
His word. Chrys. here replaces τοὺς
αἰῶνας in his paraphrase by τὰ πάντα, the
universe. Since writing the note above
referred to, I have seen Delitzsch's com-
mentary, which strongly maintains the
mere material sense of οἱ αἰῶνες, but not
to me convincingly) to have been framed
(so E. V. for κατηρτίσθαι: and we cannot
perhaps do better. It is rather however,
furnished forth, 'made to be, and to be
what we find them:' see reff. Ps.) by the
word of God (so Philo, in Del., διὰ ῥήμα-
τος τοῦ αἰτίου δ σύμπας κόσμος ἐδημιουργ-
εῖτο. ῥῆμα differs from λόγος, in being
the *spoken word*, the command, as through-
out Gen. i., whereas λόγος may be, as Del.,
the inward shaping of the thing willed,
as well as its outward manifestation. Cf.
Philo de Sacr. Abel et Cain, § 18, vol. i.
p. 175, ὁ γὰρ θεὸς λέγων ἅμα ἐποίησεν μηδὲν
μεταξὺ ἀμφοῖν τιθείς. ῥῆμα must not

here be taken for the personal word: ch.
i. 2 is on a different matter), so that (it
seems necessary here, with almost all
Commentators except Hofmann, Lünem.,
and Delitzsch, to keep to the ecabtic εἰς
τό as against the telic. For even granted
that we have on the whole a good sense
given by the telic,—that God's purpose in
framing the αἰῶνες was that &c. (which I
own I can hardly see), yet there would
be two weighty reasons against admitting
it here: 1. that it would be unnaturally
introduced, because it is not this *purpose*
of God which we apprehend by faith, but
the fact which is supposed to testify to
this purpose: whereas if we take the telic
sense of εἰς τό, we must include the pur-
pose itself in that which we apprehend: 2.
that it does violence to γεγονέναι, which
on that hypothesis ought to have been
some subjective word, not, as it is now,
a mere record of past fact. It would be
philological labour thrown away to shew
that the ecabtic sense of εἰς τό is legiti-
mate. The directive force of εἰς may lie
either in the purpose of the worker, or in
the tendency of the result. Cf. esp. Luke
v. 17) not out of things apparent hath
that which is seen (i. e. the visible world)
been made (the first and chief difficulty
here is in the position of μὴ, and the
conclusion which we are thence to form as
to our rendering. Most of the transla-
tions (Syr., D-lat., "*ut ex non apparenti-
bus*," vulg., "*ut ex invisibilibus*," Erasmus,
Luther, al.) regard it as belonging to
φαινομένων, and render as if it were ἐκ τῶν
μὴ φαινομένων (so Scriv.'s a, a *secunda*
manu). And so likewise Chrys. (ἐξ οὐκ
ὄντων τὰ ὄντα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός), Thdrst.
(ἐξ ὄντων γὰρ δημιουργοῦσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι,
ὁ δὲ τῶν ὄλων θεὸς ἐκ μὴ ὄντων τὰ ὄντα
παρήγαγε), Ec., Thl., Faber Stap., Jac.
Cappell., Estius, Calov., Heinrichs, Valck-
naer, Tholuck, al. And, thus taking the
construction, these render in two differ-
ent ways: 1. take the μὴ φαινόμενα as
things unseen, in contrast to the things
seen; 2. as things non-existent, as con-
trasted with things existent. The former
of these regard the assertion as meaning
that God created the world out of the pre-
viously non-apparent Chaos, the "*Thohu*
wa-Bohu" of Gen. i. 3; the latter as re-
ferring to the creation out of the ideas in
the divine mind, in which (see this ably
argued out in Delitzsch's *Biblische Psy-
chologie*, pp. 23, 24) all creation præ-
existed from eternity. As against both
these views it is asserted positively by

h = John 1. 3. μένων τὸ βλεπόμενον ἡ γεγονέναι. ⁴ Πίστει ¹ πλείονα ADKLP
 ch. iv 3. Gen ii 4. θυσίαν Ἀβελ ^k παρὰ Κάιν ¹ προσήνεγκεν τῷ θεῷ, δι' ἧς efghk
 i = ch. iii 3. Matt ii 25. καὶ 41, 42. Mark xii 33 (Rev. i. 19?) k ch. i 4 reff. i = ch. v 1 reff. 17. 47

CHAP. XI. 3. rec τα βλεπομενα (*change of number to suit φαινόμενον*), with D³KL rel vulg [syrr arm] Chr, [Thdr Damasc]: txt A D¹(and lat) [P]N 17 copt [æth] Clem, Ath, [Chr-2-mss, Euthal-mss].

Lünemaun, and contended by Bleek and De Wette, that such a transposition of the negative particle is altogether impossible. Delitzsch replies that Chrys. and the Greek interpreters who so transposed it, understood their own language: and argues for the admissibility of the transposition, citing such expressions as ἡγουμένων ἀνδρῶν ου τῶν ἀδυνατωτάτων, Thuc. i. 5, and οὐκ ἐπὶ μεγάλοις μεγάλως διεσπουδάζετο, Arrian. Alex. vii. 23. 12, and such opinions as that of Valcknaer here, who calls it “consectam Græcis transpositionem voculæ negantis,” and Rost, § 135. 1, “If a single idea expressed by a noun is to be emphatically denied, which noun is preceded by an article or a preposition, then the particle of negation is put before the article or the preposition.” And certainly it does seem difficult to deny the existence of such cases, and to say with Bleek, that no examples have been given where a μή or οὐ belonging to a participle or adjective is separated from it by a governing preposition: the only apparently applicable instance, 2 Macc. vii. 28, ὅτι οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός, being struck away by the Vatican reading being ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων. Still, if we grant the legitimacy of the inversion in cases of emphatic denial, it will remain for us to consider, whether such inversion is to be assumed here. And, I own, it seems to me quite unnecessary. The ultimate sense is in the main the same in either case; but the straightforward construction of the words gives by far the more apposite expressed meaning. In all that we see with our sense, of re-creation and reproduction, τὸ βλεπόμενον ἐκ φαινομένου γέγονεν. The seed becomes the plant: the grub the moth. But that which is above sight, viz. faith, leads us to apprehend, that this has not been so in the first instance: that the visible world has not been made out of apparent materials. On this acceptance of the construction, we need not interpret φαινόμενα otherwise than according to its plain meaning, things apparent: nor does the text stand committed to the before-mentioned præ-existence, or to any Philonian scheme of creation: being simply a negative proposition).

4.] By faith (see above) Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice

than Cain (not elliptic, for παρὰ τὴν τοῦ Κάιν: but as in reff., ‘than Cain did.’ But how πλείονα θυσίαν? First, there can be no doubt that the adj. must be taken not of quantity, but of quality. So Chrys., τὴν ἐντιμωτέραν λέγει, τὴν λαμπροτέραν, τὴν ἀναγκαιοτέραν: and Thdr. and Thl, τὴν τιμιωτέραν. But how was it so? Our text answers us, πίστει. The more excellence must be looked for then rather in the disposition with which the sacrifice was offered than in the nature of the sacrifice itself. Gregory the Great (cited by Del.) says well, “Omne quod datur Deo, ex dantis mente pensatur; unde scriptum est, ‘Respexit Deus ad Abel et ad munera ejus, ad Cain autem et ad munera ejus non respexit.’ Neque enim sacrum eloquium dicit, respexit ad munera Abel et ad Cain munera non respexit, sed prius ait quia respexit ad Abel, ac deinde subjunxit, ‘et ad munera ejus.’ Idcirco non Abel ex muneribus, sed ex Abel munera oblata placuerunt.” This beyond doubt is the principal ground of the πλείονα. With regard to the sacrifices themselves; with our present knowledge of type and sacrifice, many reasons might be alleged why that of Abel should be more according to God’s will than that of Cain; but none of those reasons can be safely or decisively applied here. That Abel’s consisted of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof—the *first* and *the best*, whereas Cain’s was merely an offering of the fruit of the ground, perfunctory and common-place,—may be a circumstance not without weight in appreciating the term πίστει. That Abel’s was an offering of slain animals, God’s own appointed way, so soon after, of the sinner’s approach to Him, whereas Cain’s was only a gift, as if he could approach God without shedding of blood,—this may also be an important element in the term πίστει. But it would not be safe here to insist on either of these. The difference alleged by Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 141, that Abel brought the flesh of those beasts whose skin had covered his bodily nakedness,—in faith, as an offering imputing the covering of his soul’s nakedness by God’s grace,—is too far-fetched, and too alien from any subsequent typology of sacrifice, to be entertained for a moment), by means of

^m ἐμαρτυρήθη εἶναι ⁿ δίκαιος, μαρτυρούντος ^o ἐπὶ τοῖς ^{m ver 2.}
^p δώροις αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ^q καὶ δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανὼν ἔτι λαλεῖ. ^{n Matt. xxiii.}
⁵ Πίστει Ἐνώχ ^a μετετέθη ^r τοῦ μὴ st ἰδεῖν ^t θάνατον, καὶ ^{o = ch. viii. 1}
 p ch. v. 1 reff. q ch. vii 12 reff. = Gen. v. 24. Wisd. iv 10. Sir. xlv. 16. r ch. x.
 7, 9 reff. s = Acts ii 27, from Ps. xv. 10. t Luke ii. 26 John viii. 51. see
 Ps. lxxviii, 48.

4. for του θεου, τω θεω AD¹N¹ 17 [Euthal-ms¹]: txt D³KL[P]N rel vulg syrr copt
 [arm Clem₁ Chr Euthal-ms² Thdrt Damasc]. δια ταυτης D¹. rec λαλειται
 (perhaps a change to a more obvious meaning, 'is spoken of': perhaps, with Bloomf,
 though not very prob, a mistake of the scribes by reason of a flourish after the ει.
 See note), with DKL rel harl [æth] Thdrt (but see note) Ec: txt A[P]N² a 17 [47]
 vulg syrr copt [arm] Clem₁ Orig₁ Ath₁ Chr₁ [Euthal-ms] Primas.

which (viz. which *faith*, not, which *sacrifice*, as Cramer: δι' ἧς must apply to the same as δι' αὐτῆς below, and that surely can refer to nothing but the πίστις which is the great leading idea of the chapter) he was testified (see above, ver. 2) to be righteous (when? by whom? not, by our Saviour, nor by St. John (reff.), though in both places such testimony is borne to him: but as explained in the next clause, at the time of his sacrifice, and by God Himself), God bearing testimony upon (in regard to: the same prep. and case, as in Gen. iv. 4, καὶ ἐπέειπεν ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ Ἀβὲλ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δώροις αὐτοῦ) his gifts (of what kind this testimony was, there can be little doubt. Theodotion's rendering, καὶ ἐνεπύρισεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός, though wrong as a rendering, is probably right in fact. Cf. Exod. xiv. 24: 1 Kings xviii. 24, 38. Chrys. refers to this rendering, but erroneously attributes it to the Syr.: Thl. says, λέγεται δὲ ὅτι καὶ πῦρ κατελθὼν ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀνήλωσε τὴν θυσιαν, καὶ ἐκ τούτου καὶ ὁ Καὶν ἐπέγνω ὅτι προετιμήθη ὁ Ἀβὲλ. πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως; διὰ καὶ τις τῶν μεταθεμένων τὴν Ἐβραϊδα εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν οὕτως ἔθηκεν, Ἐπέβλεπεν ἐπὶ τὰς θυσίας Ἀβὲλ ὁ κύριος καὶ ἐνέπρησε. Ec. also mentions the report); and by means of it (his faith, again, not, as Ec., al., his sacrifice: see above) having died (join together, not δι' αὐτῆς ἀποθανόν, as Ec., πρόφασιν γὰρ αὐτῷ γέγονεν ἡ θυσία σφαγῆς, but δι' αὐτῆς λαλεῖ: see below) he yet speaketh (viz. as interpreted by the parallel place, ch. xii. 24, where it is said of the αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, that it κρεῖττον λαλεῖ παρὰ τὸν Ἀβὲλ,—by means of his blood, of which it is said by God in Gen. iv. 10, φωνῇ αἵματος τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου βοᾷ πρὸς με ἐκ τῆς γῆς. So Th. Aquinas, Galen, Ribera, Jac. Cappell, Grot., Erasmus, al., Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Ebrard, Delitzsch. The interpretation of λαλεῖ (and of λαλεῖται, so that no safe inference can be gathered as to the reading from the fact of this interpretation) has usually been as in Chrys., πῶς ἔτι λαλεῖ; τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ ζῆν σημείον

ἔστιν καὶ τοῦ παρὰ πάντων ᾗδεσθαι θαυμάζεσθαι καὶ μακαρίζεσθαι (see also below): Thdrt., τὸ δὲ ἔτι λαλεῖ, ἀντὶ τοῦ αἰδιμὸς ἐστὶ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος καὶ πολυθρύλλητος, καὶ παρὰ πάντων εὐφημεῖται τῶν εὐσεβῶν: Ec., λαλεῖ δὲ τῇ φήμῃ, τῇ δόξῃ, τῇ μνήμῃ: Thl., δοξάζομενος, μνημονευόμενος λαλεῖ, ὥς καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς λαλεῖ δρώμενος μόνον. Probably the change to the passive has been due to this interpretation, that voice seeming more naturally to express it. Some of those who read λαλεῖ, have taken it in the sense of "speaks to us to follow his example." So Chrys. in the next words to those quoted above: ὁ γὰρ παραινῶν τοῖς ἔλλοις δικαίοις εἶναι, λαλεῖ: Thl., ἡ πίστις αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν ἔτι ζῆν καὶ διδάσκαλον καθίστασθαι πᾶσι, λαλοῦντα μονοουχὶ Μιμήσασθέ με κ.τ.λ.: Corn. a-Lapide,—joining however the two,—“Pietas, martyrium et memoria adhuc recens est et celebratur apud omnes fideles eosque ad sui imitationem exhortatur melius quam si Abel mille linguis eos exhortaretur.” Valckenae, Kuinoel, al. And perhaps Stuart may be partly right, who, recognizing the allusion to Gen. iv. 10, says, “The form of expression only in our verse seems to be borrowed from Gen. iv. 10; for here it is the *faith* of Abel which makes him speak after his death; viz. to those who should come after him, exhorting and encouraging them to follow his example.” I say *partly* right, for however this may be in the background, the cry of his blood is obviously primary in the Writer's thought, from ch. xii. 24, where the voice of Abel is contrasted with that of the Christian blood of sprinkling. Calvin and Delitzsch appear to have exactly hit the right point, in saying, “Porro singulare divini erga eum amoris hoc testimonium fuit, quod Deus curam habuit mortui: atque inde patet reputari inter Dei sanctos, quorum mors illi pretiosa est”). 5, 6.] The example of Enoch: and axiomatic declaration upon it. 5.] By faith (πῶς δὲ πίστει μετετέθη; ὅτι τῆς μεταθέσεως ἡ εὐαρέστησις αἰτία, τῆς δὲ εὐαρέστησεως ἡ πίστις. Chrys.)

οὐχ ἠύρισκετο, διότι ^a μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. πρὸ γὰρ ADKLP
8 a b c d
e f g h k
l m n o
17. 47
τῆς ^u μεταθέσεως ^m μεμαρτύρηται ^v εὐαρεσθήκεναι τῷ θεῷ.
⁶ χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον ^v εὐαρεσθῆσαι πιστεῦσαι γὰρ
δεῖ τὸν ^w προσερχόμενον τῷ θεῷ, ὅτι ἐστίν, καὶ τοῖς ^z ἐκ-
ζητοῦσιν αὐτὸν ^y μισθαποδότης γίνεταί. ⁷ Πίστει ^z χρη-
ματισθεὶς Νῶε περὶ τῶν ^a μηδέπω βλεπομένων ^b εὐλαβηθεὶς
^c κατεσκεύασεν ^d κιβωτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ,
^e from Amos ix. 12. ^f here only +. (-δοσία, ch. ii 2) ^g here only
11. Rom. iii. 2 ^h here (Acts xxiii. 10 v. r.) only. ⁱ Prov. xxx. (see xxiii. 5) Deut. ii. 4.
b here (Acts xxiii. 10 v. r.) only. ^j 1 Pet. iii. 2, 6. ^k 1 Pet. iii. 20 only. ^l Num. xxi. 27.
17. ch. iii. 3, 4 bis ix 2, 6. ^m Luke xxi. 27 (ch. ix. 4. Rev. xi 19) only. ⁿ GEN. vi 14 al.
38. Luke xxi. 27 (ch. ix. 4. Rev. xi 19) only. ^o GEN. vi 14 al.

5. (ἠύρισκ., so ADN.) for διότι, ὅτι N¹. μετετέθηκεν D²⁻³ L^N d [Euthal.ms].
rec aft μεταθέσεως ins αυτου, with D³ K L N³ rel syr [(Syr) arm Chr, Thdrst
Damasc]: oft AD¹ [P] N¹ 17 [47] latt copt [Euthal.ms]. (εὐαρεσθηκεναι, so AKL
o 17 [47] Thl.)

6. om τω D² N¹ [k] 17.

Enoch was translated, not to see death (cf. LXX, Gen. v. 24, after which this verse is framed: καὶ εὐηρέστησεν Ἐνὼχ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ οὐχ εὐρίσκειτο θῆτι (ἠὺρ, διότι Α) μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός. μετετέθη, as in reff., by a sudden disappearance from this earth: οὐχ ἠύρισκετο, cf. the similar expression of Livy i. 16, in relating the supposed disappearance of Romulus in the storm, "nec deinde in terris Romulus fuit." This translation was hardly, as Calvin, "mors quædam extraordinaria," though he means this in no rationalistic sense, as is plain from his accompanying remarks:—but rather a change which passed upon him altogether without death, from corruptibility to incorruptibility, from the natural body to the spiritual. The τοῦ μὴ ἰδεῖν is purpose and purport in one. The construction, after a sentence and in relation to it, is said by Winer, § 44. 4. b, to be chiefly familiar, in the N. T., to St. Luke and St. Paul. See reff.), and was not found (see above), because God translated him. For before his translation a testimony is given to him (the perfect implies the continued existence of the testimony in the text of Scripture) that he hath pleased God (on εὐηρ. and εὐαρ. see Winer, § 12. 3. b. The temporal augment, usual after εὐ- and δυσ-, is omitted in the κοινὴ διάλεκτος): 6.] but apart from faith it is impossible (it is a general axiom, not a mere assertion regarding Enoch; if it were, we should expect ἀδύνατον (ἦν) αὐτῷ) to please (him, as is evident) at all (this sense of doing a single act well pleasing to God, is given by the aorist: cf. Rom. viii. 8, οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρεῖσαι οὐ δύνανται. The aor. expresses simply the verbal idea without reference to time; and therefore when in a negative sentence gives the exclusive meaning 'at any time,' 'at all'):

for it behoves him that cometh to God (Luther, al. render, "him that will come:"); but it is much more probable that ὁ προσερχόμενος is the habitual, official present—'the comer to God.' For the expression, see reff. It is that approach which is elsewhere designated ἐγγίζειν τῷ θ., ch. vii. 19,—for the purposes of worship or of communion, or of trust, or service generally) to believe (aor., not πιστεύειν, because it is not here the state in which the comer is at his coming, but the state which has originated his coming, of which that coming is the fruit, which is insisted on) that He is (exists: his faith being to him thus a πράγματος ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένου), and becomes (is eventually: 'evadit') a renderer of reward (ch. ii. 2) to them that seek Him out (ἐκζητέω, more than ζητέω, as 'exoro' than 'oro.' Thus his faith is also to him an ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις: God's existence is realized to him by it, and by it his future reward assured). 7.] Example of NOAH. Gen. vi. 8 ff. By faith, Noah, having been warned (viz. by God, Gen. vi. 13 ff. On the word, see note ch. viii. 5) concerning the things not yet seen (these words belong to χρηματισθεὶς, not to εὐλαβηθεὶς, as Erasmus (vers.) and Grotius. The latter asserts that εὐλαβεῖσθαι περὶ τιμος occurs in Plato; but the passage appears to be Legg. xi. p. 927 C, εὐλαβούμενον περὶ τροφήν τε καὶ παιδείαν ὀφθανῶν, and it is asserted by others that εὐλαβεῖσθαι περὶ τιμος is not found. Still it might surely be legitimate: we have εὐλαβεῖσθαι ἀμφὶ τινι in Lucian, Gall. 21. But the other arrangement is more rhythmical, and more obvious), taking forethought (see, on ch. v. 7, the distinction made by the Stoics, Diog. Laert. vii. 63: φοβηθήσεσθαι μὲν τὸν σοφὸν οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ' εὐλαβηθήσεσθαι εὐλάβειαν εἶναι

δι' ἧς ^ε κατέκρινεν τὸν ^ι κόσμον, καὶ ^ε τῆς ^ε κατὰ πίστιν ^ε = Matt. xii. 41, 42 || L.
^ε δικαιοσύνης ἐγένετο ^ι κληρονόμος. ^ε Πίστει ^ι καλούμενος ^ε = ver 38.
 27. 2 Pet. ii 5. elsw., John passim. ^ε κατὰ, here only. ^ε κ., Rom. x. 6. διὰ, & ἐπὶ, w. dat.,
 Phil. iii. 9. simple gen. & Rom. iv. 11, 13. h ch. i 2 reff. i ch. v. 4 reff. James i.

8. ins o bef καλουμενος AD¹ 17 arm Thdrt, qui vocatur latt.

ἐναντίαν τῷ φόβῳ, ὅσαν εὐλογον ἔκκλιν. Many interpret it, "fearing God," understanding θεόν: and most, "fearing," but the above distinction is important) prepared (so 1 Pet. iii. 20; the LXX in Gen. vi. 15 have ποιεῖν) the ark (not "an ark:" see 1 Pet. i. c. The word κιβωτός had become appropriated to the well-known ark, and so was used anarthrously) for the preservation of his house (cf. Philo de Abr. § 8, vol. ii. p. 8, *μόνος δὲ εἰς οἶκος, ὁ τοῦ λεχθέντος ἀνδρὸς δικαίου καὶ θεοφιλοῦς, διασώζεται*); by means of which (to what does ἧς refer? to σωτηρίαν, to κιβωτόν, or to πίστει? Certainly not to the former: for thus Noah's σωτηρία would be the inheriting of the righteousness which is by faith. Possibly, to κιβωτόν (so Chrys., Ec., Thl., Faber Stap., Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappell., Grot., Carpzov, Cramer, Michaelis, Bisping, al.); for it was by the building of it that he condemned the world in its unbelief, and by it that in some sense, as the manifested result of his faith, he became heir of the righteousness which is by faith. But it must be confessed that this latter part of the interpretation halts considerably. And on this account as well as on account of its inadequacy to the spirit of the passage, I do not hesitate, with Primas., Thomas Aquin., Luther, Cnjetan, Justiniani, Wolf, Bengel, and most of the recent Commentators, to prefer *πίστει* as the antecedent: "by which faith," as above on δι' αὐτῆς, ver. 4. It is true, that *πίστει* here is somewhat far off; but it is the burden of the chapter, and continually before the Writer's mind, and it was by his *faith*, rather than by the results of that faith that he κατέκρινεν κ.τ.λ., and κληρ. ἐγένετο κ.τ.λ.) he condemned (κατέκρινεν may be either imperfect, he condemned, while building the ark, the unbelieving world around,—or aor., he once for all condemned the unbelieving then, and in them, the world, which lies in unbelief. Better perhaps the latter. On the sense, Limborch says, "Et ille dicitur aliquem damnare, qui suo facto ostendit quid alterum oportuerit facere, et, quia non fecit, illum criminis commissi convincit, ac propterea juste puniri." See a like use in reff.) the world (reff.), and became heir of the righteousness which is according to faith (Noah is the first in Scripture

who is called *δικαίος*, πῖς, Gen. vi. 9, as Philo, *πρῶτος οὗτος δίκαιος ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἀνεβρῆθη γραφαῖς*, Congr. Erud. Grat. § 17, vol. i. p. 532. Elsewhere Philo interprets the name itself of Noah thus: *ἐρμηνεύεται γὰρ Νῶε ἀνάπανσις ἢ δίκαιος*, Leg. Alleg. iii. 24, p. 102: *ὅς Ἑβραίων μὲν γλῶττι καλεῖται Νῶε, τῇ δὲ Ἑλλήνων ἀνάπανσις ἢ δίκαιος*, De Abr. 5, vol. ii. p. 5. See also Ezek. xiv. 14, 20, where he is named together with Daniel and Job as an example of *δικαιοσύνη*: and Wisd. x. 4, 6: Sir. xlv. 17: 2 Pet. ii. 5; where he is called *κῆρυξ δικαιοσύνης*. And this righteousness, which is matter of history in the O. T., our Writer refers to his faith as its measure. So Calvin, "Moses refert illum fuisse justum: causam et radicem hujus justitiæ fidem fuisse, quia ille historice non refert, ex re ipsa apostolus testatur." This *δικαιοσύνη κατὰ πίστιν* seems to be altogether in St. Paul's sense, the righteousness which is by faith, Rom. iv. 13, though the expression itself is foreign to St. Paul. The *κληρονόμος* idea is also according to St. Paul. It should be noticed that the whole expression is used, in an Epistle in which righteousness by faith forms no part of the main subject, as one familiar and well known to the readers).

8—22.] Thus far the examples have been taken from the antediluvian world. Next, he takes them from the patriarchs of Israel; with whom *the promise* was ever the object of faith: a *land*, in which they were strangers: a son, who was not yet born: a people, who were yet to be.

8.] ABRAHAM'S example. By faith Abraham, being called (viz. by God, Gen. xii. 1 ff. With the art. (see var. read.), *ὁ καλούμενος Ἀβραάμ* can hardly mean any thing but 'he that was called, named, Abraham.' And the sense thus would be very good,—whatever Bleek and Delitzsch have said against it,—when we take into account the meaning of the name Abraham, the father of nations. That this change of name did not take place till 25 years after his removal from Haran, is no objection, but is just what would be the point raised: 'By faith, he who was (afterwards) called Abraham, father of nations' &c. Lünemann's rendering of *ὁ καλούμενος*, "he that was called by God," hardly requires refutation. But on the whole, I adhere to the rec. text.

κ ch v 9
 Matt. viii.
 27 i Rom
 vi. 12 &c
 1 Pet iii. 6
 w. inf., here
 only see
 note
 1 = Matt. viii
 4 al fr
 m elsw., = John
 (in 6 al fr
 1 John ii 11)
 only.
 n pres., John
 i. 40 Acts iv 13 ix 26 Gal ii 14 ver 13. 1 Macc. vi 9. Winer, § 40 2 c
 18 only. Gen. xviii. 8. xx 1 xxi. 23, 34 xiv. 37. xxi. 3. xxxi. 27 Exod. vi. 4 (-κος, Gen. xxii. 4 -κους,
 ib xxviii 4) p constr., Mark 1 39 al fi q so χρόνος τ. ἐπ., Acts vii 17 r Acts
 vii. 6 Luke xii. 12. Ps. cxi. 11. s Acts xi. 29 2 Kings xi. 11 t Rom. viii 17. r Acts
 .ii. 6 1 Pet iii. 7 only t. (μεν, Sir. xxi. 26) u so ch. vi. 17. t Acts xiii 16 1 Cor. xi.
 33. xxi. 11. ch. x 13. James v. 7 only t. Gen. xliii. 9 al. w Rev. xxi. 14, 19. P's lxxxi. 1.

εις τοπον bef εξελθ. D latt. rec ins τον bef τοπον (in ignorance of the usage of
 a prep), with D³KL^N3 rel [arm] Chr Thdrt Damasc: om AD¹[P]N¹ 17 [Euthal-ms].
 rec ημελλεν, with D³L[P]N Euthal-ms] Thdrt Ec: txt A[Woide] D¹K Chr
 Damasc Thl. εις κληρ. bef λαμβ. N¹.—om εις N¹ (insd by origl scribe or N-corr¹).
 9. for πιστει, και D¹ (and lat). aft παρωκ. ins αβρααμ D³[P] m o. rec ins
 την bef γην, with D¹3 rel Chr Thdrt Thl: om AD²KL[P]N¹ b¹ c d e g h k 17 [47
 Euthal-ms] Damasc Ec. συνκληρονομων ADN 17. for της αυτης, αυτου D¹
 38: αυτων æth: om της N¹: αυτης bef επαγγ. N-corr¹.

The manuscript evidence is strong for the other, but not overwhelming; and the comparison of *πιστει χρηματισθεis* N¹æ with *πιστει καλούμενος* 'Αβραάμ gives great support to the rec. In fairness it should be said, as Del. points out, that (δ) καλούμενος, appended to names, is exceedingly common with St. Luke (Luke i. 36; vi. 15; vii. 11; viii. 2; x. 39, &c.), and, as he also remarks, it may appear that Clem. rom. read and understood this "he that was called Abraham," for he says, 'Αβραάμ δ φίλος προσαγορευθεὶς πιστὸς ἐρέθη ἐν τῷ αὐτὸν ὑπήκουον γενέσθαι τοῖς ῥήμασι τοῦ θεοῦ. Of the Greek Commentators, Thdrt. says, τὸ δ καλούμενος 'Αβραάμ, διὰ τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος ἐναλλαγὴν εἰρηκεν: Ec., θεοῦ καλοῦντος ὑπήκουσε, πιστεύσας ὅτι ἐπ' ἀγαθῷ καλεῖ: Thl., πιστει ὑπήκουσεν 'Αβραάμ, κελευόμενος ἀφείναι τὴν πατρίδα) obeyed to go out (the infin. is epeexegetic, explaining *wherewith* he obeyed. Cf. Rev. xvi. 9: Col. i. 22, &c. Winer, § 44. 1) to a (or, 'the,' even without τόν, after a preposition) place which he was hereafter to receive for an inheritance (not that he was conscious even of this promise when he went out, for it was made to him afterwards in Canaan, see Gen. xii. 7), and went out, not knowing where (whither) he was (is) going (coming). The indic. *ἔρχεται* is perfectly normal, a matter of fact, not one of possibility only, being in question. Cf. *εἶδον τοῦ μὲν*, ref. John: *ἐπίστασθε* . . . *πῶς μεθ' ὧν ἐγενόμην*, Acts xx. 18. But οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ, Matt. viii. 20, when the matter is one of mere possibility. See Winer, § 41. 4).
 9.] By faith he sojourned (*παροικεῖν*

in classical Greek signifies to dwell in the neighbourhood of, and is followed by a dative: so Thuc. iii. 93, φοβοῦμενοι μὴ σφισι μεγάλη ἰσχυὶ παροικῶσιν. Isocrates uses it in the sense of "to dwell alongside of," with another reference, and an accus.: ἀπὸ Κνίδου μέχρι Ξινόπτης Ἑλληνας τὴν Ἀσίαν παροικοῦσι, p. 74. But the Hellenistic sense is, to dwell as a stranger, to sojourn only. So LXX in ref.: so Philo, Quis Rer. Div. Hær. § 54, vol. i. p. 511, τῷ φιλαρέτῳ κατοικεῖν οὐ δίδωσιν δ θεός, ὥς ἐν οἰκείᾳ γῇ, τῷ σώματι, ἀλλὰ παροικεῖν ὥς ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ μόνον ἐπιτρέπει χώρα. And Confus. Ling. § 17, p. 416, κατῴκησαν ὥς ἐν πατρίδι, οὐχ ὥς ἐπὶ ξένης παρῳκήσαν) in (pregnant construction, as often in St. Luke, see Acts vii. 4; viii. 40; xii. 19; xviii. 21: Luke xi. 7: he went into the land and sojourned there) the land (γῇ is one of those words which very commonly drop the article, especially when in government) of the promise (concerning which the promise, Gen. xii. 7, had been given) as a stranger's (as if it did not belong to him, but to another: see ref. Acts, which is strictly parallel, and cf. γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ, Gen. xv. 13), dwelling (the aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. before) in tents (cf. Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 3; xviii. 1 fl. ὅπερ τῶν ξένων ἐστὶ, τῶν ἄλλοτε εἰς ἄλλο μέρος μεταβαίνοντων διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τι ἴδιον. Thl.) with Isaac and Jacob (Thl., Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Griesb., Lachm., al. join these words with *παρῳκήσεν* above. But they more naturally belong to ἐν σκηναῖς κατοικήσας, which has just preceded: for otherwise we should expect *ἐξεδέχοντο* in ver. 10) the heirs with him of the same promise (της ἐπ. της αὐτης, as

σαν ^x πόλιν, ἥς ^y τεχνίτης καὶ ^z δημιουργὸς ὁ θεός. ^x ch. xiii. 14, ^y Acts xix. 24, 38 Rev. ^z viii. 22 only. = Wisd. 11 Πίστις καὶ αὐτὴ Σάβρα δύναμιν εἰς ^a καταβολὴν ^b σπέρ-
^{xiii. 1.} ^{x. 2.} ^z here only† ^{2 Macc. iv. 1.} = Xen Mem. i. 4. 7. Philo, passim. (^{-γενν.} 2 Macc
^{only.} Num. v. 13. ^a = ch. iv. 3 ix 26 (see note)†. (^{2 Macc ii. 29 only}) ^b = here

11. aft *sarra* ins η *στειρα* D² m [Euthal-ms]; *στειρα* D¹ (and lat) vulg; *στειρα ουσα* [P 47] f syrr coptt [æth arm Thl].

ποιμένες ἦσαν ἐν τῇ χάρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ, Luke ii. 8; the only other place where this arrangement is found. What is implied is, not so much that the promise was renewed to them, as that all three waited for the performance of the same promise, and in this waiting, built themselves no permanent abode): 10.] for (reason of his παροιμία in the land of promise as in a strange land) he waited for (the prep. in ἐκδέχομαι, as in ἐκζητέω above, ver. 6, intensifies the expectation) the city which has the foundations (beyond doubt, the heavenly city, the *ἑνω Ἱερουσαλήμ*, thus contrasted with the frail and moveable tents in which the patriarchs dwelt. Delitzsch shews that the idea was an Old Testament one; and no other interpretation will suit the language here used. The πόλις θεοῦ ζώντος of ch. xii. 22, and the μέλλουσα πόλις of ch. xiii. 14, must be here meant also. Of the earthly Jerusalem indeed it is said, ref. Ps., οἱ θεμέλιοι αὐτοῦ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τοῖς ἁγίοις: but it is impossible that the earthly Jerusalem can be meant here. The lives of the dwellers in her rather corresponded to the precarious dwelling in tents than to the abiding in a permanent city: and the true reference of τοὺς θεμελίους ἔχουσα is to be found in ref. Rev., τὸ τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως ἔχων θεμελίου δώδεκα. As having these foundations, it forms a contrast to the tent, placed on the ground, and easily transported. Ebrard objects to this view, that it is unhistoric to say that the patriarchs looked for the heavenly city: but Del. well answers, that it is not the mere historic question, what they knew and expected, with which our Writer is concerned, but the question what it was that their faith, breaking through this knowledge in its yearnings for the future, framed to itself as matter of hope. The expectation of the literal fulfilment of a promise is one thing: the hopes and prospects and surmises built upon the character of that promise, another. The one is mere belief: the other is faith), of which the architect and master-builder is God (very similarly, ch. viii. 2, ἡν ἐπηξεν ὁ κύριος, οὐκ ἄνθρωπος: cf. also ver. 16 below. τεχνίτης, so ref. Wisd., οὕτε τοῖς ἔργοις προσσχόντες ἐπέγνωνσαν τὸν τεχνίτην. And Philo, Leg. Alleg. i. 7, vol. i. p. 47, οὐ τεχνίτης μόνον

ἀλλὰ καὶ πατὴρ ὢν τῶν γιγνομένων: De Mut. Nom. § 4, p. 588, ὁ γεννήσας καὶ τεχνιτεύσας πατήρ: ib. (of men), δημιουργία τοῦ τῶν καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν μόνου τεχνίτου. In Xen. Mem. i. 4. 7, it is said of the world, πᾶν ἔοικε ταῦτα σοφοῦ τινος δημιουργοῦ καὶ φιλοζώου τεχνήματι: and Plato, Tim. § 9, calls God δημιουργὸν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τεκταίνοντον αὐτόν. See Wetst.). 11.] Example of SARAH, whose faith worked with that of Abraham to produce Isaac. By faith Sarah herself also (the καὶ αὐτῇ has been very variously interpreted. "Even S. who before was barren," says Schlichting: and to this view perhaps the gloss *στείρα*, or *ἡ στείρα*, or *στείρα οἶσα*, is owing (see digest): Chrys. says, ἐντρεπτικῶς ἐνταῦθα ἡρέατο, εἰ γε γυναικὸς ὀλιγοφύχουτεροι φανείην: and similarly Thl., Ec., al.: Bleek says, "even S. who was once incredulous;" and so De W., Winer, Lünem. But I believe Delitzsch is perfectly right in rejecting all these and falling back on St. Luke's usage of αὐτὸς and καὶ αὐτὸς, which is very frequent, as Winer remarks, § 22. 4, Remark: see Luke xx. 42, καὶ αὐτὸς Δαυεὶδ: xxiv. 15, καὶ αὐτὸς Ἰησοῦς: Acts viii. 13, ὁ δὲ Σίμων καὶ αὐτὸς: and especially καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάκοντα ἀρχόμενος, Luke iii. 23: from which it appears that the words merely indicate transition from one personal subject to another, the new subject being thus thrown out into prominence) received power for (δύναμις εἰς is an expression of St. Luke's, Luke v. 17, δύναμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰάσθαι αὐτόν: the preposition indicating the direction in which the power is exercised) the deposition of seed (power, to fructify seed deposited. So Ec., ἐνεδυναμώθη εἰς τὸ ὑποδέξασθαι παιδοποιῶν σπέρμα. I am satisfied that this and no other is the meaning, from the fact that the expression is one so constantly used in this sense, and that the Greek reader would be sure thus to take it. No Greek Father, no ancient version, dreamt of any other meaning. So Chrys., εἰς τὸ κατασχεῖν τὸ σπέρμα, εἰς ὑποδοχὴν δύναμιν ἔλαβεν. Thl., τουτέστιν, ἐνεδυναμώθη εἰς τὸ ὑποδέξασθαι καὶ κρατῆσαι τὸ καταβληθὲν εἰς αὐτὴν σπέρμα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ (giving another alt., dependent on the idea τὴν γυναικα οἶόν τι σπέρμα ἀφ' ἐαυτῆς συνεισάγειν and

c = 2 Cor. viii. 3. **ματος** ἔλαβεν καὶ ὁ παρὰ καιρὸν ἡλικίας, ἐπεὶ πιστὸν **ADKLP**
 d = Matt vi. 27. Luke 11:52 αὐτὸν ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγελίαμενον. ¹² εἰς διὸ καὶ ἀφ' ἡ ἐνός **h a b e d**
 25 (αὐτὸν) ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγελίαμενον, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα **e f g h k**
 25 (αὐτὸν) ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγελίαμενον, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα **l m n o**
 25 (αὐτὸν) ἡγήσατο τὸν ἐπαγγελίαμενον, καθὼς τὰ ἄστρα **17. 47**
 τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῷ πλήθει, καὶ ὡς ἡ ἄμμος ἡ παρὰ τὸ
 χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης ἡ ἀναριθμητος. ¹³ Κατὰ πίστιν
 γύναον τὴν ἡλικίαν ἥδη προβεβηκόσιν. ^{e ch. x 23 (reff.)} ^{f ch x 20 reff} ^{g ch.}
 11:52 ff. ^{h ch.} ^{i Rom. iv 19} ^{j Col iii. 5 only} ^{k Rom. iv 19} ^{l Matt vii. 26} ^{m Rom.}
 k Luke xxi 25. Acts vii. 43 (from Amos v 26) xxvii 20 only. ^{n here only} ^{o (h xii 15 al.)} ^{p Judg vii.}
 12 al. Rev. xii 18 xvi 5 only. ^{q Job xxi 33.} ^{r Prov.}
 12 al. Herod. i. 180 al. "labium fossae." ^{s Lxx. xxvii. 37.}
 vii. 26. ^{t ver 7.}

aft ελαβεν ins eis το τεκνωσαι D¹ m: simly syr.

[om 2nd και D¹-gr sah].

rec aft ηλικίας ins ετεκεν, with D³KL[P]^N3 rel syrr [arm Chr₁ Thdrt Damase]: om AD^N1 17 latt coptt aeth Chr-ms [Euthal-uns].

12. rec εγεννηθησαν, with D²3 LN Chr Thdrt Damase Thl: txt AD¹K[P 17 Euthal-
 ms]. rec (for ως ἡ) ωσει, with (c, e sil) [Chr₁ Euthal-uns Thdrt]: txt ADKL[P]^N
 rel [Chr-ms Thl.—καθως η D¹ n]. om η παρα το χειλος D¹(and lat) aeth[Tischd^f].

interpreting the καταβολή of herself). Thdrt., ἀπηγόρευσε γὰρ τὸν τόκον οὐ μόνον τὸ γήρας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς μήτρας ἡ πῆρσις. With regard to the phrase, see numerous examples in Wetst. and Bleek. Galen has, among many other passages, τὸ τοῦ ἄρρενος σπέρμα τὸ καταβαλλόμενον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τοῦ θήλεως. But this is objected to by several modern Commentators, Böhme, Stier, Bleek, De Wette, Lunem., who take καταβολή as in καταβολή κόσμου, and σπέρμα the seed which should descend from her, her posterity, as in Gen. xii. 7 al. freq., and in ver. 18 and ch. ii. 16 of our Epistle. Of this meaning instances are not wanting, but all of them derive that sense from the other, and it is hardly possible, though such expressions as καταβολή Ρωμύλου (Plut. de Fort. Rom. p. 320), γένων ἄρχαι καὶ καταβολαί (Plut. Vita Marc. Anton. p. 932) may occur, where the context makes it plain what is meant, that such an one as καταβολή σπέρματος should occur, so calculated to mislead, if both words had been intended in an unusual and metaphorical sense), and that (see Hartung, Partikellehre i. 145. His most apposite instances are in Latin: c. g. Plaut. Rud. i. 2. 33, "dabitur opera, atque in negotio:" Terent. Andr. ii. 1. 37, "ego vero, ac lubens") beyond (in inconsistency with, contrary to the law of) the time of age (proper for the καταβολή σπέρματος. So Abraham and Sarah are called υπερήλικες in Philo de Abr. § 22, vol. ii. p. 17: ἥδη γὰρ υπερήλικες γεγονότες διὰ μακρὸν γήρας ἀπέγνωσαν παιδὸς σποράν. And Plato, Theæt. p. 149 c, has τοὺς δι' ἡλικίαν ἀτόκοις προσέταξε), seeing that she esteemed Him faithful who had promised (see ref.). 12.] *Wonderful result of this faith of Abraham and Sarah.* Wherefore also (δὲ καί, which occurs again ch. xiii. 12, is frequent in St. Luke

and St. Paul, see reff.) from one sprung there (the reading is doubtful, but ἐγεν. ἀπό seems to suit better the father, whereas ἐγενν. ἀπό, these were born from,' would almost necessarily be said of the mother) and that (there is no foundation for Lunemann's notion, that the plur. ταῦτα has reference to the two circumstances, the deadness of Abraham and the unbelief of Sarah: ταῦτα in such sentences is perpetually the collective plural, = τοῦτο. Cf. Kuhner, Gram. § 667 c, who gives as examples, Plato, Rep. iii. p. 404 B, "Ὀμηρος . . . ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἡρώων ἐστιασίαις οὐτε ἰχθύων αὐτοὺς ἐστία, καὶ ταῦτα ἐπὶ θαλάττῃ τῇ Ἑλληνισπόντῃ ὕψτας: Demosth. c. Phorm. Extr., θανάτῳ ζημιώσαντες εἰσαγγελέντα ἐν τῇ δῆμῳ, καὶ ταῦτα πολλὴν ὑμέτερον ὄντα, "quamvis civis vester esset") (from one) deadened (past that vital power which nature requires: see ref. Rom.) even as (it may be asked what is the subject to ἐγενήθησαν? Some supply τέκνα or ἐκγονοί, see Winer, § 64. 3: but it is better to make the whole, καθὼς to the end, the virtual subject, latent in καθὼς = ὁμοιωμένοι τοῖς ἀστρ. κ.τ.λ.) the stars of the heaven in multitude, and as the sand which is by the lip (margin, cf. παρὰ χεῖλος ἑκατέρου τοῦ ποταμοῦ in ref. Herod. and Polyb. v. 14. 6; iii. 43. 8 al. fr. in index) of the sea which is innumerable (so ran the promises to Abraham, Gen. xiii. 16, καὶ ποιήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τὴν ἔμμου τῆς γῆς: Gen. xv. 5, ἀνάβλεψον δὴ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἀριθμήσου τοὺς ἀστέρας, εἰ δυνήσῃ ἐξαριθμῆσαι αὐτούς: καὶ εἶπεν, Οὕτως ἔσται τὸ σπέρμα σου: and more fully Gen. xxii. 17, πληθύνων πληθυνῶ τὸ σπέρμα σου ὡς τοὺς ἀστέρας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ὡς τὴν ἔμμου τὴν παρὰ τὸ χεῖλος τῆς θαλάσσης. The comparison with the sand as indicating great number is frequently found in the

ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ ῥαβόντες τὰς ῥα ἐπαγγελίας, ἡ ch ix 15.
 ἀλλὰ ῥα πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ῥα ἀσπασάμενοι, ῥα plur. ch xi.
 ῥα ὁμολογήσαντες ῥα ὅτι ῥα ξένου καὶ ῥα παρεπίδημοί ῥα εἰσιν ἐπὶ ῥa Luke xvii. 12
 τῆς γῆς. 14 οἱ γὰρ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες ῥα ἐμφανίζουσιν ὅτι only
 ῥα πατρίδα ῥα ἐπιζητοῦσιν. 15 καὶ εἰ μὲν ἐκεῖνης ῥα ἐμνημόνεον only
 note. tconstr., John i. 20 1 John iv. 15 (Acts xxiv. 14) only.
 35, &c Acts xvii 21. Eph ii 19. 3 John 5 only. 2 Kings xv. 19.
 11 only. Gen. xliii. 4. Psal xxxviii. 14. w pres., ver 8 reff.
 y elsw, Gospd (Matt xiii. 54, 57 ἡ Mk. L. John iv. 44) only. Esth. ii. 10.
 39. Acts xii 19. Phil. iv. 17 al 1 Kings xx. 1. a = Acts xx. 35 al 1 Chron. xii. 15.

13. for λαβόντες, προσδεξαμένοι (see note) Δ: κομισαμένοι (see ver 39) [P]^N 17. 23¹.
 39. 57. 71. 80 Chr-3-mss [Euthal-ms Damasc, Thl]. rec aft ἰδόντες ins και πεισ-
 θέντες (with c, e sil): om ADKL[P]^N rel [vss gr-ff Aug¹]. aft ξενου ins και
 παροικοι D¹ (not lat).

14. ζητοῦσιν (inquire D-lat) D¹ 109-78 Chr-ms Procopi.

15. μνημονεύουσιν Ν 47. 73. 80 [Euthal-ms] Thdr¹: μνημονεύουσαν D¹: ἐμνημόνευσαν

O. T., e. g. Gen. xli. 49: Josh. xi. 4: 1 Sam. xiii. 5: 2 Sam. xvii. 11: 1 Kings iv. 29: Isa. x. 22. Cf. also Herod. i. 43, οἷδα δ' ἐγὼ ψάμμου ῥα ἀριθμόν, καὶ μέτρα θαλάσσης, and Pind. Olymp. ii. in fine, ἐπεὶ ψάμμου ἀριθμὸν περιέφευγεν).

13—16.] Before the Writer passes on to more examples of faith, he looks back over the patriarchal age, and gathers in one the attributes of their faith.

13.] In (according to, consistently with, in the course of: not this time πιστεῖ, because their deaths were not the results of their faith, but merely according to and consistent with it) faith died these all (there is no need to say with Ec., Thl., Primas., al., ἐξηρημένον τοῦ Ἐνώχ: the promises began with Abraham, and it is evident from the end of our verse, and from ver. 15, that the reference is solely to the patriarchs), not having received (the participial clause conditions and substantiates the κατὰ πίστιν . . ἀπέθανον: and for this reason it is μὴ λαβ. and not οὐ: 'as those who did not receive' &c.) the promises (plur., because the promise was again and again repeated to the patriarchs, see the citations from Gen. above, and add Gen. xvii. 5—8; xxvi. 3, 4; xxviii. 13, 14. The ἐπαγγελία here as so often comprehends τὸ ἐπηγγελμένον), but having seen them from afar (καὶ πεισθέντες, see var. readd., has come in from a gloss: so Chrys., οὗτοι πεπεισμένοι ἦσαν περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς καὶ ἀσπασσάσθαι αὐτάς: Ec., καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι πεισθέντες), and greeted them ("From afar they saw the promises in the reality of their fulfilment, from afar they greeted them as the wanderer greets his longed-for home even when he only comes in sight of it at a distance, drawing to himself as it were magnetically and embracing with inward love that which is yet afar off. The exclamation, 'I have waited for thy salvation, O Lord,' Gen. xlix. 18, is such an ἀσπασμός,

such a greeting of salvation from afar." Delitzsch. Wetst. quotes Virg. Æn. iii. 522, "Quam procul obscuros colles humilemque videre Italia . . . Italia læto socii clamore salutant"), and confessed that they were strangers and sojourners upon the earth (this Abraham did, ref. Gen., to the children of Heth, παροικος καὶ παρεπίδημος ἐγὼ εἰμι μεθ' ὑμῶν: and Jacob, Gen. xlvii. 9, to Pharaoh, αἱ ἡμέραι τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ζωῆς μου ὡς παροικῶ κ.τ.λ. See Ps. cxviii. 19: Eccles. xii. 5: Philo de Agricolt. § 14, vol. i. p. 310, τῷ ὄντι πᾶσα μὲν ψυχὴ σοφοῦ πατρίδα μὲν οὐρανόν, ἐξήνθη δὲ γῆν ἔλαχεν: and Confus. Ling. § 17, p. 416, διὰ τοῦτο οἱ κατὰ Μωυσῆν σοφοὶ πάντες εἰσάγονται παροικοῦντες: αἱ γὰρ τούτων ψυχὰι στέλλονται μὲν ἀποικίαν δὴ ποτε τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. In Wetst., several citations are given from the classics where human life is called a παρεπίδημία. The word is found in Ælian (V. H. viii. 4) and Polybius (xxxii. 22. 4), and παρεπίδημιος and -μία often).

14.] For (justification of the assertion, that it was κατὰ πίστιν that they ran and finished their course, by the inference from their own confession) they who say such things make manifest (so Acts xxiii. 15: where see examples in Wetst. The word in this sense is pure classical Greek: cf. Plato, Soph. p. 244, οὐκ εἰς αὐτὰ ἡμῖν ἐμφανίζετε ἱκανῶς, τί ποτε βούλεσθε σημαίνειν, ὅπόταν δν φθέγγωσθε; and p. 218, ζητοῦντι καὶ ἐμφανίζοντι τί ποτε ἐστίν) that they seek after (in ἐπιζητέω, the preposition implies the direction of the wish or yearning) a home (our English word 'country,' without some possessive pronoun, does not give the idea strongly enough. Even Bleek, who might have given it, daß sie ein Vaterland suchten, has rendered, daß sie nach der Heimath suchten:—οἱ ξένους ἑαυτούς, φησιν, ὀνομάζοντες, δηλοῦσιν ὡς οὐδὲν

b here only
Josh. iv. 16
al.
c w. inf., 1 Pet.
iv. 17. Rev
xi. 13 al.
Eph. ii. 12.
d Matt. ii. 12.
Luke x. 6.
Acts xviii. 21
only Exod. xxxiii. 27. Judg. xi. 39 A
viii. 20 Symm.) g ch. ii. 14 reff.
Mark viii. 38 bis; L. Rom. i. 16. 2 Tim. i. 8. (Isa. i. 29 AN³-3b.)
ἐπαίσχ., ch. ii. 11. m Matt. xx. 23. xxv. 34. John xiv. 2, 3
o ch. v. 1 reff.

ἀφ' ἧς ὁ ἐξέβησαν, εἶχον ἂν ὁ καιρὸν ὁ ἀνακάμψαι 16 νῦν δὲ
ἡ κρείττονος ὁ ῥέγονται, ἡ τοῦτέστιν ἡ ἐπουρανίου διὸ οὐκ
ἡ ἐπαίσχυνεται ἡ αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς ἡ ἐπικαλεῖσθαι ὁ αὐτῶν
ἡ ἡτοίμασεν γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἡ πόλιν. 17 Πίστει ὁ προσενηνόχεν

1 Tim. iii. 1. vi. 10 only t. (act., Job
i ch. ii. 11 reff.) f j const.,
k Exod. iii. 6, 15, 16. n inf., aft.
m ver. 10.

17. 31 B² Chron., rec (for ἐξεβησαν) ἐξηλθον, with D³KLN³ rel [Chr Procop., Thdrt],
ἐξηλθεν ο: txt AD¹[P]N¹ 17 [Euthal-ms Ps-]Ath, Chron, Damasc., om an D¹.

16. rec νῦν, with d e g h: txt ADK L[e sil P]N rel [Ps-]Ath Chr [Euthal-ms
Procop.,] Thdrt Chron, [Damasc]. ἐπικαλ. αὐτων bef 2nd θεος D¹(and lat) [P]

115.—καλεῖσθαι K: αὐτοὺς [L].

οικεῖον κρίνουσι τῶν παρόντων, ἀλλ'
ἐτέρων ἐπιθυμοῦσι πραγμάτων. Thdrt.).

15.] And if indeed ('posito,' that . . . : hence the indicative) they were mindful (see below. Bl., De W., Lünem. render it, "had made mention," as in ver. 22. And so Del. inclines. But this would necessitate a very harsh ellipsis: If we found them making mention &c., they might have had opportunity to gratify the wish thus expressed) of that (home) from which they went out, they would continually be having opportunity to return (ἀνακάμπτω is neuter generally, in classical Greek also: cf. Herod. ii. 8, ταύτη μὲν λήγον ἀνακάμπτει εἰς τὰ εἰρηται τὸ ὄρος. The two imperfects in this sentence present some little difficulty. The general rendering of dependent imperfects is as in John v. 46, εἰ ἐπιστεύετε Μωυσεῖ, ἐπιστεύετε ἂν ἐμοί, "If ye believed Moses, ye would believe me." So also in Latin: "Servi . . . mei si me isto pacto metuerent, ut te metuunt omnes cives tui, domum meam relinquendam putarem," Cic. in Cat. i. 7: "If my slaves feared me . . . I should think." But such a rendering here is out of the question, both events being past and gone: we could not say, 'If they remembered . . . they might have opportunity.' It would therefore seem that the imperfects are here used not so much in their logical temporal places, as on account of the *habitual* sense which both members of the sentence are meant to convey: 'If they were, through their lives, mindful &c., they would have through their lives,—they would continually be having, opportunities' &c.): 16.] but now (as the case now is: the logical νῦν: see 1 Cor. xiii. 13 note, and our ch. viii. 6) they desire (ὀρέγεσθαι τινος, classical: see many instances in Wetst. on 1 Tim. iii. 1) a better (home), that is, a heavenly one (the justification of this assertion, which seems to ascribe N. T. ideas to the O. T. fathers, must be found in such

sayings as that of the dying Jacob, Gen. xlix. 18, which only represent a wide class of their faithful thoughts): wherefore God is not ashamed of them (reff.) to be called (here ἐπαίσχυνεσθαι has a double object, αὐτοὺς and ἐπικαλεῖσθαι. For the latter construction also see reff.) their God (viz. in reff. Exod. Thdrt. (not Chrys. as Bleek) says, ὁ γὰρ τῶν δυνάμεων κύριος καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης καὶ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ποιητής, ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ὀνομά σου, τὰλλα πάντα καταλιπὼν ἔφη Ἐγὼ θεὸς Ἀβραάμ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαάκ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ. From the present ἐπαίσχυνεται, and especially from the clause which follows, it is probable, as Bleek has well remarked, that the Writer intends not merely to adduce that God did once call Himself their God, but that he is now not ashamed to be so called, they enduring and abiding with Him where He is: in the same sense in which our Lord adduces the same circumstance, Matt. xxii. 31 ff and ||. See below): for He prepared for them a city (permanent and eternal, in contrast to the tents in which they wandered. There are two ways of understanding this clause: 1. with Schlichting, Grot., Böhme, De W., Hofmann, Delitzsch, to take the aor. as a pluperfect, "for God had prepared for them a city:" "quia Deus cœlestem illam patriam et regnum suum Abrahamo, Isaco, et Jacobo destinavit, propterea se Deum illorum summumque patronum jure et merito appellat," Schlicht.: 2. with Thl., al., and Bleek, τοσοῦτον οὐκ ἐπαίσχυνεται αὐτοὺς, ἀλλ' οἰκεῖος ἔχει, ὥστε καὶ τὴν πόλιν, ἣν ἐπεθύμουν, τὴν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἡτοίμασεν αὐτοῖς. I would adopt a modification of this last. God is not ashamed of them, nor to be called their God: and we find proof of this not only in His thus naming Himself, but in His preparing for them a city: the home for which they yearned: He did not deceive their hopes, but acted as their God by verifying those hopes. Thus, and thus only, does

Ἀβραὰμ τὸν Ἰσαὰκ ^ππειραζόμενος, καὶ τὸν ^ιμονογενῆ ^ρπροσέφερεν ὁ ^ττὰς ἐπαγγελίας ^σἀναδεξάμενος, ¹⁸ πρὸς δὲ ἐλαλήθη ^ιὅτι ἐν Ἰσαὰκ ^κκληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα· ¹⁹ ^νλογισάμενος ὅτι καὶ ^ωἐκ νεκρῶν ^ωἐγείρειν δυνατὸς ὁ θεός,
s = here (Acts xxviii 7) only. (2 Macc vi. 19. viii 36 only.) t ch vii 17 ref. u = Rom ix 7, from GLN xxi. 12 1sa xliiii. 1. v = & constr., Rom ii. 3 viii. 18. 2 Cor. x. 7, 11. 1 Macc. vi. 9. w Matt. xvi. 9. 1 Cor. xv. 12. Gal. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 21 al.

17. om αβρααμ 8-pe Chr-3-mss: marked with ast in syr: ins aft πειραζ. D¹(and lat); bef προσεν. 71. ^{ισακ} (sic) [D¹]N, so ver 18 (and 20 [D¹] N-corr¹).

18. om σι D¹(and lat) [P] a¹ 238 Chr.₂[ins.].

19. for ἐγείρειν, ἐγειρε (= -ραι) A; ἐγειραι [P] 17 [Euthal-ms] Chron. ^{δυναται} AD², possit D-lat: txt D¹ K¹ L¹ N rel Orig₁ Cyr[_p] Euthal-ms] Chr₃ Thdrt Chron₁ [Damasc₁, δυνατος εστιν P], potens est vulg [Orig-int₁]. — ο θες ἐγειρει, omg δυνατος, o.

ἡτοίμασεν keep its proper emphasis, and the aor. its proper time: *they looked for a city*: and God refused not to be called their God, for He *prepared* for them that city, verified those their hopes. And if we ask for the *interpretation* of ἡτοίμασεν, I answer, in the preparation of the way of Christ, and bringing in salvation by Him, of which salvation they in their anticipation of faith were partakers, John viii. 56, Ἀβραὰμ . . . ἡγαλιάσαστο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη).

17—31.] Having spoken thus generally of the faith of the patriarchs, he returns to *individual instances*, and begins again with Abraham, recounting the severest test to which his faith was put. ἐνταῦθα οὐ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μόνον ὑπερβῆναι ἐχρῆν λογισμούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτερόν τι πλέον ἐπιδείξασθαι τὰ γὰρ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐδόκει τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ μάχεσθαι, καὶ πίστις ἐμάχετο πίστει καὶ πρὸς ταῦμα ἐπαγγελία κ.τ.λ. Chrys. Cf. Sir. xiv. 20 (καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ εὐρέθη πιστός): Wisd. x. 5 (αὕτη . . . τὸν δίκαιον . . . ἐπὶ τέκνον σπλάγγχοις ἰσχυρὸν ἐφύλαξεν): 1 Macc. ii. 52: James ii. 21.

17.] By faith, Abraham hath offered (perfect, as if the work and its praise were yet enduring; not, “was offering” as commonly taken, “was in purpose to offer,” which would be the imperfect. Bleek quotes from Salvián de Gubernat. Dei i. 8, p. 17, “Immolari sibi Deus filium jussit: pater obtulit, et quantum ad defunctionem cordis pertinet immolavit.” Besides which consideration, the προσφέρειν, the ἀνενέγκαι αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, did actually take place) Isaac when tempted (cf. καλούμενος ver. 8: and ref. Gen.), and (the καὶ rises into climax: not only Abraham Isaac, but &c) he that had accepted the promises (ἀναδεξάμενος, more than ἔχω, ch. vii. 6; he had as it were with open arms accepted and taken to himself each and all of the promises, the possession of Canaan, the multiplication of his seed, the blessing of all nations in his seed) was offering (now the Writer trans-

forms the time into the purely temporal and strict one—he was in the act of offering—the work was begun) his only-begotten (so Aquila, and similarly Symm. (τὸν μόνον σου) in Gen. xxii. 2, for ἡγῆται τῆς πατρὸς τὸν υἱόν σου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, LXX. And so Philo de Somn. i. § 34, vol. i. p. 650, Ἀβραὰμ ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ μόνου παιδὸς δλοκαυτώσεως. Chrys. says, τί οὖν ὁ Ἰσραὴλ; πόθεν ἦν; μονογενῆ λέγω, φησίν, ὅσον εἰς τὸν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας λόγον).

18.] he to whom (πρὸς ὃν refers, not to Isaac, as many Commentators and our E. V., “of whom it was said,” but to Abraham, the immediate antecedent in the text, and the immediately resumed subject, after the relative clause, λογισάμενος κ.τ.λ.) it was spoken (by God: but the aor. need not be made into a pluperfect). In Isaac (the ὅτι is found in ref. Gen., and in a causal meaning. The most probable account of its appearing here is, that the Writer takes it from the O. T. text, but uses it as the recitative particle) shall thy seed be called (“Three ways,” says Delitzsch, “of interpreting this are possible, 1. after Isaac shall thy seed be named (Hofm.): 2. in, through, of, Isaac shall seed be called into being to thee (Drechsler): 3. in Isaac shall seed be named to thee, i. e. in or through him shall it come that a seed of Abraham shall be possible (Bleek).” Then he puts aside the first, seeing that only once is the seed of Abraham called Isaac (Amos vii. 9), and the second, seeing that καὶ (though sometimes bearing the meaning, see Isa. xli. 4) never so absolutely signifies “to call into existence” as it must on that interpretation: and prefers the third. In Isaac, through and in descent from him, shall thy seed be called thy seed: only Isaac’s descendants shall be known as Abraham’s seed): 19.] (reason of this paradoxical conduct: because Abraham’s faith was able, in anticipation, to clear the suspicion of God’s faithfulness by the suggestion of His power. He could

x = (see note)
 Matt. xii. 44.
 y = (see note)
 ch. ix. 9.

z = Matt. xxv. 27. Gen. xxxviii. 20 al.

20 Πίστει ADKLP
 Na b c d
 e f g h k
 l m n o
 17. 47

and would make a way to the keeping of His own promise) reckoning that God is (not, *was*, see below) able to raise (no supply of "*him*" is admissible, as mistakenly inserted by many Commentators and even by the E. V. It was not God's power to raise *Isaac*, but God's power, generally, to raise from the dead, that Abraham believed. This, which is so plain from the form of the sentence, is made plainer still by the use of the present *ἐγείρειν*, not the aor. *ἐγείρειν* which would more probably be used if a single case had been in view: see Matt. xvi. 21: Mark xiv. 28: Luke iii. 8; ix. 22. The aor. here (see digest) has probably been a correction arising from the application to Isaac) **even from (among) the dead** (St. Matt. commonly uses, with *ἐγείρειν*, *ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν*: St. Luke, John, Paul, *ἐκ νεκρῶν*), **from whence** (i.e. from the dead: so Thdr.-mops., Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grot., Lamb. Bos, Michaelis, Schulz, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Stier, Hofmann, Delitzsch. But most Commentators regard *θεν* as the illative particle, "whence," "unde," as in the other five places where it occurs in this Epistle, ch. ii. 17; iii. 1; vii. 25; viii. 3; ix. 18. The whole meaning is discussed below) **he also** (*καί*; *besides the λογίσασθαι*. It belongs, not to *ἐν παραβολῇ* alone, but to the whole fact, *ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκομίσατο*—to the verb with its qualifying adverb) **received him back** (so *κομίζεσθαι* often: e.g. Polyb. i. 83. 8; iii. 51. 12, of captives: i. 59. 7, of money expended: iii. 40. 10, of hostages: x. 34. 3, 8, 10, of wife and children (*μάλιστα πεπεισμένος οὕτως τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα κομίζεισθαι*): of a fortress or city, ii. 51. 6 al. fr. So Philo de Joseph. § 35, vol. ii. p. 71, *κομίσασθαι τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἀνύβριστον*: § 38, p. 74, *τίς γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο πατρὶ δωρεὰ μείζων ἢ τὴν ἀπογνοσθέντα* (Joseph) *κομίσασθαι*: And Josephus, Antt. i. 13. 4, uses the word of Abraham and Isaac on the very occasion here in question: *οἱ δὲ παρ' ἐλπίδας ἑαυτοὺς κεκομισμένοι*. See also reff. and 1 Macc. xiii. 37: 2 Macc. vii. 29; x. 1. In the face of these examples, Sykes and Schulz assert that the word never has this meaning) **in a parable** (figuratively: in what sense, see below). This clause has been very variously interpreted. The prevalent understanding of it, since Camerarius and Raphel, has been, "whence (= wherefore) also he received him by means of (in, instrumental) his surrender of him." And this Lünemann,

who has adopted it, calls the simple and only right sense of the words. According to this view *παραβολῇ* signifies a giving up to danger, a *παραβάλλεσθαι* (*τὴν ψυχὴν*), which latter is an expression often found, e.g. Hom. Il. i. 322: Thuc. ii. 44. But though there is abundant example of the verb in this sense, there is none of the substantive, nor any thing approaching to one (in Passow indeed we have as a sense of *παραβολή*, *das Danksagen, auf's Spiel setzen, Wagen, Wagnis, Wagstück*: and in Liddell and Scott, "the making a venture;" but it is entirely unsupported by example, either in classic or Hellenistic Greek, and therefore very properly excluded by Palm and Rost). This rendering then must fall to the ground, unless it can be shewn that no other will serve, and thus we are justified in supposing it the only case in which *παραβολή* occurs in this sense. Near akin to this is the view of Raphel (and Krebs), who says, "*Quem-admodum ἐν ἀληθείᾳ προ ἀληθῶς, ἐν τάχει προ ταχέως, aliaque hujusmodi dicuntur: ita etiam ἐν παραβολῇ προ παραδόλως* puto accipi posse: quo verbo sæpius utitur Polybius: cujus interpres Casaubonus, licet veriter *zudacter*, et Camerarius in comment. utriusque lingue *periculose*, certum tamen est, aliquibus locis etiam *insperato* verti posse:" cf. *παρ' ἐλπίδας* in Josephus, above. Then he attempts to prove this from Polybius and from Pliny, Ep. ix. 26. 4, "Sunt enim maxime mirabilia quæ maxime insperata, maximo periculosa, utque Græci magis exprimunt, *παράβολα*." But neither this nor any of the passages from Polyb. proves his point; every one of them having the meaning *boldly*, not *unexpectedly*. It seems then that we must abandon all idea of this class of interpretations, and fall back on the usual one, found in our ch. ix. 9, and every where else in the N. T., of a likeness or figure. In favour of this meaning it may also be asked, Is it in the least probable that our Writer would have put before his readers so common an expression in so uncommon a sense? But, when we have taken the more ordinary meaning, we are by no means set at rest. For, a. Hammond, Lamb. Bos, Alberti, Mill, Sykes, Schulz, Stuart, refer the words to the *birth* of Isaac,—"from whence," i.e. *ἐκ νεκρωμένου σώματος*, "he had at first received him." But, 1. this would certainly require the more definite pluperfect, not the quasi-pluperfect of an aorist reaching back beyond *λογισάμενος*; and, 2. it

καὶ περὶ μελλόντων ^a ἠύλόγησεν Ἰσαὰκ τὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ τὸν Ἡσαΐ. ²¹ Πίστει Ἰακώβ ^b ἀποθνήσκων ἕκαστον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ ἠύλόγησεν, καὶ ^c προσεκύνησεν ^c ἐπὶ τὸ ^d ἄκρον

31. 3 Kings: 47.

d Matt. xxiv. 31 || Mk. Luke xvi 24 only

a ch vii. 1.
GEN. xxviii.
27 ff.
b GEN. xlviii.
21. so -kev,
Luke viii. 42.
c GEN. xliii.
1 Kings xiv. 27.

20. rec om 1st καί, with D⁸KL[P]X rel syrr coptt [æth arm Chr, Sevrn,]; ins AD¹ b¹ m 17 latt Chr, [Euthal-ms] Thdrt Damase Primas. (ἠυλόγησεν, so A m 17 Chr, [Euthal-ms] Thdrt.) om ἰσαακ X¹ (ins X¹ corr¹-3).
21. (ἠυλόγησεν, so AD 17 Chr, [Euthal-ms] Thdrt₂.)

would be harsh and unnatural that the ἐκ νεκρῶν should refer to the person himself who ἐκοίμισατο αὐτόν. β. Corn. a-Lapide regards Isaac himself as the παραβολή, interpreting by the Latin "in parabolam (εἰς παραβολήν); id est, ut Isaac esset parabola, fabula, proverbium, exemplum memorabile &c. . . . ut cum Deus per se aut suos nobis aliquid jusserit licet arduum et difficile, exemplum Isaac ob oculos habentes, fidenter et genere nos offeramus," &c. γ. Bengel, on the other hand, regards Abraham as the παραβολή, "omnis enim posteritas celebrat fidem Abraham, offerentis unigenitum." δ. Others take ἐν παραβολῇ to mean, *as a type*; either of the Resurrection generally (so Thdrt., ὡς ἐν συμβόλῳ καὶ τύπῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως: τῇ γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀναιρεθεὶς προθυμία, τῇ τοῦ κεκαλυκέντος τὴν σφαγὴν ἀνεβίω φωνῇ—but afterwards he refers the figure to the passion of Christ: al.),—or of our Lord's sufferings (so Chrys., τούτέστιν, ἐν ὑποδείγματι ἐν τῷ κριῷ, φησί. πῶς; τοῦ γὰρ κριοῦ σφαγισθέντος οὐτος ἐσώθη ὥστε διὰ τοῦ κριοῦ αὐτὸν ἔλαβεν, ἀντὶ τούτου σφάξας ἐκείνον. ταῦτα δὲ τύποι πινὲς ἦσαν ἐνταῦθα γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς ἐστι τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ σφαγιαζόμενος: Ec., among many interpretations, Primas., Carpzov, al.). But, undeniable as is the typical reference of the whole occurrence to Christ, His sufferings and Resurrection, it seems exceedingly improbable that our Writer should have intended so much for his readers by ἐν παραβολῇ. We come then, approaching what I believe to be the true meaning, to, ε. that given by Theodore of Mopsuestia: τοῦτο λέγει, ὅτι ἀκολούθως ἔτυχεν τῇ ἐαυτοῦ πίστει τῇ γὰρ ἀναστάσει πιστεύσας, διὰ συμβόλων τινῶν ἀποθανόντα αὐτὸν ἐκοίμισατο. τὸ γὰρ ἐν πολλῇ τοῦ θανάτου προσδοκία γενόμενον μηδὲν παθεῖν, τοῦ ἀληθῶς ἀναστησομένου σύμβολον ἦν, ὅσον τοῦ θανάτου πρὸς βραχὺ γενεσάμενος, ἀνέστη μηδὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ θανάτου παθών· τὸ γοῦν ἐν παραβολῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐν συμβόλοις. So Calvin, "Tametsi vere non resurrexerit Isaac, quodammodo tamen videtur resurrexisse, quin repente et mirabiliter in-

spectata Dei gratia eripitur." Castellio, Beza, Schlichting, Grot., Jac. Cappell., Scaliger, Heinsius, and many others, Bleek, De W., Stier, Hofmann, Delitzsch. The objection to this seems to be that which Del. himself brings against some of its supporters, that it does not go far enough for ἐν παραβολῇ, but by its "quodammodo," and "similitudine quodam," weakens it too much. We may with reason ask, *What was the παραβολή?* if it is meant merely, that though not actually, yet in some sense, Abraham received Isaac from the dead, would not ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν be the more obvious way of expressing this? The true identification of the παραβολή is I am persuaded to be found in the figure under which Isaac was sacrificed, viz. the ram, as already hinted by Chrysostom. Abraham virtually sacrificed his son: God designated Isaac for the burnt-offering, but provided a ram in his stead. Under the figure of that ram, Isaac was slain, being received back by his father in his proper person, risen from that death which he had undergone ἐν παραβολῇ, in, under, the figure of the ram. Chrys. himself afterwards, in recapitulating, gives this very interpretation as an alternative: ὅθεν αὐτὸν φησί, καὶ ἐν παραβολῇ ἐκοίμισατο· τούτέστιν, ἐν αἰνίγματι ὥσπερ γὰρ παραβολῇ ἦν ὁ κριὸς τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ.

20.] By faith, Isaac blessed Jacob and Esau concerning things future also (the καὶ belongs, not to πίστει,—πίστει καὶ περὶ μελλ., by faith and that respecting things future,—as Lünem., al. (Syr. joins πίστει περὶ μελλ.), for πίστις περὶ, though good Greek, is not N.T. language,—but to περὶ μελλ.,—blessed them concerning not only things present, but things future also. Jacob is named before Esau, as the worthier and more important in the theocratic sense; perhaps also as having gained the greater portion of the blessing).

21.] By faith Jacob, when dying (reff.), blessed each of the sons of Joseph (the faith consisted in transposing his hands wittingly, laying the right hand on the head of the younger, Ephraim, who was to become the greater tribe): and he worshipped (this incident is not connected

e = Matt. ii 19
al. GEN. I. τῆς ῥάβδου αὐτοῦ.

22 Πίστει Ἰωσήφ ἐτελευτῶν περι

ADKLP
N a b c d
e f g h k
l m n o
17 47

with the other, but took place before it, on another occasion, when Jacob made Joseph swear to him that he would bury him with his fathers, and not in Egypt, Gen. xlvii. 31. Perhaps the Writer inverts the order of the two, to bring the two acts of blessing, that of Isaac and that of Jacob, together. This act of worship was one of faith, inasmuch as it was connected with a command, the point of which was, God's promise respecting the land of Canaan. And the faith was shewn by the turning of his aged and dying body in a posture of thankful adoration) on the top of his staff (an incalculable quantity of idolatrous nonsense has been written on these words by R.-Cath. Commentators, taking as their starting-point the rendering of the Vulg. "et adoravit fastigium virgæ ejus," and thence deriving an argument for the worship of images, assuming that there was an image or symbol of power upon Joseph's staff, to which they apply the words. But first, it must be Jacob's, not Joseph's staff, which is intended—"virgæ suæ," not "ejus," as Faber Stap. remarked, and Aug. notices, qu. 162, in Genesin, vol. iii. pt. i., "Quod habent Latini codices, *Et adoravit super caput virgæ ejus*, nonnulli codices emendatius habent, *Adoravit supra caput virgæ suæ, vel in capite virgæ suæ*, sive in *caumine*, vel *super cacumen* (notice, there is nothing here about *adoravit fastigium*, of which see more below). Fallit eos enim verbum Græcum quod eisdem litteris scribitur sive *ejus*, sive *suæ*: sed accentus dispares sunt, et ab eis qui ista noverunt in codicibus non contemnuntur; valent enim ad magnam discretionem. Quamvis et unam plus literam habere posset, si esset *suæ*, ut non esset *αὐτοῦ*, sed *ἐαυτοῦ*." Then what follows is well worth transcribing: "Ac per hoc merito quæritur, quid sit quod dictum est. Nam facile intelligitur senem qui virgam ferebat eo more quo illa ætas baculum solet, ut se inclinavit ad Deum adorandum, id utique fecisse super cacumen virgæ suæ, quam sic ferebat, ut super eum caput inclinando adoraret Deum. Quid est ergo, *Adoravit super cacumen virgæ ejus*, id est, filii sui Joseph? An forte tulerat ab eo virgam, quando ei jurabat idem filius, et dum eam tenet, post verba jurantis, nondum illa reddita mox adoravit Deum? Non enim pudebat eum ferre tantisper insigne potestatis filii sui, ubi figura magnæ rei futuræ præsignabatur: quamvis in Hebræo facilissima hujus quæstionis absolutio esse dicatur, ubi scriptum perhibent, *Et adoravit Israel ad caput lecti*,

in quo utique senex jacebat, et sic positum habebat, ut in eo sine labore, quando vellet, oraret. Nec ideo tamen quod septuaginta interpretati sunt, nullum vel levem sensum habere putandum est." The reader will observe that there is nothing here of adoring the staff or the top of the staff. What Jerome thought of such an idea, is plainly seen, Quæst. Heb. in Genesin, vol. iii. p. 371: "In hoc loco quidem frustra simulant adorasse Jacob summitatem sceptri Joseph, quod videlicet honorans filium, potestatem ejus adoraverit: cum in Hebræo multo aliter legatur,—et adoravit, inquit, Israel ad caput lectuli: quod scilicet, postquam ejuraverat filius, securus de petitione quam rogaverat adoraverit Deum contra caput lectuli sui. Sanctus quippe et Deo deditus vir, oppressus senectute, sic habebat lectulum positum, ut ipse jacentis habitus absque difficultate ulla ad orationem esset paratus." The idea itself is found in Chrys., but without the *image*: *τουτέστι, καὶ γέρον ὦν ἤδη προσεκύνει τῷ Ἰωσήφ, τὴν παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ προσκύνῃσιν δὴλῶν τὴν ἐσομένην αὐτῷ*. And so Thl., Phot. in Eccl., and apparently Thdr.: so Erasmus. (par.), "Longius etiam prospiciebat senis fides, cum exosculans virgam filii Joseph, veneraretur in eo Christum omnibus imperaturum, cujus ille delatus et proditus a fratribus imaginem gesserat." I will only cite the inference from the above ancient data in Corn. a-Lapide, as most instructive regarding the grounds on which age after age the chief abominations of the church of Rome have been introduced: "Recte ergo *ex hac adoratione sceptri Josephi Patres Concilii Niceni II. probant adorationem et cultum imaginum*, eumque non in imagine hæreret, sed ad prototypum suum referri et transire docent." The real question with regard to the passage is confined within very narrow limits. The same Hebrew word *נֶזֶק* signifies a staff, or a bed, according as it is pointed *נֶזֶק* or *נֶזֶק*. And, as there are no points in the ancient Heb. text, it is an open question, which meaning we are to take. The LXX have taken *ῥάβδος*, though as Jerome notices, in loc., they have rendered the same word *κλίνη* in Gen. xlviii. 2, two verses after. Our E. V. has taken this latter: "And Israel bowed himself upon the bed's head." And so almost all the moderns agree in taking it. Stuart, it is true, has argued at some length for the meaning "staff," on the ground that the eastern beds have no head properly so called, being merely a carpet or rug spread on the ground. But

τῆς ^f ἐξόδου τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ^g ἐμνημόνευσεν, καὶ περὶ ^f τῶν ^h ὁστέων αὐτοῦ ⁱ ἐνετείλατο. ²³ Πίστει Μωσῆς γεννηθεὶς ἐκρύβη ^j τρίμηνον ὑπὸ τῶν ^k πατέρων αὐτοῦ, διότι εἶδον ^l ἀστείον τὸ παιδίον· καὶ οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸ ^m διατάγμα τοῦ βασιλέως. ²⁴ Πίστει Μωσῆς ⁿ μέγας γενόμενος

³⁹ John xix 36, from Exod. xii. 46 [Eph. v. 30] only. Gen. i. 25. i w. περί, Matt iv. 6 || L. (from Ps xc. 11) only. Num xxvii. 19. j here only. Gen. xxxviii. 24. 4 Kings xxiii. 31 B. xxiv 8. 2 Chron xxxvi 2, 9 only. see John iv. 35 (fem.) Herod ii 134, τὴν τρίμηνον ἐκαστην. k = here only. (Eph. vi. 4. Col iii 21. 1 Tim xix 14*) see note. l Acts vii 20 only. Eubod. ii 2 m here only Ezra vii. 11 Wisd xi. 7 (of the same order) only. n = (Rom. ix. 12) Gen. xxxviii. 11. Eubod. ii. 11. Hom. Odys. β 314. σ. 217.

23. (only the Δ of διατάγμα is left in A, and there could hardly have been room for the word on the part which has perished.) at end ins πιστι μεγας γενομενος μωσης ανλεν τον αιγυπτιον κατανοων την ταπινωσιν των αδελφων αυτου (proδ interpol from Acts viii. 23) D vulg-3-inss(apud Sabatier).

he has in his mind in thus objecting, a bedstead, not a bed. The head of a bed, be it where or what it may, is that part of it where the person's head lies: and Delitzsch has made it probable from the Heb. verb, נִשְׁכַּח, "se prostravit," that Jacob turned himself in his bed so as to lay his face to the pillow: cf. Isa. xxxviii. 2. If the 'staff' is to be taken, then it must be his own, not Joseph's staff, which is indicated, and the gesture might have had a meaning correspondent to the thought in Gen. xxxii. 10, ἐν τῇ ῥάβδῳ μου διέβην τὴν Ἰορδάνην τοῦτον: viz. the recognition of that God who had supported him through life, and declaration of his having done with all human supports. On the whole, see Suicer, vol. ii. p. 858. It is due to the better R.-C. Commentators, such as Estius and Justiniani, to say, that no such inference as that cited above is to be found in them.

Some have expressed surprise that no mention is made of the far more important blessings of the twelve sons of Jacob in Gen. xlix.: and conjectures have even been made to amend the text: e. g. that of Böhme, ἐκαστον τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰωσήφ: but both without reason. Delitzsch says well, "He plucks, so to speak, only the flowers which stand by his way, and leaves the whole meadow-full to his readers".

22.] By faith, Joseph when dying (the word in ref. Gen.) made mention of (every where else in the N. T. μνημονεύω is, as in the classics, to remember (see on ver. 15), and is found either with a gen. or with an accus., but not with περί, e. g. Luke xvii. 32: Acts xx. 35: Matt. xvi. 9: 1 Thess. ii. 9) the exodus (by this time technically so known, from the title of the second book of Moses: see ref. Ps., and Jos. Antt. v. 1. 20) of the sons of Israel, and commanded concerning his bones (viz. when he said καὶ συνανοίσετε τὰ ὀστᾶ μου ἐντεῦθεν μεθ' ὑμῶν. Even Joseph, who had attained such eminence

and power in Egypt, did not account it his country, but in faith spoke of the promise of God as certain, Gen. i. 24, and realized it so as to enjoin the removal of his own remains when it should come to pass).

23.] Now the writer passes on to Exodus, and its chief example, Moses, who even in his preservation by his parents was the child of faith. By faith Moses when born was hidden three months (τρίμηνον) is probably feminine, see ref. Herod., and cf. τὴν δευτέραν ἐκμηνον, Polyb. xxvii. 6. 2: τὸν χρόνον τὸν τῆς τριμήνου, Aeschin. Ctes. p. 63. 34. τὸ τρίμηνον is also in use: Polyb. i. 38. 6; v. 1. 12, and in Plut. and Ptolemy: and we have δ ἐξάμηνος, Xen. Hell. ii. 3. 9) by his parents (οἱ πατέρες is explained by Bengel, al., "Occultatus est Moses a patribus, id est a patre (Ammaram) et ab avo, non materno, qui erat ipse Levi, sed paterno, qui erat Kohath. Vixit ergo Kohath, nascente Mose. Magnus loci hujus recte explicati usus est in chronologia sacra." But whatever inferences are deduced from it rest, it is to be feared, on a very slender foundation: for there can be no doubt that οἱ πατέρες does signify parents. In a passage of Parthenius, Erot. 10, cited by Wetst., we have εἰς ἐπιθυμίαν Λευκάνης ἐλθόν, παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αἰτησάμενος αὐτὴν ἡγάγετο γυναῖκα. See other Greek and Latin examples in Wetst. The instance given by Delitzsch from Plato, Legg. vi. p. 772 end, is not decisive, ἀγαθὸν πατέρων φύννι. In the Hebrew text of Exod. ii. 2, it is his mother only who does the whole: but the LXX have the plural as here), because they saw the child was comely (so in Exod. ἀστείον, τοῦτέστιν ὠραῖον, τῇ ὄψει χαρίεν, Thl.: καὶ νῦν ἀστεία εἰ σὺ ἐν τῷ εἶδει σου, Judith xi. 23. Thdr. says, εἰς γὰρ τὸ τοῦ παιδὸς ἀποβλέψαντες εἶδος, θέλεις αὐτὸ κηδεμονίας ἡλπίσαν ἀπολαύσασθαι): and they feared not the command of the king (to destroy all the male children, Exod. i. 22. So Philo,

ο = here only. ^o ἡρνήσατο λέγεσθαι υἱὸς θυγατρὸς Φαραώ, ²⁵ ^p μᾶλλον ADKLP
 Wisd. xii. 27. Jos. Antt. iv. 5. 1. ^p ἑλόμενος ^r συγκακουχεῖσθαι τῷ ^s λαῷ τοῦ θεοῦ ἢ ^t πρὸς-
 παύσιν; ^u καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀρνούμενη τὸ ^x ἡγήσασθαι τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ^y ἠθαρῶν τὸν ^z ὄνειδισμόν
 δρᾶν, Soph. Phil. 118. p here only. Jer. viii. 3 A. classics, passim in Wetst q Phil. i. 22. 2 Thess. ii.
 13 only. Deut. xxvi. 18. t here only ^r κακουχεῖσθαι, ver. 37 reff. s ch. ii. 13 al. 1 Pet.
 ii. 10. 5 see Rom. xi. 1. 1 Mh. 2 Cor. iv. 8 only. u = ch. ii. 13 al. (see note.)
 v 1 Tim. vi. 17 only. w. gen. ^x Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 33 al. in Bleek and Wetst ^y εἰσω, Mt. Mk. I. only, exc. 2 Cor. iv. 7. Col. u. 3. Deut.
 xi. 12. x = ch. x. 29 reff. y elsw, Mt. Mk. I. only, exc. 2 Cor. iv. 7. Col. u. 3. Deut.
 xxviii. 12 al. fr. Rom. xv. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 7. ch. x. 33. xiii. 13 only. Isa. xliii. 28.

26. rec εν αιγυπτω, with rel Cyr-jer, Chr-montf, [Damasce Ec], εν αιγυπτου (itacism)
 A 17: αιγυπτίαν 23, *ægyptiorum* vulg: *ægyptum* D-lat: txt D[-gr] KL[P]N e f h n
 [47] syrr copt [æth arm Orig, Syn-ep-Antch,] Clem, Eus, Chr-3-mss Thdrt Phot, [Thl].

Vita Mos. i. 3, vol. ii. p. 82, γεννηθείς ὁ παῖς
 εὐθὺς ὅψιν ἐνέφηνεν ἀστείωτέραν ἢ κατ'
 ἰδιώτην, ὥς καὶ τῶν τοῦ τυράννου κηρυγ-
 μάτων ἐφ' ὅσον οἶόν τε ἦν τοὺς γονεῖς
 ἀλογῆσαι. Their faith was, loving trust in
 God who had given them so fair a child,
 which led them to perform as far as in them
 lay, the duties of parents to it, and not the
 cruel part which the tyrant prescribed.
 διὰταγμα is a word of later Greek: see reff.,
 and Philo de Decal. § 4, p. 183).

24—28.] *The faith of Moses when come to
 man's estate.* 24.] By faith Moses,

when grown up (μέγ. γεν., τούτέστιν ἀν-
 δρωθείς, Thl. The expression is from ref.
 Exod. Schulz and Bretschn. imagine it
 to mean, having become great, viz. in dig-
 nity as a citizen: but the usage is the other
 way, see reff.), refused (add to reff., Herod.
 iii. 1, οὐκ εἶχε οὐτε δοῦναι οὐτε ἀρνήσα-
 σθαι: vi. 13, εἶδον γὰρ τοὺς Ἰάνας ἀρνευ-
 μένους εἶναι χρηστούς: Eur. Iph. Aul. 972,
 οὐκ ἡρνούμεθ' ἂν τὸ κοινὸν αἰεῖν) to be
 called son of a daughter of Pharaoh (per-
 haps θυγατρός is indefinite; but it is by
 no means certain: all these nouns of rela-
 tion are used constantly without the article,
 when they are undeniably definite. There
 is no record in the O. T. of this refusal of
 Moses: but the fact of the adoption was
 matter of Jewish traditionary belief, see
 Philo below, and the Rabbinical testimony
 in Schöttgen: and the refusal is fairly
 gathered from his whole conduct. It is
 interesting to read and to compare the in-
 flated account of the same in Philo, Vita
 Mos. § 7, p. 85 f.: ὁ δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν φθάσας
 τὸν θρόνον τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης εὐτυχίας, καὶ θυγα-
 τριδοῦς μὲν τοῦ ποσοῦτος βασιλέως νομισ-
 θεῖς, τῆς δὲ παππῆας ἀρχῆς θρόνον οὐδέπω
 γεγονὸς ἐλπίζονταὶ ταῖς ἀπάντων διαδοχῶς, καὶ
 τί γὰρ ἕλλ' ἢ ὁ νέος βασιλεὺς προσαγορευό-
 μενος, τὴν συγγενικὴν καὶ προγονικὴν ἐξή-
 λωσε παιδείαν, τὰ μὲν τῶν εἰσποιησμένων
 ἀγαθῶν, καὶ εἰ λαμπρότερα καιροῖς, νόθα εἶναι
 ὑπολαβάν· τὰ δὲ τῶν φύσει γονέων, εἰ καὶ
 πρὸς ὀλίγον ἀφανέστερα, οἰκεία γούνη καὶ
 γνήσια), 25.] choosing rather (μᾶλ-

λον αἰρεῖσθαι with an accus. of a noun or
 an infin. of a verb, is very common in the
 best Greek. Wetst. has accumulated two
 whole columns of examples) to suffer afflic-
 tion with (reff.) the people of God, than
 to possess a temporary enjoyment of sin
 (is ἀμαρτίας gen. objective, of the thing
 enjoyed (as usually, see examples in Bleek)
 or gen. subjective, of the thing to which
 the enjoyment belongs? Delitzsch main-
 tains the latter (so also Bleek), resting on
 the nature of the contrast: participation
 of the lot of God's people being set against
 the enjoyment of sin: so that the lot of
 God's people is parallel with ἀμαρτία, the
 latter signifying apostasy from God and his
 people. But surely the antithesis is a false
 one. It is κακουχία on the one hand, which
 is opposed to εἶχειν ἀπόλαυσιν ἀμαρτίας
 on the other: the possession of affliction (with
 God's people), to the possession of the en-
 joyment of sin. Thus we have αἱ τῶν
 ἀφροδισίων ἀπολαύσεις, Xen. Hier. i. 26:
 σίταν καὶ ποτῶν ἀπόλαυσις, id. Mem. ii.
 1. 33 al. And I do not see how the
 other view accords with the anathorous
 ἀπόλαυσιν), 26.] esteeming (the
 second aor. part. is contemporary, not ante-
 cedent, to the first: it comes in with a
 slightly ratiocinative force—"esteeming,
 as he did") the reproach of Christ (what
 is the ὄνειδισμός τοῦ χριστοῦ? Certainly
 not, with Thl. (so even Lünem.), merely
 reproach similar to that of Christ: ὥσπερ
 γὰρ ὕστερον τὸν χριστὸν ὀνειδίζον οἱ παρ'
 αὐτοῦ εὐεργετούμενοι, καὶ τελευταῖον
 ἐσταύρωσαν ὁπῶν καὶ πρότερον Μωσῆν
 οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐεργετούμενοι: nor again
 does the more usual explanation, τὸ διὰ
 χριστὸν ὀνειδίζεσθαι (Chrys.), satisfy the
 genitive here; nor even the modification
 of it which makes Moses thus choose,
 from a principle of faith in the Messiah to
 come. Thdrt. is better, who explains it
 τὸ ἐν τύπῳ χριστοῦ: but then he gene-
 ralizes it off into τὸ κατὰ τὴν εὐσεβείαν
 ὑπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων τολμώμενον, as Thl.
 above. The typical sense is not excluded:

τοῦ ^aχριστοῦ, ^bἀπέβλεπεν γὰρ εἰς τὴν ^cμισθαποδοσίαν. ^a gen. = ch. xiii. 13.
 27 Πίστει ^dκατέλιπεν Αἴγυπτον, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν ^e2 Thess. iii. 5.
 γὰρ n. τοῦ βασιλέως, τὸν γὰρ ^eᾔορατον ὡς ὄρων ^fἐκατέρησεν. ² Cor. i. 5.
^b here only. Ps. x. 5.
^c Cant. v. 1.
^d (vi. 1). εἰς μόνον τὸ λυσιστελεῖς τὸ ἐκ τῶν ἀρπαγῶν ἀποβλέπων, Jos. B. J. ii. 15 l. ^e ch. ii.
² x. 35 only+. (-δότης, ver. 6) ^d Matt. iv. 13 1 Kings xxxi. 7. ^e Rom. i. 20 ^f Col. i.
 15, 16. 1 Tim. i. 17 only Gen. i. 2. Isa. xlv. 3. 2 Macc. ix. 5 only. ^f here only. Job ii.
 9. Isa. xlii. 14. Thuc. ii. 44 al. in Bl.

27. κατελειπεν (itacism) AL²[¹(Tischdf)] d o 17 [47¹].

but it is included in a higher one. Far better is Bleek, "reproach which Christ had to bear in his own person, and has to bear in his members." And in this view, we may say, as Del. and Hofm., that all Israel's reproach was Christ's reproach: Israel typified Christ; all Israel's sufferings as the people of God were Christ's sufferings, not only by anticipation in type, but by that inclusion in Christ which they, His members before the Head was revealed, possessed in common with us. So Estius, "*improperium Christi*, i. e. *populi Dei Christum exspectantis, quatenus injuria membrorum in caput redundat*." Nay Christ was ever present in and among God's people: and thus De Wette well and finely says here, "The Writer calls the reproach which Moses suffered, the reproach of Christ, as Paul, 2 Cor. i. 5: Col. i. 24, calls the sufferings of Christians the sufferings of Christ, i. e. of Christ dwelling, striving, suffering, in his Church as in His body; to which this reproach is referred according to the idea of the unity of the Old and New Testaments, and of the eternal Christ (the Logos) already living and reigning in the former." And so Tholuck. See the whole well discussed in Delitzsch's note: and in Bleek. Cf. ch. xiii. 13) greater riches than the treasures of Egypt: for he looked (ἀποβλέπειν εἰς is well defined by Bl., "so to look at any thing, as to be by waiting for it, or generally by the regard of it, determined or strengthened in a course of action." So Demosth. Mid. p. 515, οὐδ' ἀπέβλεψεν εἰς τὰς οὐσίας τὰς τούτων: Isocr. ad Nicoel., ὅταν μὲν γὰρ ἀποβλέψωσιν εἰς τὰς τιμὰς κ. τοὺς πλοῦτους κ. τὰς δυναστείας: and often in Plato, e. g. Gorgias, p. 474 D, 503 D: Alcib. (2) 145 A: Legg. iv. 707 C) to the recompense of reward (reff.: viz. the great eternal reward spoken of vv. 39 f.: not the possession of Canaan merely, as Grot.). 27.] By faith, he left Egypt, not fearing the wrath of the king (when? this is much disputed. Was it when he fled after the murder of the Egyptian? or when he left Egypt with the children of Israel, of which Jos. says, Antt. ii. 11. 1, κατέλιπον τὴν Αἴγυπτον μὴ ἐκτακτικῶς? Against the latter, which is the opinion of Lyræ, Calvin, Schlichting, Grot., Calov.,

Heinr., Böhme, Kuin., Bleek, Ebrard, Bisping, al., it seems a decisive objection, that the Exodus was made not in defiance of the king of Egypt, but with his consent, and at his urgent instance. It is also a lesser objection to it that thus the chronological order is broken, the next particular, the institution of the Passover, having taken place previously to the Exodus. A third objection is, and one not easily got over, that the singular κατέλιπεν cannot well be referred to an event in Israel's history, but must refer to the personal history of Moses. Otherwise we should expect εἰέβη below in ver. 29. Regard being had to these objections, I cannot but think that to understand κατέλιπεν of the Exodus is altogether impossible. It must then refer to the former flight. And this is the view of all the ancient expositors, Greek and Latin: and among the moderns, of Zeger, Jac. Cappell, Heinsius, Calmet, Bengel, Michaelis, Schulz, De Wette, Stengel, Thol., Lünem., Delitzsch, al. But we are here met by a startling difficulty. In Exod. ii. 14 we read that on finding that his slaying of the Egyptian was known, ἐφοβήθη Μωυσῆς: here we read, μὴ φοβηθεὶς τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ βασιλέως. Were it not for this difficulty, we may safely say that the other interpretation would never have been thought of; but standing as it does, it is no wonder that it has driven Commentators to another resource. Still, if owing to other circumstances in the text it is, as we have seen it to be, necessary to refer it to that first leaving of Egypt, we have no right to set those aside on account of this difficulty: rather should we say that there must be some solution of it, however difficult to find. Those which have been given are certainly not satisfactory. The old ones (Chrys., Thl., Œc., al.) go mainly on this, that he so left Egypt, as intending to return to it, but avoiding the thrusting of himself into danger at the moment. Thdr̄t. seems to regard μὴ φοβηθεὶς as a pluperfect aor. part., "when he had set at nought" the king's anger: τὴν μὲν Αἴγυπτον φοβηθεὶς κατέλιπε, θαρσαλέως δὲ τὸν Αἰγύπτιον κατακόντισε, τὴν φυγὴν τοῖνον ἀντὶ τῆς αἰτίας τέθεικε τῆς φυγῆς. Of the moderns, Bengel says, "Tinuul, et

διὰ ⁿ ξηρὰς γῆς, ἧς ^o πείραν ^p λαβόντες οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι ⁿ = Matt. xxi. 15 only. Exod. 12, &c. only. Josh. vi. 6 (7).
^a κατεπόθησαν. ³⁰ Πίστει τὰ ^r τείχη Ἱεριχώ ἔπεσαν, ^s κυκλωθέντα ^t ἐπὶ ἑπτὰ ἡμέρας. ³¹ Πίστει Ῥαὰβ ἡ ^u πόρνη οὐ ^v συναπώλετο τοὺς ^w ἀπειθήσασιν, ^x δεξαμένη τοὺς ^y κατα-
 vi. 1. 28 al. see Bl. p = 2 Tim. i. 5. 2 Pet. i. 9. q = here only. (1 Pet. v. 8 reff.) Exod. xv. 4 (B), 12 Num. xvi. 30, 32. r Acts ix. 25. 2 Cor. xi. 33. Rev. xii. 12, &c. only. Josh. vi. 20. s Luke xxi. 20. John x. 24. f Acts ix. 25. 2 Cor. xi. 33. Rev. xii. 12, &c. only. Josh. vi. 6 (7). t = Acts xiii. 31. xix. 8, &c. u Matt. xxi. 31, 32. James ii. 25 al. Josh. ii. 1. vi. 25. v here only. Gen. xviii. 23. xix. 15 al. w ch. iii. 18 reff. x Matt. x. 40, 41 al. y here only. Gen. xlii. 9, &c. (-πεῖν, Gal. ii. 4.)

29. rec om γῆς (as LXX), with D³KL[P] rel Thdrt Damasc: ins AD¹N 17 [47] latt Syr copt [æth arm Euthal-ms] Chr Thdrt-ms. κατεποντισθησαν k 10. 31. 49. 71-3. 109. 213 Chr₂ (but mss vary) Thdrt.

30. rec επεσε, with K rel; επεσεν D³L [Euthal-ms]: επεσον m Chr-2-mss: txt AD¹[P]N 17 Chr-ms.

31. aft η ins επιλεγομενη N¹(N³ disapproving) [Ephr₁].

in boats, or on a bridge, or swimming or wading: e. g. Herod. i. 75, of the river Halys, Κροῖστος, . . . κατὰ τὰς εὐούσας γεφύρας διεβίβασε τὸν στρατόν: . . . ἀπορέοντος ὅπως οἱ διαβήσεται τ. ποταμὸν ὁ στρατός. . . . ἐπεὶ τε καὶ ἐσχίσθη τάχιστα ὁ ποταμός, ἀμφοτέρῃ διαβατὸς ἐγένετο. Here it is used of a *bridge*, of *crossing*, *generally*, and of a *ford*. See other examples in Bl.) the red sea (so the LXX always for רִדְדִּים, the sea of (red) weeds) as through dry land (we should rather expect ὡς ξηρὰν γῆν; but the unusual expression is apparently borrowed from the narrative in Exodus (ref.), οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπορεύθησαν διὰ ξηρὰς ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης): of which (viz. of the red sea, not, of the dry land, as Böhme, Kuinoel, and Klee. For as Lün. observes, the idea of the sea is necessarily called up again by κατεπόθησαν, shewing that it, and not the dry land, is the leading idea) the Egyptians making experiment (here, πείραν λαμβάνειν is in an active sense: in ver. 36, in a passive. Both are sufficiently common: e. g. for the active, Plato, Protag. p. 342 A, εἰ βούλει λαβεῖν μου πείραν ὅπως ἔχω: ib. 348 A: Gorg. 448 A: Polyb. ii. 32. 5, ἔκριναν τῆς τύχης λαβεῖν πείραν. See many others in Bleek: and for the other sense, on ver. 36) were swallowed up (by the sea. The verb is a general one, qualified by the particular mode of καταπίεσθαι. So in reff. Exod. and Num.: Diod. Sic. i. 32, τῶν δ' ἀποσχιζομένων μερῶν τὸ μὲν . . . ὑπ' ἄμμου καταπίνεται. And Polyb. ii. 41. 7, using the word of drowning, qualifies it: Ἐλίκης, τῆς . . . ὑπὸ τῆς θαλάττης καταποθείσης. There is something to be said for the reading κατεποντισθησαν, though it is weakly supported by mss,—as being the Alex. reading of the LXX in Exod. xv. 4, and found in Chrys. and Thdrt. Bleek inclines to think that our Writer may have had it in his Alexandrine

LXX).

30.] A second example of the strength of faith in Israel generally. By faith (of Israel, who obeyed the command of Joshua through all the days, which to the unbeliever would seem irrational. Cf. Chrys., οὐ γὰρ δὴ σαλπίζων ἡχὴ λίθους ὅλα τε καταβάλλειν ἐστί, κὰν μυρία τις ἔτη σαλπίζῃ, ἀλλ' ἡ πίστις πάντα δύναται), the walls of Jericho (more commonly τῆς Ἱεριχώ: but our Writer frequently omits the demonstrative article, see ver. 17; ch. iv. 7; vii. 11; ix. 4) fell (cf. Josh. vi. 5, 20. In the former of these it is πεσέται τὰ τείχη, in the latter ἔπεσαν ἅπαν τὰ τείχος: our Writer uses the plural verb with τείχη: each and every defence fell together), having been compassed about (see the narrative in Josh. vi.) during seven days (ἐπὶ, of time, with an accusative, gives the whole duration: see reff., and Winer, 49. 1. 2).

31.] The last example is one connected with the taking of Jericho, just mentioned. By faith (shewn in her confession Josh. ii. 9, "I know that Jehovah hath given you the land:" and ib. ver. 11, "Jehovah your God, He is God in heaven above and in earth beneath") Rahab the harlot (not to be softened into "cauponaria," as Valcknaer, al. Clement of Rome devotes to her a whole chapter of his Epistle to the Corinthians, and has no idea of her other than as an harlot. Calvin says well, "Hoc (epitheton) ad anteaquam vitam referri certum est: resipiscentiae enim testis est fides." See note, Matt. i. 5) did not perish with them who were disobedient (on the word ἀπειθέω, see note ch. iii. 18. The inhabitants of Jericho were disobedient to the will of God manifested by the signs and wonders which he had wrought for Israel: as is implied by Rahab's speech, Josh. ii. 9-12), having received (viz. to her house: κατέλυσαν ἐκεῖ, Josh. ii. 1) the spies (sent by Joshua to Jericho: ἀπέστειλεν Ἰησοῦς δύο νεαρίσκους κατασκο-

z Acts xv. 33.
only. Gen.
xxvi. 29.
a see John xi.
47.
b here only.
Obad 5 Ed-
vnt. A not B
F.) (Jer
xxxi 17, 18 compl.) only. see note.
27. xi. 27 only.

σκόπους ² μετ' εἰρήνης.

³² Καὶ ^a τί ἔτι λέγω; ^b ἐπι- ADKLP
λείψει με γὰρ ^c διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος περὶ Γεδεών, Βαράκ ^d ε f g h k
τε καὶ Σαμυὼν καὶ ^e Ἰεφθάς, Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ ^f 1 m o
τῶν προφητῶν, ³³ οἱ δὲ διὰ πίστεως ^d κατηγωνισαντο βασι- 17. 47

³². om ετι D¹[-gr].

rec γαρ bef με, with D³KL[P] rel Clem [Chr Euthal-ms
Thdr̄t]: om γαρ b¹: txt AD¹[N] 17. aft περι ins δε D¹[-gr]. om τε και
(aft Βαράκ) AN 17 vulg copt Clem [Ephr̄i, C₃r₁] Ambr₁.—και βαράκ κ. σ. D¹. om
και (bef ιεφθαε) AN 17 Clem [Ephr̄i, C₃r₁].

πεῦσαι, Josh. ii. 1) with peace (reff.: so that they had nothing hostile to fear from her). On the introduction of Rahab in James ii. 25, as an example of justification by works, see note there.

³²—⁴⁰.] The Writer breaks off, feeling that such an illustration of faith by examples would be endless, and *gathers up those many which remain in one*,—*ἐν ἀλλήδην τῶν λοιπῶν μνημονεύει*, as Thdr̄t.

³².] And what say I (λέγω is most probably indicative, not subjunctive: cf. ref.: and see Winer, 41. α. 3: Bernhardy, p. 396. The sense is the same: 'What am I saying, going to say, more,' is tantamount to 'what shall I say more') yet (more, any further)? for the time (ὁ χρόνος ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, φησίν, ἀρμόδιος καὶ οἷον ἡ συμμετρία, Eccl.: ποῖος; ἡ ὁ πᾶς εἴρηται δὲ τοῦτο, ὡς συνηθὲς ἡμῖν λέγειν, ὑπερβολικῶς ἢ, ὁ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ σύμμετρος, Thl. The latter is the more probable) will fail me (ἐπιλείπει ἂν με would imply, *if I undertook it*,—the hypothesis affecting the whole clause: the ind. future states the failure of the time as a positive certainty, the hypothesis now lying in the pres. part. διηγούμενον. The phrase is a common one, and the construction regular: cf. Demosth. p. 324. 17, ἐπιλείπει με λέγοντα ἡ ἡμέρα τὰ τῶν προδοτῶν δνόματα: Julian, Orat. i. p. 341 B, ἐπιλείπει με τᾶκείνου διηγούμενον ὁ χρόνος: Philo de Merc. Meretr. § 3, vol. ii. p. 167, ἐπιλείπει με ἡ ἡμέρα λέγοντα τὰ τῶν κατ' εἶδος ἀρετῶν δνόματα: and many other examples, Greek and Latin, in Wetst. and Bleek) narrating (if I narrate) concerning (so we have in Plato, Euthyd. p. 6 C, πολλὰ περὶ τῶν θείων διηγήσομαι) Gideon (it is almost impossible to determine satisfactorily the arrangement of the copula from the manuscript evidence: and if once we allow subjectivities to creep in, there is no end to the varieties which different men may find suitable. I have left the rec. text, which though against AN, has the great body of manuscripts with it. And thus standing, the names form two groups: 1. Γεδεών, Βαράκ τε καὶ Σάμωων, καὶ Ἰεφθάς,

. . . 2. Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν προφητῶν: the former, the Judges: the latter, the Prophets, David and Samuel at the head of them, the former as a king, the latter as a judge, being exceptional and transitional. The order is not chronological: Gideon, the first mentioned, is posterior in time to Barak, the second; Samson, the third, to Jephthah, the fourth; and David, the first of the second group, posterior to Samuel, the second. The reason for this may be the greater celebrity of Gideon as a champion of the faith than of Barak, and of Samson than of Jephthah: and in the second group, it is natural to put David, for his eminence, first, and besides, Samuel thus becomes the first in the rank of the Prophets properly so called, Acts iii. 24. Delitzsch's arrangement, which makes Γεδεών Βαράκ τε καὶ Σάμωων the first group, Ἰεφθάς, Δαυεὶδ τε καὶ Σαμουὴλ the second, and the Prophets a third, suits indeed the strictly pressing of the τε καὶ in the two places, which is a trifling matter, —but by placing Jephthah with David, and separating Samuel from the Prophets, breaks up the real and far more important classification. The τε καὶ is in fact no more than the simple copula in sense, but a little varied: and as De Wette has remarked, Gideon and Barak, David and Jephthah are not more nearly connected by it, than the other names by καὶ. On Gideon, see Judg. vi.—viii.) and Barak (Judg. iv. v. Barak was not so strong in faith as he might have been, though he did believe, and go to the fight, and triumph: see Judg. iv. 8, 9) and Samson (Judg. xiii.—xvi.) and Jephthah (Judg. xi. 1—xii. 7) and David and Samuel and the prophets; ³³.] who (οἱ does not strictly identify the antecedents, but more nearly = οἵτινες, 'quales' rather *which* than *who*: for many of the actions which follow were done by others than those previously mentioned) through faith (these words διὰ πίστεως, apply to the whole sentence as far as ἀλλοτρίων ver. 34. διὰ πίστεως instead of πίστει for the first time in the chapter, suits perhaps better the miscel-

λείας, ^e εἰργάσαντο ^e δικαιοσύνην, ^f ἐπέτυχον ^f ἐπαγγελιών, ^e Acts x. 35.
^g ἔφραξαν ^g στόματα ⁱ λέοντων, ^{34j} ἔσβεσαν ^k δύναμιν ^k πυ- ^f ch. vi. 15 reff.
 ρός, ἔφυγον ¹ στόματα ¹ μαχαίρης, ^m ἐνεδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ^g Rom. iii. 19.
 ἀσθενείας, ἐγενήθησαν ἰσχυροὶ ἐν πολλέμῳ, ⁿ παρεμβολὰς ² Macc. xiv.
^h as above (g). ² Cor. xi. 10 only. ^{Prov.} xxi. 13. ⁱ Rev. iv. 7 reff. ^j Matt. xii. 20 (from Isa. xlii.
 3). xxv. 8. Mark ix. 44, &c. (from Isa. lxi. 24) ^{Eph.} vi. 16. ¹ Thess. v. 19 only. ^k Wisd. xii. 19.
 1 Luke xxi. 24. Josh. xxi. 48 al. ^m elsw., P. only (Rom. iv. 20. ^{Eph.} vi. 10 al.), exc. Acts ix.
 22. ² Sam. v. 34 AB(not Ed-vat. Fl. Ps li 7 (9) only. ⁿ = here (ch. xiii. 11, 13. Acts xxi. 34,
 37. xxi. 24. xxiii. 10, 16, 32. Rev. x. 9) only. ^{Judg.} iv. 16. vii. 14 al.

33. ἠργασαντο D¹N¹ [47¹]. στομα D¹[-gr].

34. (μαχαίρης, so AD N, also [D¹N] in ver. 37.)

ἐνεδυναμωθ. AD²³: ἐδυν-

αμωθ. N¹.

laneous verbs of predication which follow, e. g. ἔσβεσαν δύναμιν πυρός) subdued kingdoms (on the verb, see reff., and examples in Wetst. and Bl.,—Plut. Numa, § 19, ἀπὸ Καίσαρος, τοῦ κατηγορησιαμένου Πομπηίου, &c. The acts referred to may be Gideon's victory over the Midianites (Judg. vii.), Barak's over the Canaanites (ib. iv.), Samson's over the Philistines (ib. xiv. ff.), Jephthah's over the Ammonites (ib. ix.), David's over the Philistines (2 Sam. v. 17—25; viii. 1; xxi. 15 ff.), Moabites, Syrians, Edomites (ib. viii. 2 ff.), Ammonites (ib. x. xii. 26 ff.), wrought righteousness (so Samuel, the righteous judge, 1 Sam. xii. 3, 4; David, the righteous king, 2 Sam. viii. 15; 1 Chron. xviii. 14; and indeed in a wide sense all of them, see Jer. xxiii. 5; Ezek. xlv. 9, τοῦτο κοινὸν τῶν ἁγίων πάντων, as Thdrst.), obtained promises (the words are capable of two senses: 1. got from God spoken promises, as e. g. the Prophets: or 2. obtained the fulfilment of promises. (1) is taken by Chrys. (referring it to the promise to David that his seed should sit on his throne), Thdrst., Primas, Schlicht., Bleek, Ebrard, al. But it seems to me altogether improbable that the Writer should thus illustrate faith by a fact which, though it may have accompanied faith in the recipient, was certainly no fruit or direct triumph of it: and that in the face of such sayings as Josh. xxi. 45 and 1 Kings viii. 56, and of Gideon's trials of God. The objection which is brought against (2), that it is inconsistent with μὴ λαβόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ver. 13, and with οὐκ ἐκομίσαντο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ver. 39, is very simply answered: it is not said that they ἐπέτυχον τῶν ἐπαγγελιών or τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, but anarthrously: they obtained promises, but not the promises which were yet future. And so most Commentators), stopped the mouths of lions (referring principally, it may be, to Daniel, of whom it is said, Dan. vi. 22, that God sent his angel and stopped (ἤρξα, ἐνέφραξε Theodotion; LXX freely, ἔσωσέν με ἀπὸ τῶν λ.) the mouths of the lions: where notice also the addition (ver.

23 Theod.), ὅτι ἐπίστευσεν ἐν τῷ θεῷ αὐτοῦ. But reference may be also to Samson, Judg. xiv. 6, and David, 1 Sam. xvii. 34: and I may add, Benaiah the son of Jehoiada, 2 Sam. xxiii. 20: 1 Chron. xi. 22),

34.] quenched the power of fire (so the three companions of Daniel,—Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, Dan. iii. Thl. says, οὐκ εἶπε δὲ ἔσβεσαν πῦρ, ἀλλὰ δύναμιν πυρός, ὃ καὶ μείζον ἐξαπτόμενος γὰρ ὕμνος δύναμιν τοῦ καίειν οὐκ εἶχε κατ' αὐτῶν. It is said of them, 1 Macc. ii. 59, that they πιστεύσαντες ἐσώθησαν ἐκ φλογός. Delitzsch reminds us that one of the two martyrs at Brussels, Henry Voes and Joh. Esche, when the flames of the faggots rose round him, said, that it felt to him as if they were strewing roses under him), escaped the edge (στόματα, plur., because the Writer has various examples in mind) of the sword (e. g. David from Saul, 1 Sam. xviii. 11; xix. 10, 12; xxi. 10; Elijah, 1 Kings xix. 1 ff.; Elisha, 2 Kings vi. 14 ff., 31 ff.; Jeremiah, Baruch, Jer. xxxvi. 26; Ebedmelech, Jer. xxxviii. 8 ff., compared with xxxix. 18), were made strong out of weakness (so Samson, after his hair grew, Judg. xvi. 28 ff.: David, who ends so many of his plaintive psalms with jubilant thanksgiving: Hezekiah, who after deadly sickness was restored to fifteen years of health, 2 Kings xx.: Isa. xxxviii. [see also ref. Judg., of Gideon]. The ancient expositors refer the words, not so probably, to the strengthening of Israel after the return from the captivity: so Chrys., ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας, τουτέστιν, ἀπὸ αἰχμαλωσίας. τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπάνοδον τὴν ἀπὸ Βαβυλῶνος ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται), were made (see note on ch. iv. 3) strong in war (Thdrst. says, καὶ οἱ προρρήθέντες, καὶ οἱ τοῦ Ματθαίου παῖδες, 'Ιουδας καὶ 'Ιωνάθης καὶ Σίμων. It is not improbable that these later glories of the faith were also before the Writer's mind: they unquestionably are in the next verse), put to flight (the classical usage: so Il. ε. 37, Τρῶας δ' ἐκλιναν Δαναοί: Il. ξ. 510: Od. i. 59) armies (παρεμβολή, which occurs in ch. xiii. (reff.) in its usual sense of a camp, is

ο = here only. ADKLP
 Homer, pas- N a b c d
 sim. e f g h k
 p = here only. l m o
 Isa. i. 7. 17. 47
 Ps. cxi. 11
 al. fr.
 q = 4 Kings iv. 36, 37. r here only t. (-νον, 2 Macc. vi. 19, 28) s = ch x 34. t = here
 Only. (ch. ix. 15 al) u = ch. i. 4 reff.

ο ἔκλιναν ῥ ἄλλοτρίων. 35 q ἔλαβον γυναῖκες ἐξ ἀναστά- ADKLP
 σεως τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐτῶν, ἄλλοι δὲ ῥ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ e f g h k
 s προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ῥ ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα ῥ κρείττονος ἀνα- l m o
 17. 47

35. γυναῖκας AD¹N¹, *acceperunt mulieres de resurrectione mortuorum suorum* D-lat:
accep. mul. de res. mortuos suos vulg. ἀπετυμπανίσθ. D¹.

not unfrequently used in Hellenistic Greek for the army which is in the camp: see reff., and add Ælian, Var. Hist. xiv. 46, οἱ κύνες προφηδῶντες ἐτάραττον τὴν παρεμβολήν) of aliens (see reff. The word is common in the LXX, of Gentiles, aliens from God's people. The reference of the fact may be general, to many who have preceded: but I should rather regard it as describing the Maccabæan victories. Delitzsch would understand all from ἐφυγον στόματα μαχαίρας, of those times: the escape of Mattathias and his sons into the mountains, the increase and success of the little band that strengthened itself in God, the first victories of Judas Maccabæus over Apollonius, Seron, and others, the formal and victorious war of the Asmonæan heroes with the Syrians and neighbouring people. "That the Writer," he continues, "should recognize these as illustrious deeds of faith, is no wonder. In our times indeed it is the custom to represent the mighty revival of the Maccabæan period rather as human than divine, rather as patriotic and popular than theocratic and national: but the book of Daniel shews us, in prophetic delineation of that time, the holy people of the Most High, conflicting with the atheistic and antichristian prince of this world, and ascribes to this conflict the highest imaginable importance in reference to the sacred history. Therefore I hold that the clauses from ἐφυγον pass beyond τῶν προφητῶν, and over the book of Daniel to the first of Maccabees, which in the LXX is attached to it: which indeed is generally acknowledged with regard to the two last clauses, and is the more certain because παρεμβολή (πῆχη), both in the sense of a *camp*, and in that of an army in order of battle, is one of the favourite words in 1 Macc., and ἀλλότριον (as well as ἀλλόφυλοι) occurs there, as the translation of עַרְבִּי or עַרְבִּי: e. g. i. 38; ii. 7: cf. xv. 33." And perhaps after all, this may be the true view).

35.] Women received (back: so Xen. Cyr. v. 1. i, ταύτην οὖν (τὴν γυναῖκα) ἐκέλευεν ὁ Κύριος διαφυλάττειν . . . ἕως ἂν αὐτὸς λάβῃ. See also below) their dead by (out of, by means of, their reception springing out of it as its cause) **resurrection** (not, *the resurrection*: see below.

The cases alluded to seem to be those of the widow of Zarephath, 1 Kings xvii. 17 ff., and the Shunamite, 2 Kings iv. 17 ff., whose sons were raised, the former by Elijah, the latter by Elisha. The faith must be that of the women themselves, the subject of the sentence, not merely that in the Prophets: but (for the contrast, see below) **others were broken on the wheel** (the case especially referred to is that of Eleazar, 2 Macc. vi. 18—end; and the τύμπανον seems to have been an instrument like a wheel or drumhead, on which the victim was stretched and scourged to death: cf. reff. Josephus, de Macc. v. 9, 10 (4 Macc. v. 32), makes Eleazar say to Antiochus, πρὸς ταῦτα τροχούς εὐτρέπιξε κ.τ.λ. And in the deaths of the seven brothers, which are related differently from the account in 2 Macc. vii., we read of the first (4 Macc. ix. 12), ἀνέβαλον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τροχόν, and similarly of several of the others. See Bleek and Wetst. for examples of the word. It occurs in the Schol. to Aristoph. Plut. 476, ὃ τύμπανα καὶ κύφωρες, οὐκ ἄρξετε, where the Schol. says, τύμπ., ξύλα, ἐφ' οἷς ἐτυμπαίνουσιν ἐχρόνῳ γὰρ ταύτῃ τῇ τιμωρίᾳ. And in Aristot. Rhet. ii. 5 al.), **not accepting** (οὐ, because the fact of their absolutely refusing is mainly in view) **the deliverance** (offered to them: see in the deaths of the seven brethren passim, 2 Macc. vii. Eleazar himself says, 2 Macc. vi. 30, δυνάμενος ἀπολυθῆναι τοῦ θανάτου, σκληρὰς ὑποφέρειν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα ἀλγηδόνas), that they might obtain a better resurrection (there can I think be little doubt that Chrys.'s explanation of κρείττονος is right: κρείττονος; . . . οὐ τοιαύτης, ὅλας τὰ παῖδια τῶν γυναικῶν. Those sons were raised by a kind of resurrection to a life which should again end in death: but these expected a glorious resurrection to endless life. Cf. 2 Macc. vii. 9, ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ νόμων εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ὥσθι ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει: also ib. v. 11, 14, 20, 23, 36. And so Thl., Bengel, Schulz, Bohme, Bleek, De Wette, Stuart, Ebrard, Delitzsch, al. Qc. understands κρείττονος as opposed to the resurrection of the ungodly to judgment, Dan. xii. 2:

g Acts xix. 13. **χαίρης ἀπέθανον** ^ε περιήλθον ἐν ^η μῆλωταῖς, ἐν ^ι αἰγείοις ADKLP
xxviii. 13. ^κ δέρμασιν, ^ι ὑστερούμενοι ^μ θλιβόμενοι ^ν κακουχούμενοι N a b c d
1 Tim. v. 13 only. Wisd. e f g h k
vi. 13. 38 ὧν οὐκ ἦν ^ο ἄξιος ^ρ κόσμος, ἐπὶ ^ι ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι l m o
h here only. 17. 47
3 Kings xix. 13, 19. 4 Kings ii. 8, 13, 14 only. (see Clem. in note.) i here only. Exod xxv. 4. xxxv. 6, 26. Num.
xxxi. 20 only k here only. Exod xxv. 5. see Zech. xiii. 4. Matt. iii. 4 || Mk. 1 = Luke xv.
14. 2 Cor. xi. 8. Phil. ii. 12. Deut. xv. 8 A Ald compl. Sir xiii. 4 m 2 Cor. i. 6. iv. 8. vii.
5. 1 Thess. ii. 4. 2 Thess. i. 6, 7. 1 Tim. v. 10 (Matt. vii. 14 Maik. iii. 9) only. Ps cxix. 1 n ch. xvi.
3 only. 3 Kings ii. 26 bis. xl. 39 A (not in B) only. q Matt. xv. 33. Mark viii. 4. 2 Cor. xi. 26 only. Ezek. xxxv. 4.
3 John 6. p = ver. 7 reff. q Matt. xv. 33. Mark viii. 4. 2 Cor. xi. 26 only. Ezek. xxxv. 4.

[Euthal-ms]: om **πειρασθ.** 2. 43 lectt 8-17 Syr ^{æth} Orig₁ (ins₂) Eus₁ [Ephr₁ Socr₁]
Thl. **κακοχουμ.** D³L [m 47 Eus₁: **κακοχου.** P]: **κακωχ.** K

38. rec (for **πει**) **εν**, with DKL rel Clem Orig₂ Eus₃: txt AN 17. 71-3. 118 Orig₁
Ath₁ Socr₁.

is not altogether wanting for its omission. The Syr. omits it, which is of some weight. 2. It has seemed to many critics that some mention of *fire* might well be expected here; so they have conjectured **ἐπὶ ῥήσθησαν, ἐπυράσθησαν, ἐπυρώθησαν, ἐπεπύρασθησαν, ἐπεπύρωθησαν, ἐπεπύρωσθησαν**. Others, 3. have thought that *mutilation* was more probably intended, and have conjectured **ἐπὶ ῥάσθησαν**. Many other conjectures may be seen in Bleek, Lünem., and Delitzsch: **ἐπάρσθησαν** (from **πείρω**, Beza, edd. 1, 2 al., adopted by Luther in his version: but hardly a legitimate formation), **ἐπεράσθησαν** (from **περάω** (?): Wakefield), **ἐσπεπράσθησαν** or **-άσθησαν** (from **σπείρω** = **τροχός**: so Alberti), **ἐπράσθησαν** (*were sold*: Le Moyné), **ἐπηρείσθησαν** (Reiske as quoted in Wetst.), **ἐπέρθθησαν, ἐσφαιρίσθησαν, ἐταριχεύθησαν** (but this last only ironically in Matthæi). *If any conjecture is to be made*, I would say that either the omission, or **ἐπὶ ῥήσθησαν**, would appear to me the most probable. The former is advocated by Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Grot., Hammond, Whitby, Calmet, Storr, Valcknaer, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee, Delitzsch: the latter by Junius and Piscator: and *some word* indicating death by fire, by Beza, edd. 3, 4, 5, Gataker, Colomesius, Sykes, De Wette, Ebrard, al. As it stands, I do not see how any appropriate meaning can be given to the mere enduring of temptation, placed as it is between being *sawn asunder* and *dying by the sword*, died in the murder of the sword (i. e. were slain by the sword; see reff. One Prophet only perished by the sword in the kingdom of Judah, viz. Urijah, Jer. xxvi. 23: but under Israel it is said, 1 Kings xix. 10, "they (the house of Omri) have slain thy Prophets with the sword." Perhaps the Maccabean persecutions may again be before the Writer's mind: see 2 Macc. vii. 4. Chrys. says beautifully, **τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τί λέγεις; οἱ μὲν ἐφύγον στόματα μαχαίρας, οἱ δὲ ἐν φόβῳ μαχαίρας ἀπέθανον; τί ἐστι τοῦτο; ποῖον ἐπαινεῖς; ποῖον θαυμάζεις; τοῦτο**

ἢ ἐκείνο; γαί, φησί, καὶ τοῦτο κακείνο· δύο γάρ ἐστι τὰ θαύματα τῆς πίστεως, ὅτι καὶ ἀνὴρ μέγας, καὶ πάσχει μέγας, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡγείται πάσχειν): 37 b, 38.]

Examples of those who, though not put to violent death, lived lives of apparent wretchedness in the endurance of faith.

37 b.] they wandered about (τὸ **περιήλθον** διώκεσθαι αὐτοὺς δηλοῖ, ἢ ἀστατεῖν. Thl.) in sheepskins (**μῆλωτῃ**, **προβάτειος δορά**, Etym. Mag. But also, as Hesych., **πάσα βύρσα, ὅ ἐστι πᾶν δέρμα, μῆλωτῃ λέγεται**. **μῆλον** was the name for small kine, whether sheep or goats, and the **μῆλωτῃ** was the skin of such kine with the hair on. The LXX (reff.) use the word for Elijah's garment, to whom the allusion seems principally to be. Clem.-rom. ad Cor. 17, p. 241, says, **μικρὰ γενόμεθα κακείνων, οἵτινες ἐν δέρμασιν αἰγείοις καὶ μῆλωταῖς περιεπάτησαν, κηρύσσοντες τὴν ἑλευσιν τοῦ χριστοῦ, λέγομεν δὴ 'Ἡλῖαν κ. 'Ελισσαῖον, ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ 'Ιεζεκιήλ, τοὺς προφήτας**. Clem.-alex. Strom. iv. 17, § 107, p. 610 P., citing this, inserts after **μῆλωταῖς**,—**καὶ τριχῶν καμῆλειῶν πλέγμασιν**. See more particulars in Suicer, sub voce: and cf. Matt. vii. 15) and **goats' skins** (this, coming after **μῆλωταῖς**, which may mean the same, has surprised some, and has seemed to them a mere gloss on that word. But it is quoted by Clem. and Orig., besides being found in all mss. and vss. Delitzsch says that "it not only explains the former, but intensifies it: for the (commonly) black goat's skin shewed, even more than the (commonly) white sheepskin, the deep earnestness of one thrust out from the world, and dead to it." Perhaps: but it is more probable that the Writer regarded **μῆλωτῃ** as merely the sheepskin, and mentioned the other because goats were as often kept and their skin as often worn), **destitute** (reff.), **afflicted** (reff.), in misery (cf. ver. 25): 38.] of whom (viz. those who wandered about as in ver. 37: for the participial construction is resumed below, and in reference to these same persons. οὗτοι πάντες first occurs in the next verse.

καὶ ὄρεσιν καὶ ὁ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὁπαῖς τῆς γῆς. ³⁹ καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ἡ μαρτυρηθέντες διὰ τῆς πίστεως οὐκ ἔκομισαντο τὴν ἡ ἐπαγγελίαν, ⁴⁰ τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ ἡμῶν ἡ κρείττον τὴν ἡ προβλεψαμένου, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν ἡ τελειωθῶσιν.

t ch. vii. 8 reff.
only. Ps. xxxv. 13 only.

u ch. x. 38 (reff.).
x ch. ii. 10 reff.

v ch. i. 4 reff.

s Matt. xxi.
13 ||. John
xi. 38. Rev.
vi. 15 only
3 Kings xvi.
4, 12. 2 Macc.
vi. 11.
s James iii. 11
only. Exod.
xxxiii. 22.
w here

39. παντ. μαρτ. bef οὗτοι D[gr].

τας επαγγελίας A 80 Eus, Cyr[-p₁] Aug₁.

40. κρειτ. τι bef περι ημ. D¹ B¹ [copt] Orig₁[txt₂ Eus₁] Procop₁.

Of course, Carpozov's reference of ὧν is inadmissible, "quorum indignus malorum erat mundus: id est, tam crudelibus affecti sunt supplicii, ut illa mundo indigna sint: ut orbem terrarum non deceat, tam horrenda ac φοβεράτατα de eo dici") the world was not worthy (the world, by casting them out and persecuting them, proved that it was not fit to have them in it: condemned itself, in condemning them. Cf. Calvin, "Quum ita profugi inter feras vagabantur sancti Prophetæ, videri poterant indigni quos terra sustineret. Qui fit enim ut inter homines locum non inveniunt? Sed Apostolus in contrariam partem hoc retorquet, nempe quod mundus illis non esset dignus. Nam quocumque veniant servi Dei, ejus benedictionem, quasi fragrantiam boni odoris, secum afferunt. Sic domus Potiphar benedicta fuit in gratiam Josephi, Gen. xxxix. 5, et Sodoma salva futura erat, si in ea inventi fuissent decem justi homines, Gen. xviii. 32"); wandering in deserts and mountains and caves, and the chinks of the earth (the Holy Land was especially calculated, by its geological formation, and its wildernesses, to afford shelter to persecuted persons: so did it to a hundred of the Lord's prophets whom Obadiah hid by fifty in a cave (σπήλαιον), 1 Kings xviii. 4, 13: to Elijah, ib. xix. 9, 13: to Mattathias and his sons, who fled to the mountains, 1 Macc. ii. 28 f., and many others in the wilderness: to Judas Maccabæus, who fled with others εἰς τὴν ἔρημον and there lived ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν like the wild beasts, 2 Macc. v. 27. Cf. also ib. vi. 11; x. 6. Jos. Antt. xii. 6, 2, of Mattathias, καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν μετὰ τῶν τέκνων εἰς τὴν ἔρημον ἐξώρμησε, καταλιπὼν ἅπαναν τὴν αὐτοῦ κτῆσιν ἐν τῇ κόμῃ. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ καὶ πολλοὶ ποιήσαντες, μετὰ τέκνων καὶ γυναικῶν ἔφυγον εἰς τὴν ἔρημον καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις διήγον. But τῆς γῆς must not be taken for "the land," viz. Palestine, as Böhme: it is general).

39.] And these all (these, every one of them.) πάντες οὗτοι would be 'all these.' All, viz. all that have been named or referred to throughout the chapter: not only, as Hammond, al., those ἄλλοι since ver. 35), borne

witness to by their faith (the emphasis is on μαρτυρηθέντες, not on διὰ τῆς πίστεως: and the sense is rather 'though borne witness to,' than 'being,' or 'because,' borne witness to.' On the word and its import see vv. 2, 4, 5), did not receive the promise (many promises indeed they did receive, ver. 33: but not THE PROMISE κατ' ἐσχῆν, the promise of final salvation, or as it is called ch. ix. 15, τὴν ἐπαγγ. τῆς αἰωνίου κληρονομίας: the perfection, to which without us they were not to attain. "But," says Delitzsch, "do we not read ch. vi. 15, of Abraham, ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας? Certainly, he has obtained the promise, yet not this side the grave, but, as we there maintained, in his life on the other side the grave: the general and actual salvation of the N. T. is, in their heavenly estate, the joy of the patriarchs. And this view is confirmed by looking forward to ch. xii., where the O. T. believers translated into heaven are called the πνεύματα δικαίων τετελειωμένων, or at all events are included in that designation. And another question arises. It is said of the O. T. saints, that they did not obtain the promise: but is it not plain, from ch. x. 36, that κομίζεσθαι τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν is for us also a thing future? Doubtless, but with a significant difference. For them, final salvation was a thing purely future: for us, it is a thing present as well as future: present, in that it is once for all brought about by Christ's offering of Himself,—future, inasmuch as the unfolding of all the fulness of that which we possess, and the taking possession of it, when unfolded in its fulness, is for us yet to come: cf. ch. ix. 28 with x. 14").

40.] God (Clem.-alex. Strom. iv. § 16, p. 609 P., cites this with τοῦ θεοῦ joined to τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, and so does the liturgy of Chrysostom in some manuscripts. In that case προβλεψαμένου would be in apposition with θεοῦ. But such a connexion is not likely) having provided (foreseen from far (reff.): προορᾶν, προῖδεῖν, προῖδῃσθαι are more usual words) concerning us (περὶ ἡμῶν has the emphasis, as contrasted with οὗτοι πάντες, us, viz. the Writer and his readers, as belonging to the N. T. church) something

1 Thess. iv. 6
only Job
xxii. 10
πέφρακτο διὰ το

XII. ¹ Ὁ τοιγαροῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς τοσούτου ἔχοντες ² περι-

z = here (ch v 2 Mark ix 42. Luke xviii. 2 Acts xxviii. 20) only τ. τὸ ἔθνος στρατοπέδους

ADKLP
N a b c d
e f g h k
l m o
17. 47

CHAP. XII. 1. for τοσούτου, τηλικούτου N¹.

better (what is this κρείττον τι? The Fathers generally interpret it of the ultimate state of glorious perfection, which shall only then come in, when all the number of the elect shall be accomplished. So Chrys., ἐννοήσατε . . . τί ἐστὶ, καὶ ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸν Ἀβραὰμ καθῆσθαι, καὶ τὸν ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, περιμένοντας πότε σὺ τελευτήσῃς, ἵνα δυνήθῃσι τότε λαβεῖν τὸν μισθόν. On this view, as Delitzsch says, the κρείττον τι would consist in this, that the history of mankind has not been cut short as it would have been if the ancients had received the promise in this sense, but has been continued for us to partake of our present privileges under the N. T. But, he continues, this eschatological narrow acceptance of the promise, has against it not only what is said of Abraham in ch. vi. 15, viz. ἐπέτυχεν τῆς ἐπαγγελίας, but also the whole spirit of the Epistle, which regards final salvation as brought in with the propitiation of Christ, and τὸ ἔσχατον τῶν ἡμερῶν as begun with His first Advent. The Writer cannot be ignoring this all-inclusive beginning of the N. T. fulfilment of the promises, in attributing to us κρείττον τι than the O. T. believers had. And consequently we must understand by the expression, something better than they had, viz. the enjoyment, here, of the fulfilment of the promise, which they never had here, and only have there since Christ's descent into Hades and ascension into heaven. It is that κρείττον τι for which the Lord felicitates his disciples, Matt. xiii. 17, the revelation of the Son of God, ch. i. 1, the σωτηρία of ch. ii. 3), that they should not apart from us be made perfect (the design of God in this provision of something better for us was, that they, the O. T. saints, should not be perfected without us, i. e. independently of the N. T. salvation of which we are partakers,—cut off from Christ's universal Church of which we are members. But we read, ch. xii. 23, of them as τετελειωμένοι now. And therefore the Writer implies, as indeed ch. x. 14 seems to testify, that the Advent and work of Christ has changed the estate of the O. T. fathers and saints into greater and perfect bliss; an inference which is forced on us by many other places in Scripture. So that their perfection was dependent on our perfection: their and our perfection was all brought in at the same time, when Christ ἤλθε προσ-

φορᾷ ἐτελείωσεν εἰς τὸ διηγεῖσθαι τοὺς ἁγιαζομένους. So that the result with regard to them is, that their spirits, from the time when Christ descended into Hades and ascended up into heaven, enjoy heavenly blessedness, and are waiting, with all who have followed their glorified High Priest within the veil, for the resurrection of their bodies, the Regeneration, the renovation of all things. This thought naturally leads on to the opening verses of the next chapter).

CHAP. XII. 1—11.] EXHORTATION, mixed with reproof, on looking back at all these witnesses, and looking also to Jesus, who has come to glory through suffering, not to faint in the conflict with sin; nor to forget the love of our Father, who visits us with chastisement that we may bring forth the fruit of righteousness. This exhortation was begun at ch. x. 19, and broken off by the insertion of all those examples of the nature and triumphs of faith. It is now resumed, having, so to speak, accumulated new momentum by the interruption, and is pressed home directly on the readers.

1.] Wherefore (τοιγαροῦν) is an earnest and solemn inference, only found at the beginning of a sentence. “τοι,” says Delitzsch, “affirms the conditions of fact, γὰρ grounds on them, οὖν follows thereupon; so that the whole amounts to an earnest ergo”) we also (as well as those just enumerated) having so great a cloud (see below) of witnesses surrounding us (in order to understand μαρτύρων aright, we must bear in mind both the similitude here used, and the connexion with the preceding chapter. “Hic versus totus constat vocibus agonisticis,” says Hammond. And this being so, who can help referring this cloud of witnesses which surrounds us to the agonistic scene which is depicted, and regarding them as lookers on while our race is run? Whoever denies such reference, misses, it seems to me, the very point of the sense. But even thus we have not exhausted the meaning of μαρτύρες. It is improbable, as Delitzsch well observes, that the Writer should have used the word μαρτύρες so closely upon μαρτυρηθέντες, ch. xi. 39, without any reference to that idea. See also ib. vv. 2, 4, 5. So that we can hardly help giving to ‘witnesses’ a sense not confined to their looking on upon us, but extending to their ethical condition of witnesses for the faith. But we may notice, that De-

κείμενον ἡμῖν ^a νέφος μαρτύρων, ^b ὄγκον ^c ἀποθέμενοι ^a here only†.
Hom. II. 8.

274 al. Eur. Hec. 897. Apoll. Rhod. Arg. iv. 398 (al. in Bleek.)
c James i. 21 reff.

b here only†. (see note.)

litzsch in contending for this double sense, has in fact a triple reference of the word to justify: they are *borne witness to*, they have their *μαρτυρία*, ch. xi. 5: and by this they become *μαρτύρες*: and they carry out that office in being witnesses of our conflict here below. Bohme (cited by Del.) remarks, that this manifold reference of the word has been the reason why the Writer has not written *μαρτύρες τῆς πίστεως* or the like. And now the propriety of the other words used at once appears. νέφος, not only an immense multitude (*νέφος μιμούμενον τῇ πυκνότητι*, Thdrt.: cf. ἡμα δὲ νέφος εἶπετο περὶ ὧν, ref. Hom.: τοῖον Ἑλλάνων νέφος ἀμφὶ σε κρύπτει, ref. Eur.), and that number as it were pressing us all around as the spectators did the combatants in the circus (*περικείμενον*, see reff. *τουτέστι, πάντοθεν ἡμᾶς περιέχον*, Thl.),—but also fitly compared to a cloud from the fact of its being *above us*, they looking on from that heavenly bliss which they entered at Christ's triumph. So that the words must be taken as distinctly so far implying community between the church triumphant and the church below, that they who have entered into heavenly rest are conscious of what passes among ourselves. Any interpretation short of this leaves the exhortation here tame and without point. If they are merely quasi-witnesses, merely witnesses in a metaphor, the motive, as far as this clause supplies one, is gone. The Greek expositors generally regard *μαρτύρων* as referring only to their having witnessed for the faith. So Chrys., ἐμαρτύρησαν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ μεγαλειότητι: Thdrt., πλήθος τοσούτων . . . μαρτυρεῖ τῇ δυνάμει τῆς πίστεως: Thdr.-mops., μαρτύρων ἐνταῦθα οὐ τῶν πεπονημένων λέγει, ἀλλὰ τῶν μαρτυρούντων πρὸς τὴν πίστιν. Most of the moderns take this meaning (even Lünemann); others that of martyrs, rejected above by Thdr.-mops.: cf. Acts xxii. 20: Rev. ii. 13 (xi. 3): xvii. 6. νέφος is interpreted by the Greek expositors (not Thdrt.) as *affording shade and protection*. So Chrys., περικείμενον κύκλῳ, ἐν μέλζονι ἀδεία εἰκότως εἶναι ποιήσει: and (Ec., in his altern. more explicitly, νέφος δὲ ἐκάλεσαν αὐτούς, ἥ ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν ὑπὸ καύματος καταφλεγόμενων καὶ ὑπεισελθόντων εἰς νεφέλῃν δροσίζουσιν καὶ παραμυθθέντων. καὶ γὰρ ἡ τῶν ἁγίων μνήμη τοῦς ὑπὸ τοῦ καύσωνος τῶν πειρασμῶν ἐκκελυμένους παραμυθεῖται. ἡ ὅτι νοσητὴν (spiritual) ἡμῖν, φησί, δρόσον νέμονται, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τὸν θεὸν ἱκετεύοντες. I need not say, that such an idea is completely

precluded by the nature of the argument, and the following participial clause in ver. 2.

The best note on the whole idea and imagery is that of Schlichting: "Introducit nos veluti in theatrum quoddam amplissimum, in quod magna spectatorum turba confluerit, quæ, omnibus locis et subselliis repletis, veluti nubes quædam densa in medio certantibus circumfusa videatur. In tantæ multitudinis totque spectatorum veluti oculis certantes nos facit. Quemadmodum autem olim certantibus tanta spectatorum multitudo addebat animos, et ingens erat ad summam vincendi contentionem stimulus: sic et nobis tot testes, qui et ipsi in eodem certamine desudarunt, alacritatem addere debent, ut summis viribus ceptum stadium decurramus. Testes autem eos vocat, non tantum per prosopopœiam quandam alludens ad certaminum spectatores ut dictum est, qui sunt testes quidam virtutis eorum qui certant: sed etiam, idque multo magis, propterea, quod de Deo ejusque bonitate et justitia testentur, et omnes uno veluti dicant ore, esse Deum, et esse remuneratorem eorum qui ipsum quaerunt: apud eum, tanquam summum agonothetam, braveum esse strenue certantibus repositum: veracem illum esse in suis promissionibus: etiam post mortem posse reddere felices eos, qui ipsius causa vitam prodigissent. Testium enim nomine illi imprimis hoc loco sunt intelligendi, qui suo sanguine de Dei fide et bonitate testantur. Unde et κατ' ἐξοχὴν *martyres*, id est, testes, hic appellantur"), laying aside all superfluous weight (*ὄγκος*, according to Buttman, Lexil., from ἔγκω, from which comes *ἡνεγκον*,—any superfluous mass or burden, as in the case of the pregnant, so Eurip. Ion 15, γαστρός διήνεγκ' ὄγκον: or the corpulent, so Ælian, Hist. Anim. ii. 13, σαρκὸς ὄγκος: a state of being puffed up, either literally or metaphorically. It is used doubtless here with direct reference to athletes, who before running trained themselves so as to get rid of all superfluous flesh. So Galen, in Epid. Hippocr. iii. 6 (Bl.), καὶ γὰρ δρόμοι ταχείς καὶ γυμνάσια τοιαῦτα καὶ σαρκῶν ὄγκον καθαιρεῖ καὶ χυμῶν πλήθος κενεῖ: see other examples in Bl. But ὄγκος is also used of weight accessory from without, as well as of weight carried on the person. So Xen. Venat. viii. 8, διὰ τὸ βάθος τῆς χιόνος καὶ διὰ τὸ κάτωθεν τῶν ποδῶν λασίων ὄντων προσέχεσθαι αὐτῷ ὄγκον πολύν. So that the word may be taken, as in E. V., of every weight of every kind which may

d here only†.
(see note)
e Rom. viii. 25

πάντα καὶ τὴν ^d εὐπερίστατον ἁμαρτίαν, ^e δι' ὑπομονῆς

weigh down the runner; though, on account of what follows, I should understand it rather of weight *of* the person than weight *on* the person. See below. Some, as Castello, Heinsius, Bengel, interpret it "*fastus*," haughtiness or pride, which it may be, but the sense does not seem to be long here) and sin which is ever besetting us (εὐπερίστατος, being an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον in all ancient Greek literature, has been very variously interpreted. Its sense must be sought purely from derivational usage, and the requirements of the context. Some have taken it actively, from the sense of περιίστημι 'to circumvent;' so Carpov, "*dolosum, seducens*;" Schulz, "which hems us in on all sides." But against this is the fact that though verbals in -τος are often active, no case has been adduced of any such verbal derived from ἵστημι or its compounds being active: they are all intransitive or passive: e.g. στατός, ἄστατος, ἀνάστατος; διδάσματος, ἀδιάστατος; εὐκατάστατος, δυσκατάστατος; ἀμετάστατος, εὐμετάστατος; ἀσύστατος; ὑπόστατος: and so περίστατος and ἀπερίστατος: and thus our word might be taken passively,—"which can easily be avoided," lightly evaded: cf. περίστατος 2 Tim. ii. 16: Titus iii. 9, and Hammond here: or, "which can be easily circumvented," and so conquered. Thus in the interpretation which Chrys. prefers before the active one: his words are, εὐπερίστατον, ἥτοι τὴν εὐκόλως περιίσταμένην ἡμᾶς, ἣ τὴν εὐκόλως περίστατον δυναμένην παθεῖν, λέγει μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦτο· βῆδιον γάρ, εἰς θέλωμεν, περιγενέσθαι τῆς ἁμαρτίας: so Ps.-Athanas. quæst. 130 de Parabol. Scripturæ, vol. iv. p. 280, εὐπερίστατον εἶπε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, ἐπειδὴν μόνιμον στάσιν οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ ταχέως τρέπεται καὶ καταλύεται: Hesych., εὐκόλον, εὐχέρη: Suidas, μαρόν, ταχέως περιτρεπόμενον: D-lat., "*fragile*:" Le Clerc, al., "*quæ facile circumvenitur, vincitur*." But to this there are two objections. First the word περιίστασθαι does not seem ever to have this meaning, *overcoming*: and then that it would be exceedingly out of place thus to describe sin. and especially that sin against which the Writer considers it necessary to warn his readers, by one single epithet, as a thing lightly to be got rid of. Just as unnatural would be the sense given by Weist., "peccatum vestrum . . . non in occulto potest committi et latere, non magis quam lapsus sororis, sed conspicietur ab omnibus." Another passive sense is given by Ernesti after Hemsterhuis, "a spectatoribus cir-

cumdatus," "surrounded by men who look on:" so Isocrat. de Permut., θαυματοποιταῖς ταῖς . . . ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνοήτων περιστατοῖς γενομέναις, which Suidas interprets περι ἅς κύκλῳ ἵστανται οἱ θεώμενοι: Jambl. Vit. Pyth. v. 7, εὐθὺς δὲ περίβλεπτος καὶ περίστατος ἐγένετο: and so ἀπερίστατος is used of a man whom others do not gird around, one void of friends: so Phocyl. 24, σώσον δ' ἀπερίστατον ἄνδρα. And thus Ernesti here would have us understand εὐπερίστατος of sin as being *very popular*, having many friends and frequenters. This sense Bleek thinks has much to be said for it, both as to analogy and as fitting the context. I own I do not feel that the analogy of εἶδ in composition quite justifies it. But he prefers the ordinary acceptance of the word here, and in this I fully agree. Taking περίσταται as a middle, to *place itself around, be around*, and hence to *surround*, we should have, *sin which easily surrounds us*. And so the former of the alternatives in Chrys. (see above), which he does not prefer in his homily on this passage, but adopts in several other places: e.g. Hom. on Ps. xlviii. § 3. 4, vol. v. p. 227 (Migne), ταύτην οὖν δέδουκα τὴν ἀπατόσάν με ἁμαρτίαν, τὴν κυκλοῦσάν με. διὸ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος αὐτὴν εὐπερίστατον καλεῖ, τὴν συνεχῶς περιβάλλουσιν δολῶν, τὴν εὐκόλως, τὴν βῆδως. And on 2 Cor. Hom. ii. vol. x. p. 402, εὐπερίστατον γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία, πάντοθεν ἵσταμένη, ἐμπροσθεν, ὀπισθεν, καὶ οὐτως ἡμᾶς καταβάλλουσα. And so the vulg. "*circumstans*:" the E. V., "which doth so easily beset us:" and by far the greater part of expositors, some with, some without the sense of active hostility. Thus Syr., "quod omni tempore paratum est nobis:" Ps.-Anselm, "quod nos inique impellit et circumvallat:" Castello, "nos ambiens, sicut arboris hedera:" Valcknaer, "quod ad cingendum et irretiendum promptum est:" Bugenhagen, "semper oppugnans nos peccatum:" Erasm. (par), "quod nos undique complectitur:" al. The word being thus taken, the various acceptations of the similitude intended are well summed up by Bleek: we must understand ἁμαρτίαν either as our inner propensity to sin, which clings fast to us and will not part from us (Erasm. (vers. and not.), Luther, Vatabl., Calv., Gerhard, Seb. Schmidt, Calov., Ernesti: cf. ch. v. 2, περιέκειται ἀσθένειαν): or as a cumbersome garment girding us round and hindering us from running (Jac. and Lud. Cappell., Schlichting,

^f τρέχωμεν τὸν ^g προκείμενον ἡμῖν ^h ἀγῶνα, ⁱ ἀφορῶντες ^k εἰς τὸν τῆς πίστεως ^l ἀρχηγὸν καὶ ^m τελειωτὴν Ἰησοῦν, ⁿ πολλὰς ἀγῶνας δραμεύοντες

περί σφέων αὐτέων οἱ Ἑλληνες, Herod. viii 102. τὸν ὑπὲρ τ. ψυχῆς ἀγῶνα τρέχει, Dion. Hal vii. 48 (al in B1). g ch. vi. 18. 2 Cor. viii. 12. Jude 7 only. Lev. xxiv. 7 al ἀγῶνος μεγίστ. προκείμενον, Herod. ix 60 h = 1 Tim. vi. 12. 2 Tim. iv. 7 (Phil i. 30. Col. ii. 1. 1 Thess. ii 2) only. Isa vii 13 Wisd. iv 2. i here only τ. (see note) k (=) Acts ii. 15. v. 31. ch. ii. 10 only. (Isa. xxx. 4) 1 Macc. x 47. l here only τ. (no Gr. author.)

Wittich, Braun, Wakefield, al.), or personified, as an adversary, who surrounds us on all sides and waylays us to make us his prey (Beza, Cramer); or generally, as something which lies about us and is ever ready to catch us (De Dieu, and Syr. above): or which is ever from all sides standing in the way so as to entangle and impede our course (Grot., Limborch, Baumgarten, Bretschn., al., and recently Delitzsch). But the connexion with ἀποθέμενοι, which evidently Del. feels, seems to me fatal to his view, and indeed to all views except that which makes ἁμαρτία to lie about us, as a garment, or beset us, as an inward propensity. Of both these ἀποθέσθαι may be said; of the former literally, of the latter figuratively. And in choosing between these two, I have no hesitation in choosing the former. The Writer is speaking of our race: and having expected us to lay aside all superfluous weight of body, which the athletes did, he passes to their other lightening for the race, viz. *stripping naked*, and exhorts us to put off sin, which lies so easily about us. And thus we have a strict analogy with the imagery in Eph. iv. 22, 24, ἀποθέσθαι ἡμᾶς . . . τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον . . . καὶ ἐνδύσασθαι τὸν καινὸν ἄνθρωπον,—and with Col. iii. 9, ἀπεκδυόμενοι τὸν παλαιὸν ἄνθρωπον σὺν ταῖς πράξεσιν αὐτοῦ. Most likely the sin alludes especially, though it need not exclusively, to apostasy. There does not seem to be any allusion to the different sins which may, in the sense now so common, and originally derived from this passage in E. V., “*beset*” various persons: though, of course, such an *application* of the passage is quite admissible. The above note, as to its enumeration of opinions, is principally gathered from Bleek and Delitzsch, both of whom have gone into the matter at far greater length. Various other shades and subtleties of meaning will be found discussed by them, let us through (not merely “*with*,” but as the *state in*, by means of which: cf. 2 Cor. v. 7, διὰ πίστεως περιπατοῦμεν) *endurance run the race* (see reff. and add Statius, Theb. iii. 116, “*Quisque suas avidi ad lacrymas miserabile currunt certamen;*” and Eurip. Orest. 869, ἀγῶνα θανάσιμον δραμοῦμενον) *set before us* (reff., and Lucian, Anachars. 15, κοινὸς τις ἀγῶν . . τοῖς

ἀγαθοῖς πολλοῖς πρόκειται: Cicero pro Flacco, 37 (92), “*magnum ei erat certamen propositum*”); 2.] *looking unto* (so E. V. very exactly. ἀφορᾶν εἰς, or πρὸς τι, is an ordinary word for to direct the gaze upon any thing. So, of the outward eye, Jos. Antt. iv. 4. 7, Ἀραὼν . . θνήσκει, τοῦ πλήθους εἰς αὐτὸν ἀφορᾶντος: of the inward eye, Arrian, Epictet. iv. 1, εἰς ταῦτα ἀφορᾷ τὰ παραδείγματα: Jos. B. J. ii. 17. 2, μάλιστα δὲ ἀφορῶντες εἰς τὸν Ἑλεᾶδρον στρατηγοῦντα: Arrian, Epictet. ii. 19, εἰς τὸν θεὸν ἀφορῶντας ἐν παντὶ μικρῷ καὶ μεγάλῳ. See many more examples in Bleek. There does not appear to be in the preposition ἀφ., any intimation of looking off from every thing else unto, as sometimes asserted. It merely implies direction from the person acting, or the place from which he acts, as in the similar compounds ἀπιδεῖν, ἀποβλέπειν (ch. xi. 26), ἀφορμαῖσθαι (εἰς), ἀφικνεῖσθαι, &c.) the Leader (one who precedes others by his example, they following him: [or rather Author:] see the note on ch. ii. 10, where the meanings of ἀρχηγός are classified) and Perfecter (τελειωτής, only found here, is variously interpreted. Chrys. says, τὸν ἀρχηγὸν καὶ τελειωτὴν. τί ἐστι τοῦτο; τοῦτέστιν αὐτὸς ἐν ἡμῖν τὴν πίστιν ἐνέθηκεν, αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν δέδωκεν (John xv. 16). . . . εἰ δὲ αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡμῖν ἐνέθηκεν, αὐτὸς καὶ τὸ τέλος ἐπιθήσει. And so CEC. and Thl., Primas., Erasm. (par., “*quod cepit in nobis consummabit*”), Jac. Cappell., Wittich, Braun. Another view is that He perfects the faith by bringing it to an end in the capacity of βραβευτής, giving it its final reward: so Schlichting, Grot., Limborch, Calmet, al. Again Bl., De Wette, Ebrard would understand merely that He exhibited faith in perfection in his own example. And so nearly Bengel (“*fidei principes et consummator dicitur, quia ipse fidem Patri ab initio ad exitum præstitit*”): and Thdrt., when he says, κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀμώτερα τέθεικεν. And doubtless this meaning must not be excluded; but neither must it be held exclusively. He ἐτελείωσεν (τὴν) πίστιν, inasmuch as He perfected faith in his own person and example: but He ἐτελείωσεν τὴν πίστιν also, inasmuch as He became the Author of perfect salvation to them that obey Him.

m = ver. 16. δς ^m ἀντὶ τῆς ^g προκειμένης αὐτῷ ⁿ χαρᾶς ^o ὑπέμεινεν ^p σταυ- ADKLP
 Matt xvii. 27. ρόν, ^a αἰσχύνης ^r καταφρονήσας, st ἐν δεξιᾷ ^{te} τοῦ ^θ θρόνου ^{ABCD}
 xx. 28. ^{efghk}
 n = Matt. xxv. 21 ^{l m o}
 o = ch. x. 32 reff. ^p Heb., here only ^q Rev. iii. 18 reff. ^{17. 47}
 r Matt. vi. 24 || L. Rom. u. 4. 1 Tim. iv. 10 2 Pet. ii. 10 al. Prov. xiii. 13. ^s ch. viii. 1. ^t ch. i. 3 reff.

2. ins τον bef σταυρ. D¹ Cyr-jer.

His going before us in faith has made faith possible for us: His perfecting faith in his own person and example, has made faith * effectual for us) of the faith (viz. that faith of which we have been speaking through ch. xi.: and thus rather 'the faith' than 'our faith,' which latter is liable to the mistake so often made in English, viz. to being taken as if it = *faith in us*, so that Jesus should be said to be "author and finisher" of each individual Christian's faith which he has within him. We may render merely 'faith' without the art.; but seeing that πίστις has been anarthrous before (ch. xi. 1) when it was abstract, it would seem most probable that the art. here is intended to have a definite force. Besides which, the ascription of faith to our Lord is so plain in our Epistle (cf. ch. ii. 13; iii. 2) that we must not seem to exclude this sense in our rendering, which we certainly do by "our faith:" whereas 'the faith' includes both, and satisfies that which follows, in which His own example of endurance in prospect of triumph is set before us), (even) **Jesús, who for the joy set before Him** (ἀντὶ τῆς προκειμένης αὐτῷ χαρᾶς has been otherwise interpreted both by ancients and moderns. The Syr., Nazianz. in Ec., Beza, al. take it to mean, "instead of the joy which He had before His incarnation." ὅ ἐξόν μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας δόξης τε καὶ θεότητος, οὐ μόνον ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν ἄχρι τῆς δούλου μορφῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σταυρὸν ὑπέμεινεν. Naz. But this, though more according to the common meaning of ἀντί, seems to me doubly objectionable. First, which many have noticed, χαρά which He already had could not well be designated as προκειμένη: and then, which I have not seen noticed, χαρά can hardly be used of a state of bliss in which one already is, a quiescent or prae-existent joy, but more naturally applies to joy prompted by some cause of active rejoicing. Then another modification of this same view is found in Chrys., *τοντέστιν, ἐξὴν αὐτῷ μηδὲν παθεῖν, εἴπερ ἐβούλετο. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ δόλος εὐρέθη ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς φησιν ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις· ἔρχεται ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ἄρχων, καὶ οὐκ ἔχει ἐν ἑμὶ οὐδέν. προύκειτο τοίνυν αὐτῷ, εἴπερ ἐβούλετο, μὴ ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξουσίαν γὰρ ἔχω, φησί, θείαν τὴν ψυχὴν μου, καὶ*

ἐξουσίαν ἔχω πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν. And so Ec., Thl., Luther (da er wohl hätte mögen Freude haben, duldet er u. f. v.), Calvin ("Significat enim, quum integrum esset Christo se eximere omni molestia, vitamque felicem et bonis omnibus affluentem degere, ipsum tamen ultro subisse mortem acerbam et plenam ignominia"), al. But this again, though it might satisfy προκειμένης, falls short of the above sense maintained for χαρᾶς. Another kindred meaning is found in Erasm. (paraphr., "contentis hujus vitæ gaudiis, subit mortem"), Wolf, Raphael, Carpzov, Wetst., Paulus, Bretschn. This makes χαρά = ἡδονή, besides giving a low and unworthy sense to ἡ προκειμένη αὐτῷ χαρά, in making it to mean the pleasures of this life. The sense given above, 'for the joy set before Him,' i. e. as in comparison with, as in exchange for, the joy which was to come after, in the day of His triumph, is adopted by Thdr̄t. (but interpreting the χαρά of the salvation of men, —χαρά τοῦ σωτήρος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ σωτηρία: ὑπὲρ ταύτης δὲ πάθος ὑπέμεινε), Primasius, Corn. a-Lap., Justiniani, Schlichting, Grot., Hammond, Seb. Schmidt, Braun, Limborch, Bengel, Winer, Böhme, De Wette, Kuinoel, Bleek, Tholuck, Ebrard, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. And it is fully borne out both by usage, and the context. For thus we have ἀντί in reff., and in Xen. Hell. iv. 8. 6, *δριγίζόμενος τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀνθ' ὧν ἐπεπόνθει*: Aristoph. Plut. 434, *ἡ σφῶ ποιήσω τήμερον δοῦναι δίκην ἀνθ' ὧν ἐμὲ ζητέον ἐνθένδ' ἀφανίσαι*. See Winer, § 47. a) endured crucifixion (σταυρὸν, anarthrous and put after the verb; and thus representing rather in the abstract, the kind of death, than in the concrete, "the cross" on which He was crucified), **despising shame** (or, "the shame:") when an anarthrous noun comes before a verb in the place of emphasis, it is not so easily determined whether it is definite or indefinite. But from the analogy of σταυρὸν before, it is most probable that this is indefinite also,—every kind of shame, even to that of the shameful death which He died), and (τε is used as a copula, apart from καί, once by St. Matt. (xxviii. 12), once by St. Mark (xv. 36), twice by St. John (iv. 42; vi. 18), four times by St. Paul (Rom. ii. 19; xvi. 26: 1 Cor. iv. 21:

τοῦ θεοῦ [†]κεκάθικεν. ³ ἢ ἀναλογίσασθε γὰρ τὸν τοιαύτην ^u ὑπομεμενηκότα ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν ^v ἀντι-
λογίαν, ἵνα μὴ ^w καμῆτε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὑμῶν ^x ἐκλυόμενοι. ^y οὐπω ^z μέχρῃς αἵματος ^z ἀντικατέστητε πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρ-

Luke ii. 34 John xix. 12.)

xv 9 only.

17. ἐξελύετο τῇ ψυχῇ, Polyb. xxix. 6 14 al.
14.) μέχ. αἷμ. στάσις, Heliod. vii. 8. Wetst.
ii. 8 A (only?).

x here bis.

w James v. 15 (Rev. ii 3 rec.) only. Job x. 1 (w. ψυχ.). Wisd

Gal. vi 9 only. 1 Kings xiv. 24 1 Macc. iii.

y = Phil ii. 8. 2 Tim ii 9. (2 Macc. xiii.

z here only. Deut xxxi. 21. Josh. v. 7. Mic.

u here only†.

3 Macc. vii.

7. Ps lxxv.

6 Symm.

(see note.)

ch. vi. 16.

vi. 7. Jude

11 only.

Prov. xvii.

11. (-λέγειν,

om του θεου N.

rec εκαθισεν: txt ADKL[P]N rel.

3. om του D¹.

for υπο, απο D¹.

rec (for εαυτον) αυτον, with D⁸KL rel [Chr

Damasc]: αυτους N³ 17 [Euthal-ms] Thdrt: εαυτους D¹N¹: *semetipsos* am (with fuld¹ harl) [(Syr)]: *in vobis* D-lat: txt A[P Damasc-ms]. εκκελυμενοι D¹.

4. aft ουπω ins γαρ D¹-gr] L o vulg (with demid, agst am fuld) copt arm. μεχρη

D¹. αντεκατεστητε L¹ d k l m 17 Chr-ms Thdrt [Damasc-ms] Thl-ms: αντεστητε K: αντεκατε (sic) o.

Eph. iii. 19): but *seventy-nine* times by St. Luke: and in this Epistle four times (i. 3; vi. 5; ix. 1; xii. 2) is set down (so E. V. rightly, reading the perfect as in text. The aor. would express the fact, as it happened: the perf. gives it as it now endures, having happened. So that the latter is more real and graphic as concerns the readers) on the right hand of the throne of God (i. e. on the throne of God, at His right hand: see on ch. viii. 1, and cf. Rev. iii. 21). 3.] For (q. d. and there is reason in what I say; ἀφορώντες &c., for He like yourselves had much and continual conflict with the sinners of His day. γάρ is not as Lünem., “*Yea*,” merely strengthening the imperative: I heartily concur with the dictum of Hermann, cited here by Delitzsch: “γάρ semper reddit rationem antecedentis sententiæ vel expressæ vel intellectæ”) compare (with yourselves. ἀναλογίσασθε is very difficult to express in English. It is as Bengel, “*comparatione instituta cogitare*,” “to think on, by way of comparison.” So Plato, Theæt. p. 186 A, ἀναλογιζομένη ἐν ἑαυτῇ τὰ γεγονότα καὶ τὰ παρόντα πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα (*comparing*): Diod. Sic. xx. 8, τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ διειργόντος πελάγους ἀναλογιζόμενοι, τὴν σωτηρίαν ἀπεγίνωσκον (*reputantes*, bethinking themselves of, comparing with their power to cross it). So here it is, consider Him as set in comparison with yourselves. If the word to ‘ponder’ had any trace left of its primitive meaning, it might serve; but it has now become equivalent to ‘meditate’) Him who hath endured (perf. part. again, to set before them Christ as not merely a character of the past, but one ever present) such contradiction (ἀντιλογία need not be confined to words: see note on ch. vi. 16, and cf. ref. John, ἀντιλέγει τῷ Καίσαρι. Ec.

says, ἀντιλογίαν δέ φησι τὸν γέλωτα, τὰς πληγὰς, τὰς χλευασίας, καὶ ὅσα ἀντέλεγον τοῖς αὐτοῦ δόγμασι καὶ διδάγμασι, καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ Πιλάτου κραυγὰς. And so Chrys. and Thl. Lünemann in vain denies this sense of ἀντιλογία and ἀντιλέγειν: see ref., and Bleek’s and Delitzsch’s notes) by the sinners against Himself (i. e. by those who sinned against Him. Whether εαυτὸν or αὐτόν be read, the sense will be the same. Beware of Ebrard’s strange interpretation, given below on τὴν ἁμαρτίαν: “All mankind would be opposed to Christ as the sinners (the class of sinners); but the enemies of the gospel could not be opposed to the readers of the Epistle as the sinners, seeing that those readers themselves were sinners.” All such notions of οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ arise from wrongly connecting εἰς εαυτὸν, which follows ἁμαρτωλῶν and not ἀντιλογίαν. So ἡμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν Luke xv. 18, 21. See also Luke xvii. 4: Acts xxv. 8), that ye weary not (reff.), fainting in your souls (ταῖς ψ. ὑμῶν may be joined either with καμῆτε or with ἐκλυόμενοι. In ref. Job, we have καμῶν τῇ ψυχῇ μου: and ἐκλύεσθαι τῇ ψυχῇ is found in Polyb. ref., and xx. 4. 7, οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἐξελύθησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῖς ψυχαῖς. So also in Diod. Sic. xx. 1, διὰ τὸ μήκος καὶ τὴν ἀκαρίαν τοῦ συγγραφέως ἐκλυθέντες τὰς ψυχὰς. And this latter is preferable, on account of the rhythm, and the improbability of the participle standing thus alone at the end of the sentence).

4.] Bengel’s remark, which De Wette charges with pedantry, “a cursu venit ad pugilatum, ut Paulus, 1 Cor. ix. 26,” is nevertheless a just one. Not yet have ye resisted (so ἀντικαθίστασθαι absolutely, Thuc. i. 62, εἶδον τοὺς ἐναντίους παρασκευαζομένους εἰς μάχην, ἀντικαθίσταντο καὶ αὐτοί: and 71, ταύτης

a here only +. b here only +. Ps. xii. 2. Symm. τῆς τοῦ ποταμοῦ βίας ἐξελευθέρωντο, Polyb. v. 48. 6. c = Acts xiii. 15 xv. 31. 1 Tim. iv. 13 al. L P H 1 Macc x. 24 d = ch viii. 5 reff e Acts xvii. 2, 17. xviii. 4. Exod. vi. 27. f Prov. iiii. 11, 12. g here only, l. c. only. h here &c. 4 times. Eph. vi. 4. 2 Tim. iiii. 16 only. Prov. xv. 10. i = Rev. vii. 19. Prov. ix. 7, 8 al. j = Luke xxiii. 16, 22. 2 Cor. vi. 9. 2 Chron. x. 13. Prov. xix. 18. k Matt. x. 17. x. 19 ||. xxiii. 34. John xix. 1 only. = Ps. lxxxi. 5. Job xxx. 21 al.

5. ἐκελευσθε Κ α¹ 106-8-14 Chr(τουτ' ἔστι παρήκατε τὰς χεῖρας, ἐξελεύθητε) [Euthalm-]. ins para bef της παρακλησεως D¹[-gr]. om μου (as LXX) D¹(and lat) a m Clem₁ [Antch₂ Damasc-ms Orig-int₂]. ελεγχομενος bef υπ' αυτου D[-gr Orig-int₂].

μέντοι τοιαύτης ἀντικαθεστηκυίας πόλεως, ὡς Λακεδαιμόνιοι, διαμέλλετε. See below) unto blood (many take this to mean, have not yet sacrificed your lives. So Chrys., ὁ δὲ λέγει, τοῦτο ἔστιν οὕτω θάνατον ὑπέστητε· μέχρι χρημάτων ὑμῶν ἡ ζημία, μέχρι δόξης, μέχρι τοῦ ἐλευθέρωνεσθαι. And Thl., οὕτω, φησὶν, ἔχρι θανάτου ἐφθάσατε, ἀλλὰ ἔχρι διωγμῶν, ἔχρι ἀρπαγῆς· ὁ δὲ χριστὸς ἔχρι θανάτου ἦλθεν. And this may be so: but I would rather abide by the idea of the pugilistic figure being intended, and apply μέχρις αἵματος to the figure, not to the interpretation. Cf. Seneca, Ep. i. 13, "Non potest athleta magnos spiritus ad certamen afferre, qui nunquam suggillatus est. Ille qui vidit sanguinem suum, qui quoties cecidit contumaciore resurrexit, cum magna spe descendit ad pugnam." For the expression, cf. reff., and Niceph. Hist. a. 741, ἐνωμιότους αὐτῷ συνθήκας δεδώκεσαν, ὥς μέχρις αἵματος ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ ἀνελεῖσθαι τὸν κίνδυνον.

On the relation of such passages as this to the date of the Epistle, see in the Prolegomena, § ii. 29 ff.), contending against (πρός, of the direction towards which the athlete's force was directed: cf. μάχεσθαι πρὸς Τρώας, Il. p. 471: Matthiæ, § 591, and Winer, § 49, h. α.) sin (personified, as an adversary: not to be limited in its meaning to sin in themselves, or to sin in their persecutors, but understood of both. Delitzsch, who would confine it to the latter, says that it was not sin in themselves which would shed their blood, but rather, which would spare its being shed. Yes, and for this very reason the resisting that sin of unfaithfulness which would lead them to spare their blood, would if carried far enough, lead to the shedding of it. Similarly, the sin in their persecutors, which they were to resist, would, if yielded to, spare their blood by seducing them into apostasy. The joining πρὸς τὴν ἁμαρτίαν

with ἀνταγωνίζομενοι is even more certain than the similar connexion in ver. 3, seeing that ἀντικατέστητε has already had its qualifying clause in μέχρις αἵματος. And so almost all Commentators, except Bengel).

5.] And ye have completely forgotten (ἐκλανθάνεσθαι, more usually ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι, is seldom found. See in reff.: Il. π. 602, οὐδ' ἄρ' Ἀχαιοὶ ἀλκήης ἐξελάθοντο. It is perhaps common here, as Del. suggests, not without some reference to the sound of ἐκλυόμενοι before and ἐκλύου following. See var. readd.

There is a great difference among Commentators as to whether these words are to be read affirmatively or interrogatively. The former view is taken by all the ancient expositors, and many moderns, among whom are Wittich, Surenhusius, Wolf, Bengel, Kninoel, Klee, Tholuck, De Wette, Ebrard. The interrogative view is taken by Calvin, Beza (b), Braun, Böhme, Lachmann, Bleek, De Wette, Bisping, Lünemann, Delitzsch. The ground on which this latter is defended is that, if declarative, the words would be too severe for the general tenor of the passage. I own I cannot see this. The fact of their having thus forgotten the exhortation is surely assumed below, in vv. 7—11: and from this point forward the Writer takes up the tone of reproof, which comes to its height in vv. 16, 17. And not only this. The interrogative form would surely be most unnatural, coupled closely as it would be with an assertion of fact, οὕτω . . . ἀντικατέστητε) the exhortation (παράκλησις, as elsewhere in N. T. and especially in St. Luke (reff.), unites the ideas of exhortation and consolation. See on ch. vi. 18, and on παρακαλεῖν, ch. iii. 13), the which (that kind of exhortation, of which the following is a specimen: such seems to be the force of ἦτις instead of ἦ) discourses with you (so διαλέγεσθαι in the Acts, of opening a discourse with any one: see reff.) as with sons, My son (υἱέ in LXX: see digest), despise not (ὀλιγωρέω is not uncommon in the classics,

τιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν δν ¹ παραδέχεται. 7 εἰς ⁸ παιδεῖαν ¹ Maik iv. 20.

4. xvi. 21. xxii. 18. 1 Tim. v. 19 only. Exod. xxiii. 1. (= προσδ., Ezek. xx. 40, 41. xlii 27. ^{Acts xi.} Mial. i. 8.)

7. rec (for εἰς) εἰ, with rel [Euthal-ms Thl]: txt ADKL[P]N ¹ m o 17 [47 Syr coptt æth arm] Chr(see note) Procop₁ Damasc₂ Ec, in disciplina vulg Orig-int, in disciplinam fuld D-lat.

and with a genitive, as here) the chastening of the Lord, nor faint, when corrected by Him (Heb., "and have no aversion to His correction"): 6.] for whom the Lord loveth, He chasteneth (ἐλέγχει, LXX-B; AN have as text: in ref. Rev., both are combined, ἐγὼ ὅσους ἀν φιλω, ἐλέγχω καὶ παιδεύω), yea, and (the δὲ throws out the new feature into a climax) scourgeth every son whom He receiveth ("In the Heb. this clause according to the present punctuation is פָּאָר אֲבִיךָ וְאֵת אֲבִיךָ, 'and (that) as a father the son in whom he delighteth.' The LXX, instead of אֲבִיךָ, have expressed אֲבִיךָ, the Pihel of אֲבִיךָ 'to feel pain,' and have taken it as = 'to cause pain,' as the Hiphil אֲבִיךָ occurs sometimes, e. g. Job v. 18, of God's chastisement of men. Certainly by this rendering the parallelism with the first hemistich, and the whole expression, gain in completeness, whereas according to the Masoretic punctuation there is an appearance of lameness about it." Bleek: who thinks, as does Del., that the LXX have expressed better the sense of the Writer than the Masoretic punctuators. "For the translation of אֲבִיךָ by μαστιγοῦν, to scourge, to whip, instead of generally to punish, cf. Ps. xxxii. (xxxi.) 10, μαστίγες for ὀνείκας; and for the use of the Greek verb for divine chastisement (reff.), Tobit xi. 14 [AB (not N)], ἐμαστίγασας κ. ἡλέησάς με: xiii. 2 (5, 9), αὐτὸς μαστιγοῖ κ. ἐλεεῖ: Judith viii. 27, εἰς νομβήσιν μαστιγοῖ κύριος τοὺς ἐργίζοντα αὐτῶν." δν παραδέχεται, see reff., whom He takes to him as a veritable son, receives in his heart and cherishes). 7, 8.] Application of the passage of Scripture to the readers.

7.] First, as to the reading. As between εἰς and εἰ, the case stands thus: εἰ is found in "minusc. multis ut videtur," Tischdf. (edn. 7 [8]): in Chrys. (but more than doubtful: see below), in Thdr̄t. (also doubtful), in Thl. (certain). This is really all the authority that can be cited for it. εἰς is found in the six uncial mss. which contain the passage, in about thirty cursive mss., in all the ancient versions (apparently): in all the Fathers who cite and explain the words: e. g. Chrys. (in whose text in this Homily (xxix.) the εἰ παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε is evidently a quotation the later reading: for, after quoting the text as in rec., his sentence runs, εἰ παιδεύει,

ἕρα εἰς διόρθωσιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰς κόλασιν, οὐδὲ εἰς τιμωρίαν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ κακῶς παθεῖν: where it must be obvious to any one that εἰ παιδεύει ought to be εἰς παιδεῖαν, or the sentence is without coherence. In the Catena, this appears still more decisively: where he says, εἰς παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε, φησὶν οὐκ εἰς κόλασιν, οὐδὲ εἰς τιμωρίαν).—Thdr̄t. (in all probability: his present text runs thus: εἰ παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε· εἰ φέρετε γενναίως τὰς ἐπιφερομένας παιδείας. But it is hardly possible that εἰ φέρετε γενναίως should be the exposition of εἰ ὑπομένετε, in the sense which the verb must bear in the rec. text, and it is here again to be suspected, as even Bleek confesses, that the εἰ has been a correction to the rec.).—Ec. (ὑπομένετε, φησὶ, τὴν παιδεῖαν). Of modern critical editors, Matthæi regards εἰς as the right reading, Griesbach puts it in his inner margin, Lachmann of course adopts it, and Tregelles: also Tischendorf edd. 7, 8, but in his 2nd edn. he retained the rec.: as do Bleek, Tholuck, and Lünem.: and among ourselves, Dr. Bloomfield, who tries to explain the (angebliche) correction into εἰς by saying that εἰ "seldom begins a sentence." In the N. T., where εἰ stands alone without μή, it begins a sentence at least nine times out of ten. See Brüder. εἰς is adopted and strongly defended, by Ebrard and Delitzsch. And it seems to me the only defensible reading. The mere fact that εἰ appears at first sight to yield a better sense, should never be allowed to weigh against the almost unanimous consent of antiquity. And if we examine closer this supposed better sense, we shall find it fail us. For first, the verb ὑπομένειν is not one which will bear the mere accidental sense thus given to it. The sense which we want, with εἰ, is, 'If ye are suffering chastisement': asserting a mere matter of fact. παιδεῖαν ὑπομένειν can only signify, 'patiently to endure chastisement.' Then, taking this only possible meaning, what have we? 'If ye patiently endure chastisement, God is dealing with you as with sons:' i. e. 'your method of endurance is a sign of God's method of treatment:' a sentence which stultifies itself. Next, what is the sense with εἰς? I see no reason for departing from that given by Chrys. in the Catena (see above): "It is for chastisement that

m ver 2
n = here
only †
πάντα

τρόπον ὡς
πολεμίου
προσφέ-
ροντο, Jos.
B J vii 8 1
al. (Plato,
Philo al. in
Bl.)

r = ch v 7 reff.
xviii. 2, 4 (1 Cor. iv. 14.

^m ὑπομένετε, ὡς υἱοὺς ὑμῶν ⁿ προσφέρεται ὁ θεός· τίς γάρ ^{ADKLP}
[ἐστιν] υἱός, ὃν οὐ ⁱ παιδεύει πατήρ; ⁸ εἰ δὲ χωρὶς ἐστε ^{8 a b c d}
^h παιδείας, ἥς ^o μέτοχοι γεγόνασιν πάντες, ἄρα ^p νόθοι ^{1 m o}
καὶ οὐχ υἱοὶ ἐστε. ^{9 q} εἴτα τοὺς μὲν τῆς ^r σαρκὸς ἡμῶν
πατέρας εἴχομεν ^s παιδευτὰς καὶ ^t ἐνετρεπόμεθα· οὐ ^u πολλὴ
o ch 1 9 reff. p here only †. Wisd .v 3 only q Mark iv. 17 al Job xii 2 (only?).
s Rom. ii. 20 only Hos v 2 Sir xxxviii. 19 only. t = Matt xxi. 37 || Luke
xviii. 2, 4 (1 Cor. iv. 14. 2 Thess iii. 14. Tit. ii. 8) only. Exod. x. 3. u ver. 25. Xen. Anab ii. 3. 13

υπομεινате D¹.

om ἐστιν A[P]^N vulg sah [æth Bas.] Orig[-int.]: ins DKLN³
rel [Syr copt arm Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Antch, Damasc.].

8. νόθοι A. rec 2nd ἐστε bef κ. οὐχ υἱοί, with D²KL[P] rel Syr Mac Chr Thdrt
Damasc: txt AD¹⁻³N in 17 latt Chr-3-mss [Euthal-ms Orig-int.].

9. rec πολλῶ, with D³KL rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc.]: txt AD¹N 17 [Euthal-ms
Damasc-ms. (P def.)] aft πολυ ins δε D¹[-gr] N³.

ye are enduring, not for punishment, not for any evil purpose." "Your ὑπομονή, like His ὑπομονή, will not be thrown away. He had joy before Him, you have life (καὶ ζήσομεν, ver. 9) before you." Or if we please we may take ὑπομένετε, as Ec. above, imperatively: "Endure with a view to chastisement:" which sense however is not so good nor so natural, nor is it so likely, from the collocation of the words: for thus ὑπομένετε would come first, and it would probably be εἰς τὸ παιδεύεσθαι.

It is for chastisement that ye are enduring: as with sons, God is dealing with you (προσφέρεσθαι, see reff., united with οὕτως, τοῦτω τῷ τρόπῳ, βέλτιον, φιλικῶς, and similar adverbs, is common in good Greek of all ages. Bleek brings forward several passages very similar in construction to this: αἰς ἐὰν ὡς μιὰ προσφέρῃ . . . ἐὰν δὲ ὡς πολλαῖς κ.τ.λ., Plato, Rep. p. 435 A: Πυθαγόρας ἐρωτηθεὶς, πῶς δεῖ ἀγνωμονοῦση πατρὶδι προσφέρεσθαι, εἶπεν ὡς μητρί, &c., Stobæus, c. 39). For what son is there (two other ways of taking the words are possible: 1. as Luther, adopted by Delitzsch, to make τίς the subject and υἱός the predicate, "who is a son?" 2. as Böhme, to make υἱός the subject and τίς the predicate, "of what sort is a son?") Both of these are bad: the former, from the exceeding harshness and oddity of the question, "what man is a son, whom, &c.?" the second, from the forcing of τίς, where its natural sense serves, and from the absence of the art. before υἱός. As usually rendered, the question is exactly like τίς [ἐστιν] ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος; Matt. vii. 9; xii. 11. See also 1 Cor. ii. 11, τίς γὰρ οἶδεν ἀνθρώπων;) whom a father (possibly, 'his father:' for πατήρ (not υἱός) is one of those words which, from their being singular in their kind, often lose the article) chasteneth not?

8.] But if ye are without (separate from, no partakers in) chastisement, of which

all (God's sons: or those above mentioned, ch. xi., which is better, on account of the perfect verb) have been made partakers (μέτοχος, see reff. and note), then ye are (ἄρα, the inferential particle, in late and N. T. Greek, is found at the beginning of a clause: but never in classical Greek. Delitzsch compares two examples, one from Lucian, Jup. Tragœd. § 51, εἰ εἰσι βωμοί, εἰσι καὶ θεοί· ἀλλὰ μὴν εἰσι βωμοί, εἰσὶν ἄρα καὶ θεοί, the other, the well-known "cogito, ergo sum;" which in later and modern Greek is στοχάζομαι, ἄρα εἰμί (εἶμαι). He proceeds to say that Klotz's view, that ἄρα is not properly syllogistic but only expresses "leviorem et liberorem quandam ratiocinationem," is not confirmed by N. T. usage, nor indeed by classical, cf. Plato, Phædo § 26, οὐχ ὁρατὸν· αἰδὲς ἄρα) bastards (νόθος, ὁ μὴ γνήσιος υἱός, ἀλλ' ἐκ παλλακίδος, Phavorinus. But it is only one side of the similitude which is brought out. So Philo, De Confus. Ling. 28, vol. i. p. 426, speaking of the υἱοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων who built Babel, says that they were τῶν ἐκ πόρνης ἀποκηθέντων οὐδὲν διαφέρουντες. οὐδ' ὁ νόμος ἐκκλησίας ἀπελήλακε θείας. Chrys. explains it well: ὁρᾷς ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐφθην εἰπών, οὐκ ἐνι μὴ παιδευόμενον εἶναι υἱόν; ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις τῶν νόθων καταφρονοῦσιν οἱ πατέρες, κἂν μὴ δὲν μαθάνωσι, κἂν μὴ ἐνδοξοὶ γίνωνται, τῶν δὲ γνησίων ἔνεκεν υἱῶν δεδοίκασι μήποτε βιβνυμήσωσι, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος. εἰ τοίνυν τὸ μὴ παιδεύεσθαι νόθων ἐστὶ, δεῖ χαίρειν ἐπὶ τῇ παιδείᾳ, εἴγε γνησιότητος τοῦτο ἐστίν), and not sons.

9.] Then again (εἴτα brings in a fresh argument: "furthermore," as E. V. "deinde considerare debemus," Primas. It is taken interrogatively here by Raphael, al., as in Plato, Apol. Socr. p. 28 B, εἰτ' οὐκ αἰσχύνει, ὃ Σώκρατες κ.τ.λ.; But, 1. this would be only admissible in the case of strong indignation being expressed, which is not so here: and, 2. it would certainly

^u μᾶλλον ^v ὑποταγησόμεθα τῷ πατρὶ τῶν ^w πνευμάτων καὶ ^x ζήσομεν; ¹⁰ οἱ μὲν γὰρ ^y πρὸς ὀλίγας ἡμέρας κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῦς ^z ἐπαίδεον· ὁ δὲ ^a ἐπὶ τὸ ^b συμφέρον, ^c εἰς

w = ch 1 14 Job iv 15.

x ch. x. 38

5 James iv 14 al

z vñ 6, 7.

b = Acts xx. 20 1 Cor. xii 7. Deut. xxxiii. 6

Rom. iiii 13 al

a = Luke xliii 48.

c ch iiii. 25 ieff.

Luke ii. 51.
Rom. viii. 7.
20. Eph i.
21, 24. James
iv. 7 1 Pet.
ii 13 al. Ps.
lxi. 1
y = Luke viii. 13. 1 Cor. vii.
Matt. iii 7. Winer, § 49. l. 3. d.
121. 1

10. for οἱ, ο Ν¹. επαίδ[ευεν (sic)] ημας κα τα δοκουν τα αυτοις D¹: *erudiebant nos secundum voluntatem suam* D-lat. οιη εις το Ν¹.

require καὶ οὐ πολλὸν μᾶλλον κ.τ.λ.),—we once had (imperfect, of a state of former habit) the fathers of our flesh (see below) as chastisers (τοὺς πατ. is the object, παιδευτὰς the predicate: not as E. V., “we have had fathers of our flesh who corrected us” (πατέρας μὲν τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν εἶχομεν τοὺς παιδεύοντας)) and revered them (reff.: ἐντρέπομαι is found in classical Greek with a gen. of the object, e.g. τί βαδὺν ἐντρέπει σῆς συμμάχου; Soph. Aj. 90: but in later (e.g. LXX, Polyb., Dionys., Diod. Sic., Plutarch, al.) and N. T. Greek with an accus.): shall we not much rather be in subjection (so the E. V. well expresses the subjective force of the fut. pass.) to the Father of spirits (or, ‘of our spirits,’ understanding ἡμῶν again. But (see also below) the other is more majestic, and more in accord with the text which probably was before the Writer’s mind, Num. xvi. 22, θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός, and again xxvii. 16) and live (viz. in life eternal, as in reff.)? An enquiry arises out of the πατέρας τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν and πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων here, in what sense our earthly fathers are said to be the fathers of our flesh, and God the Father of (our) spirits. To deal with the latter first: several explanations have been given. Understanding ἡμῶν, some have taken it as, the Creator of human souls. So Primasius (“creator animorum”), Thl. (as Chrys. below, but preferring this), and among the moderns, Calvin, Beza, Jac. Cappell., Estius, Justiniani, Wetst., Heinrichs, Ernesti, al., and more recently Delitzsch, as a proof of the doctrine of Creationism (the direct creation of every man’s soul by God) against Traducianism (the derivation of our souls *ex traduce* from parent to parent). Some again, as the *originator of spiritual life*: so Seb. Schmidt, Calov., Cramer, Grotius, Hammond (par.), Limborch, Corn. a-Lapide, and more recently Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Ebrard. Others, not understanding ἡμῶν, take it as the *Father of the spirit-world*, of spiritual existences. So Erasm. Schmid, Bretschn. (lex.), al. All these three meanings are enumerated by the ancient expositors: by Chrys. without deciding between them, τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων ἡτοι τῶν χαρισμάτων

λέγει, ἡτοι τῶν εὐχῶν (read ψυχῶν), ἡτοι τῶν ἀσμάτων δυνάμεων: so (Ec.: Thl. says, πατέρα δὲ πνευμάτων ἢ τῶν χαρισμάτων ἢ τῶν ἀσμάτων δυνάμεων ἢ, ὅπερ καὶ οἰκειότερον, τῶν ψυχῶν πρὸς γὰρ ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν σαρκικῶν πατέρων εἶπε τὸν πνευματικόν. Thdrt. takes the meaning, Author of spiritual life, alone: πατέρα γὰρ πνευμάτων τὸν πνευματικόν πατέρα κέκληκεν, ὡς τῶν πνευματικῶν χαρισμάτων πηγὴν δι’ ἐκείνων δὲ ἡμῶν δέδωκε τὸ τῆς υἰοθεσίας ἀξίωμα. Others understand that πατέρα not the *originator*, but the *upholder, cherisher*: so Morus, Dindorf, Kuinoel, Böhme (“quorumlibet hominum tanquam immortalium pater, i. e. patronus, tutor, sospitatorque”), Bretschn. (lex. under πατήρ, “qui animum castigat, docet, emendat”). But, though this latter sense must not be excluded, being as it is manifestly operative in inducing present submission, to remember present dependence, so neither must the idea of origination be excluded, for it is from that fact that all a father’s rights and loving-kindnesses spring. In endeavouring to decide between these meanings, one safe standing-place may, I think, be gained, by getting free from that class of meanings which understands ἡμῶν, any further than it is necessarily involved in all spirits. τοὺς τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν πατέρας, and τῷ πατρὶ τῶν πνευμάτων without ἡμῶν, are widely and surely purposely distinct. He is described here as the Father of spirits, not as the Father of our spirits. And therefore I would understand the expression as an exalted contrast of God, a Spirit Himself, and the Creator of spirits, His like, to men, flesh themselves, and the progenitors (“creatores, quod ad similitudinem attinet”) of fleshly bodies, their like. On the consequence, as regards Creationism and Traducianism, I will not here enter. It would require far more comparison of other passages and more deliberate estimation how far this one propounds a further truth than the argument requires, to be included in a mere note. Cf Delitzsch’s argument here.

10.] The *a fortiori* is strengthened, by bringing out the difference between the two chastisements as to their *character*. For they indeed (our

d ch. vi. 7 reff. τὸ ἁ μεταλαβεῖν τῆς ὁ ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ. 11 πᾶσα δὲ ἑ παυ-
e 2 Cor. i. 12
only t. 2 Macc. xv. 2 only. f ver. 5, &c

ADKLP
N a b c d
e f g h k
l m o
17. 47

11. for 1st δε, μεν [P] 17. 21 D-lat [Orig-int.] : cm D¹-gr] 31. 109 lect-19
[æth] arm Chr-3-mss.

earthly parents) for a few days (see the meaning below. πρὸς as in reff. mainly temporal, but also indicating reference: 'during, and with a view to.' See below) chastised us (imperf. as above, ver. 9) after their own pleasure (according to that which seemed good to them: their standard and rule of action in the matter was at best their own view of what was right, and too often their own caprice or temper, ἡδονὴν πληροῦντες πολλάκις, Chrys.), but He in order to (ἐπὶ, of the contemplated direction of the result) that which is profitable, in order to our partaking of His holiness (ἀγιότης, except in the two places in reff., no where found in Greek literature. It is a more complete abstract than ἀγιωσύνη, which is rather inherent and attributive. The becoming partakers of God's holiness is manifestly to be taken subjectively: becoming holy like Him. So Thl. partly after Chrys.: τῆς ἁγ., τουτέστι, τῆς καθαρότητος αὐτοῦ ὥστε, φησὶ, γενέσθαι ἡμᾶς δεκτικούς τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀγαθῶν ἕρα οὐκ ἡ παιδεία μεταληψίς ἀγιότητός ἐστι, καὶ εἰκότως' συστρέφει γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸν ἅγιον θεόν, μὴ ἑῷσα αὐτὴν πρὸς ἀνθρώπινόν τι βέμβεσθαι). Two questions arise regarding this verse: 1. what is the intended reference of πρὸς δόλγας ἡμέρας? 2. what are the clauses opposed to one another? The former of these questions in fact involves the latter. πρὸς δόλγας ἡμέρας has been understood by many of the *duration of our natural life*, as the term to which the chastisement of our natural parents had reference, whereas that of our Heavenly Father regarded eternity. So Calv., Estius, Justiniani, Corn. a-Lap., Calmet, Schlichting, Limborch, Bengel, Tholuck, Ebrard, al. But this cannot be the meaning of the Writer. For in the first place it is not true that all earthly correction had regard only to the present life. And in the next, there is not one word in the latter clause expressing the eternal nature of God's purpose, which surely there would have been. The other interpretation, 'during and in reference to the time of our being subject to their chastisement,' is certainly the right one. So Ec. (ἡ γὰρ θάνατος τοῦ πατρός, ἡ αἵψησις τοῦ παιδός, ἵστησι τὴν παιδείαν), Thl., Schol.-Matthæi, vulg. ("in tempore paucorum dierum"), D-lat., Erasmi. (par.), Luth., Jac. Cappell., Grot., Wetst., Bohne, Kuinoel, Bleek, Lunem., Delitzsch, al. Then

we come to the second question, how the antitheses are to be arranged. Some, as Wetst., Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, and Bleek, have thought that πρὸς δόλγας ἡμέρας is to be supplied in the second member of the sentence also: seeing that the divine chastisement, like the human, lasts for a few days only, i. e. for the term of this time of trial. Others again would supply in the second member some *contrast* to πρὸς δόλ. ἡμ. So Ec. (ὁ δὲ θεὸς αἰὶ παιδεύων τελείουσ τοιεῖ), Thl., Jac. Cappell., al. Delitzsch takes the antithesis thus: The second pair of contrasts, with which he begins, is κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον. The other is, πρὸς δόλγας ἡμέρας, and εἰς τὸ μεταλ. τ. ἀγιότητος αὐτοῦ. As in πρὸς the meanings of duration and intention are mingled, so in εἰς the meanings of intention and result. But I cannot think that Delitzsch is right. Both order of words, and correspondence of meaning, are against him. Surely the true antithesis is that pointed out by the order of the clauses themselves, and by their correspondence: 1. πρὸς δόλγας ἡμέρας and ἐπὶ τὸ συμφέρον: 2. κατὰ τὸ δοκοῦν αὐτοῖς and εἰς τὸ μεταλ. τ. ἁγ. αὐτοῦ. In (1), we have set over against one another,—the short time during which, the temporary reference with which, their chastisement was inflicted,—and the great purpose, implied as eternal from its very expression as τὸ συμφέρον for an immortal being, for which He chastises us: and in (2), are opposed,—their purpose and standard of action, to satisfy their own seeming, be it good or bad,—and His purpose, to make us partakers of His holiness, which holiness, absolute and pure, is His rule of acting, and no mere δοκοῦν αὐτῶ. Thus all is straightforward, and no clause need be supplied. 11.] Recurrence to the common ground of ver. 8, in describing the attribute of *all* chastisement, divine as well as human. That this reference of the verse is right, I am fully persuaded. Delitzsch's view, that divine chastisement only is intended, confuses the logical sequence, and would certainly require, after what has gone before, some distinctive mark to indicate such restriction of the sense. The sequence of οἱ μὲν . . . ἐπαίδεον . . . ὁ δὲ . . . (παιδεύει) . . . πᾶσα δὲ παιδεία could not be otherwise interpreted than by taking πᾶσα as including the οἱ μὲν and the ὁ δὲ. It is true that in asserting what he does of πᾶσα παιδεία, the Writer lets

δεία ὃ πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἑ παρὸν οὐ δοκεῖ ἡ χαρὰς εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ὡς so Thuc. ii. 22 al. fr.
 ἡ λύπης· ὕστερον δὲ ἰκ καρπὸν ἰ εἰρηνικὸν τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς neut., here
 ἢ γεγυμνασμένοις ἢ ἀποδίδωσιν ἡ δικαιοσύνης. 13 Διὸ τὰς only.
 ὁ παρειμένας χεῖρας καὶ τὰ ἡ παραλελυμένα γόνατα ἡ ἄνορ- h gen., ch x.
 39 reff.
 i = Rom xv. 26 Cal. v.
 22, 1-ph.
 v 9.

k Phil i 11 James iii 18. Prov. xi. 30

14 reff

iv. 1. Zeph. ii. 16. Sir. ii. 12, 13. iv 29 (Isa. xxxv. 3.)

33 only 1. c Jer. vi. 24. Ezek. vii. 27 al.

l James iii. 17 only.

Dent. xxiii 6 al

Lev. xxvi 4.

o = here (Luke xi. 42) only

2 Kings x. 18, 24. Acts viii. 7 ix. 11.

m ch. v.

δι' αυτοῖς D¹[-gr].

fall out of view the capricious nature and uncertain result of human chastisement, and regards it more as a type and representative of that which is divine: all *παιδεία* properly so called, and answering its proper purpose. This is brought out in the second clause: the first is equally true of every sort of *παιδεία*. Now (exactly gives the δέ, which resumes the general from the particular, introducing an axiom to which all will assent) all chastisement for the time present (πρὸς, as before, ver. 10, 'during and in respect of: our 'for' exactly gives it. Cf. ref. Thucyd., ὁρῶν αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸ παρὸν χαλεπαίνοντας) seems (καλῶς εἶπεν· οὐ δοκεῖ. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐστὶ λύπης ἢ παιδεία, ἀλλὰ μόνον δοκεῖ. Chrys.) not to be matter of joy (χαρὰς is the gen. of category, and requires no ellipsis supplied: see on ch. x. 39, and cf. Thuc. iii. 70, βουλῆς ὢν), but of grief: but afterwards it yields (see reff. and Herod. i. 193, ἐπὶ δεικνύσῃ μὲν τὸ παράπαν ἀποδίδου) peaceable fruit of righteousness (the gen. is one of apposition; the righteousness is the fruit, the *παιδεία* being the tree. The words are otherwise taken, making δικαιοσύνης a gen. subjecti, and righteousness that which yields the fruit, by Thl. (making δικαιοσύνην to be God's righteousness: δίκαιος ὢν ὁ θεός, τοὺς ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ λυπηθέντας ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύει), Jac. Cappell. (Calv. in Bleek, but he says, "Fructus justitiæ dicitur timor Domini:" which is rather the other way), Schulz, Kuinoel, Klee, al., who make δίκαιος. an attribute not of God, but of the men spoken of: as in ref. Phil., πεπληρωμένοι καρπὸν δικαιοσύνης τὸν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, and in Liban. Decl. i. p. 198 B, μηδὲ τοῦτ' ἔδραον, πότερον ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης καρπὸς ἢ τῆς πονηρίας ἀμείνων. But seeing that παιδεία καρπὸν ἀποδίδωσιν, it must be its own fruit, and not that belonging to righteousness, that it yields. And thus Estius, Schlichting, Calov., Bengel, Storr, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch, al. And this fruit, thus considered, is the practical righteousness which springs from faith, not the forensic righteousness which comes by faith (as in Rom. v. 1). And this fruit is called *εἰρηνικός*, in con-

trast to the *ἀγών* by which it is won: it is, as Tholuck expresses it, "fruit of righteousness to be enjoyed in peace after the conflict." This is far better than to understand it 'salutaris' because εἰρήνη, peace, is used also for salvation (so Castello, Michaelis, Storr, Ernesti, Dindorf, Schleusner, Wahl, Bretschn., Kuinoel): or with Primas., Grot., Wittich, Braun, Lamb. Bos, to take it as = "gratissimum atque acceptissimum." The same sounding words occur together in ref. James, but the reference is different: see note there) to those who have been exercised by it (viz. *παιδείας*. The γεγυμνασμένοις is a clear reference to the conflict alluded to in the former verses. τί ἐστὶ, τοῖς δι' αὐτῆς γεγυμν.; τοῖς ἀνασχομένοις ἐπὶ πολλὴ καὶ καρτερήσασιν. ὁρᾷ πᾶς καὶ εὐφύμῳ ὀνόματι κέχρηται: ἅρα γυμνασία ἐστὶν ἡ παιδεία, τὸν ἀθλητὴν ἰσχυρὸν ἐργαζομένη καὶ ἀκαταγώνιστον ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσι καὶ ἔμπαχον ἐν τοῖς πολέμοις. Chrys.).

12—17.] Further exhortation, rather to promote the running the Christian race, and to take care, following peace and holiness, that there be no bitter root of sin among them, which, as in Esau's case, might deprive them of the promised blessing.

12.] Wherefore (connects with the reasoning, and also with the imagery of the foregoing verses: because suffering chastisement is the part of God's sons—because the running the race successfully brings joy and peace. And so Chrys., ὡς πρὸς δρομεῖς καὶ πύκτας καὶ πολεμιστὰς διὰ λέγεται ὁρᾷ πᾶς αὐτοὺς καθοπλίζει, πᾶς αὐτοὺς ἐπαίρει; and I see no reason with Bleek to doubt this. He does so mainly because ver. 14 would come in abruptly on the other view. But of that see below) put straight again (into their proper places) the relaxed hands (παρειμένος, not far from παραλελυμένος in sense—unstrung by infirmity, so as to be incapable of healthy motion. The two words are frequently joined together: in ref. Isa., with the same substantives as here, but ἀνεμείναι for παρ.: ἰσχύσατε χεῖρες ἀνεμείναι καὶ γόνατα παραλελυμένα: in Sir. xxv. 23, the very same words, χεῖρες παρειμένα καὶ γόνατα

οὐ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ^a ὄψεται τὸν κύριον, ¹⁵ ^b ἐπισκοποῦντες μὴ ^a = Matt. v. 8. ch. ix. 26.
 τις ^c ὑστερὼν ἀπὸ τῆς ^d χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ, μὴ τις ^e ῥίξα ^b here 1 John iii. 2.
^f πικρίας ^g ἄνω ^h φύουσα ⁱ ἐνοχλῇ, καὶ διὰ ταύτης ^k μιαν- ^c here 1 Pet. v. 2] only +
 Esth. ii. 11 al.
 ch. iv. e

1 i eff w. από, here only Eccl. vi. 2. Sir. vii. 34. d = Tit. ii. 11. 2 Cor. vi. 1. e Deut.
 xxix. 18. = 1 Tim. vi. 11¹ Sir i. 20. 1 Macc. i. 10. f Acts viii. 23. Rom. iii. 14. Eph. iv.
 31 only Deut. i. c. xxxii 32. g John xi. 41. Acts ii. 19 h = here (pass., Luke viii.
 6, 18) only Sir xiv. 18. IIad. ζ. 149. i Luke vi. 18 only, l. c. A B I [not Ed-vat] Gen. xlviii.
 1 1 Kings xix. 14 al. (Xen. Plato in Wetst.) k John xviii. 28. Tit. i. 15 bis. Jude
 8 only. Ezek. xxiv. 13

15. aft επισκ. ins ινα D¹. for χαριτος, δοξης K. δι' αυτης A[P] k 17 [47]
 Clem, Chr-comm, [Euthal-ms] : txt DKLX rel [Chr₂] Thdrt Damasc.

words, which on the other view would more naturally be *ἐιρήνην μετὰ πάντων διώκετε*. The sentiment thus is the same as in Rom. xiv. 19, ἅρα οὖν τὰ τῆς εἰρήνης διώκωμεν, καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους), and sanctification ("The connexion of καὶ τὸν ἁγιασμόν is much as in ver. 1; ch. xi. 38: the Writer uses the art., when he appends the particular to the general." Delitzsch. ἁγιασμός is not = ἁγιότης, but is the putting on of it and becoming ἅγιοι. Many Commentators, misled by the peculiar contextual reference of the word in 1 Thess. iv. 3, have restricted the meaning here to *chastity*. So Chrys. (τὸν ἁγιασμόν τί φησι; τὴν σωφροσύνην καὶ τὴν κοσμιότητα τὴν ἐν γάμῳ), Thdrt., Ec., Thl., Jer., Aug., and Jac. Cappell., Bengel, al. But the wider meaning, as a rule, must always be kept where the context does not require a narrower. And thus understood, the reference of it is well given by Limborch: "ne, dum paci studeat, nimis alius obsequendi studio quidquam contra sanctimoniam Christianam delinquat"), without (apart from) which (*χωρὶς* seems to be put after its case for rhythm's sake. In Palm and Rost's art. on *χωρὶς*, this arrangement is quoted frequently from the poets and tragedians, but does not seem to occur often in prose) none shall see the Lord (whether κύριον is to be applied to Christ, or to the Father, is uncertain. The article determines nothing. ὁ κύριος is clearly the Father in ch. viii. 2: as clearly the Son in ch. ii. 3. But here it would seem that the Father is intended. For we know, Matt. xxiv. 30: Rev. i. 7, that every eye shall see the Son, even in His glory: whereas we have our Lord using, in an ethical sentence not much unlike this one, the expression αὐτοὶ τὸν θεὸν ὄψονται):

15.] looking well (ἐπισκοποῦντες, τούτέστιν, ἀκριβῶς ἐρευνῶντες, ἐπισκεπτόμενοι, καταμανθάνοντες, Chrys. τούτέστιν, ἀκριβῶς προσέχοντες καὶ ἐρευνῶντες, Ec. The word is found in Plato, e.g. Cratyl. 399 c, ὃν ὀρᾷ οὐδὲν ἐπισκοπεῖ, al.: in Xenophon, e.g. De Laced. Rep. 3. 1, ὁ βουλόμενος καὶ ταῦτα ἐπισκοπεῖσθω, al. freq.), lest any one falling short of the

grace of God (on ὑστερέω, see on ch. iv. 1. It is here explained by Chrys., καθάπερ ὁδὸν τινα μακρὰν δευδύοντων ἐν συνοδίᾳ πολλῇ, βλέπετε, φησί, μὴ τις ἀπέμεινεν: and so Thl. In that case ἀπὸ must mean 'far from' the grace of God, as the goal to which the journey is being made. But it is far more probably in its ordinary sense, and ἀπὸ as in refl., and as Ec.: μὴ τις εἴη ἀπολελειμμένος τῆς χάριτος τοῦ θεοῦ. The whole sentence is imitated from Deut. xxix. 18, μὴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἀνὴρ ἢ γυνὴ ἢ πατὴρ ἢ φυλὴ, τινὲς ἢ διάνοια ἐξέκλινεν ἀπὸ κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν, πορευθέντες λατρεύειν τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐκείνων μὴ τις ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν ῥίξα ἄνω φύουσα ἐν χολῇ καὶ πικρίᾳ. And perhaps to this the ἀπὸ may be due, as Delitzsch suggests. But however this may be, the form of this sentence may certainly be inferred from observing that one. It is broken off at τοῦ θεοῦ in order to take up the second clause of that, μὴ τις ῥίξα κ.τ.λ. So that we need not understand ἄφ' after the participle here, as generally done, even by Thol. and Ebrard, but may pass on to the next clause, finding a common verb to both subjects in ἐνοχλῇ below. And so Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem., Delitzsch), lest any root of bitterness (not = ῥίξα πικρά, but πικρία is the origin and the ingrained character of the root, not its mere attribute. So Chrys. well, οὐκ εἶπε πικρά, ἀλλὰ, πικρίας τὴν μὲν γὰρ πικρὰν ῥίζαν ἐστὶ καρποῦς ἐνεργεῖν γλυκεῖς, τὴν δὲ πικρίας ῥίζαν καὶ πηγὴν καὶ ὑπόθεσιν οὐκ ἐστὶ ποτὲ γλυκύν ἐνεργεῖν καρπὸν πάντα γὰρ ἐστὶ πικρά, οὐδὲν ἔχει ἡδύ, πάντα πικρά, πάντα ἀηδῆ, πάντα μίσους καὶ βδελυγμίας γέμοντα. And similarly Ec. and Thl. and several moderns) springing up (φύω intrans., see refl.) trouble you (it is remarkable that the LXX [as edited] (see above) in Deut. i. c. has not ἐνοχλῇ, but ἐν χολῇ, as the Heb.: and Delitzsch supposes that the Writer followed the sound of ἐν χολῇ and substituted for it ἐνοχλῇ: as in Jude 12 the ἀπάταις of 2 Pet. ii. 13 is changed into ἀγάταις (or vice versa). But this is hardly likely, especially when we find that

¹¹ Cor. v. 9, 10, 11, vi. 9, Eph. v. 5, 1 Tim. i. 10, ch. xii. 1, Rev. xxi. 8, xxi. 15 only +. Sir xxiii. 16, 17 only Acts xxiv. 6) n = ver. 2. v. 8 vii. 9 only. Gen xxv. 33 only +. Judith ix. 5. 3 Macc iii. 24
 16 μή τις ¹ πόρνος ἢ ^m βέβηλος ὥς C μη τις
 Ἡσαῦ, δς ⁿ ἀντὶ ^o βρώσεως μιᾶς ^p ἀπέδεδωκε τὰ ^q πρωτοτόκια ἈCΔKΓ
 ἑαυτοῦ. ¹⁷ ἵστε γὰρ ὅτι καὶ ^s μετέπειτα θέλων ^t κληρονο- P N a b c
 m 1 Tim. i. 9 iv. 7, vi. 20, 2 Tim. ii. 16 only. Lev. x. 10 al. (-λοῦν, o = here only. (John iv. 32 al. 8 p = Acts k l m o
 q here only. Gen i. c 1 James i. 19 reff. s here
 t - ch i. 4 reff.

rec om *oi*, with DKL[P] rel [Chr₃ Damasc]: ins AN 17 [47] Clem₁ [Euthal-ms] Thdrt.

16. om *os* D¹[*-gr*]. rec *απεδοτο*, with DKL[P]N rel: txt AC. rec *αυτου*, with D¹KL[P]N^s rel: txt ACD² 3N¹.

17. for *θελων*, *λεγων* D¹[*-gr*].

the Alexandrine copy of the LXX, with which our Writer so often agrees, has *ἐνοχλῇ* [as has also B¹]. Delitzsch indeed supposes that this reading crept in after our Epistle was written: and strengthens his view by the superfluous and unintelligible *καὶ πικρία* following the word in the alex. text. But clearly that is no reason: nor is it probable that such correction should have been only one of four which are found in the mss. in Holmes, the other three being *εν οχλη*, *ενοχη*, *εν ω χολη*. The fact of *ἐνοχλεῖν*, ref. Luke, *ὀχλεῖν* Acts v. 16, *παρενοχλεῖν* Acts xv. 19, being all in St. Luke, does not make for Delitzsch's view: all men (taking his hypothesis of the authorship by St. Luke) are more free in quoting sayings where their own favourite words occur, and by its means the many (the whole congregation: see Gal. v. 9 quoted below) be polluted (how? by intercourse, by compromise, by over-persuasion, by imitation. The kind of pollution he explains in the next verse to arise from fornication and profanity. Thl. says, *ὁ δὲ ἀλλαχού γράφει: μικρὰ ζῆμη ἔδον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ* (Gal. v. 9), *τοῦτο καὶ ἐνταυθά φησι: μή τις πονηρὸς εἰς λόβην πλειόνων εἶναι συγχαρεῖσθαι*: 16.] lest (there be) (this is a far more probable filling up of the construction, as an independent elliptic sentence, than to suppose it to furnish another subject to *ἐνοχλῇ*) any fornicator (to be taken literally, not as alluding to spiritual fornication, cf. Deut. xxxi. 16: Exod. xxxiv. 15 f.: for as Del. observes, this sense is foreign to the N. T. except in the Apocalypse: and it is very unlikely that the Writer should have used a meaning lying so far from the context, and not suggested either by the passage of Deut. to which he was before alluding, or by the history of Esau which he is now introducing. Nearly connected with the question of the sense of *πόρνος*, is that of the punctuation: whether by a comma after it we are to sever it from connexion with Esau, or not. Most Commentators join it with what follows. So Thdrt., Schol. Matthæi, Isidor. pelus., Primas., al., and

explain it partly of the gluttony of Esau, partly of his having wedded strange women, partly by the character of a fornicator which is given him by later Jewish tradition: cf. numerous testimonies in Wetst. But others divide *πόρνος* from what follows. So Chrys., Joh. Damasc. (*ἐνταῦθα στίζει δὲ, ἵνα ᾗ τελεία διάνοια, καὶ τὸ ἐπιφερόμενον καὶ βέβηλος ὥς Ἡσαῦ*, cited in Wetst. var. read.), Thl. (*οὐ τοῦτο φησι, ὅτι πόρνος ἦν Ἡσαῦ, ἀλλ' ἔχρησ αὐτοῦ στήσον, μή τις πόρνος ἐν ὑμῖν ᾗτω. εἶπα ἀπ' ἄλλης ἀρχῆς εἶπε: μηδὲ βέβηλος ὥς Ἡσαῦ κ.τ.λ.*): and so Calvin, Seb. Schmidt, Sykes, Cramer, Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, Bisping, Lünem. It seems hardly possible to decide. The character of Esau, from Scripture as well as tradition, will very well bear the designation *πόρνος*: and the balance of the sentence is better preserved by applying both to him, than by leaving *πόρνος* insulated. The objection, that the relative clause, *δς ἀντὶ κ.τ.λ.*, applies only to *βέβηλος*, does not amount to much: for as Bengel remarks, "libido et intemperantia cibi affines." On the other hand Delitzsch's argument, that had *πόρνος* been intended to be separate, it would have stood *μή τις πόρνος ᾗ, ἢ κ.τ.λ.*, is not sound: for the ellipsis might just as well stand in both clauses, as in one. He notices that in Philo, Quæst. in Gen. xxvii. 11, lib. iv. § 201 Potter's Appendix, p. 404, "Pilosus intemperatus libidinosusque est" or profane person (τουτέστι, γαστρίμαργος, κοσμικός, τὰ πνευματικά βεβηλῶν καὶ καταπατῶν, Thl.: a man of low views, who has no appreciation of any high or divine thing: *δς τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τιμὴν ταύτην διὰ τῆς οἰκίας ῥαθυμίας ἀπέδωκε, καὶ μικρὰς ἡδονῆς χάριν τὴν μεγίστην τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀπώλεσε*, Chrys.) as Esau, who for (on *ἀντὶ*, see on ver. 2) one meal sold (the use of *ἀποδίδομαι*, middle, for *to sell*, is common in good Greek) his own birthright ('rights of primogeniture: τὰ πρωτοτόκια or -εία is the usual word in the LXX for the Heb. תְּכֵנֶחָךְ or תְּכֵנֶחָךְ עֶשָׂו, see Gen. xxv. 31—34: 1 Chron. v. 1: Deut. xxi. 17.

μησαι τὴν ^uεὐλογίαν ^vἀπεδοκιμάσθη· μετανοίας γὰρ ^wτόπον ^{u ch. i. 7 reff.}
οὐχ εὔρεν, ^{v Matt. xxi.}καίπερ ^{42 || and}μετὰ ^{1 Pet. ii. (4)}δακρῶν ^{w = Acts xxv. 16 Rom.}ἐκζητήσας αὐτήν. ^{z ch. xi.}

7 (from Ps cxvii. 22), Luke ix. 22 || Mk. xvii. 25 only. Jer. vi. 30. w = Acts xxv. 16 Rom. 4. 23 Wisd. xii. 10. x ch. v. 8 i.eff. y Acts xxi. 19, 31. ch. v. 7. z ch. xi. 6. Luke xi. 50, 51. Acts xv. 17. Rom. iii. 13. 1 Pet. i. 10 only. Eccl. i. 13.

The Greeks use for it ἡ πρεσβεία or τὸ πρεσβεῖον: Josephus has this last in this narrative, Antt. ii. 1. 1, and the LXX in Gen. xliii. 33. The reflexive *ἑαυτοῦ*, which must be read, may seem to be superfluous; but it serves to intensify the unworthiness of the act).

17.] For (the γάρ gives a reason for the caution, from the terrible result in Esau's case) *ye know* (ἴστε is not imperative, as the vulg. ("scitote") and Luther, but indicative. It was a fact of which no Hebrew could be ignorant) *that when he afterward on his part (καί brings out this: he dishonoured his inheritance, but was in his turn rejected from the blessing) wished to inherit* (see on this wide sense of κληρονομέω, ch. i. 4) *the blessing, he was rejected* (some supply παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ, some παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς. But there is no reason why both should not be joined. His father's blessing was God's blessing; his father's rejection was God's rejection. And so Thl., ἡ . . . παρ' ἀμφοτέρων δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι καὶ ὁ πατήρ κατὰ θεὸν ἀπεδοκίμασεν αὐτόν); *for he found not place of repentance* (whose repentance—his own, or his father's? The former is held by all the Greek expositors: by Luther, Calvin, Zeger, Grot., Bengel, De Wette, Bleek, Hofmann, Delitzsch, al. The latter, by Beza, Jac. Cappell., Schlichting, Raphael, Wolf, Carpzov, Tholuck, Ebrard, Stuart, Lünem., and most moderns except those named above. But the former I believe to be the only admissible sense. It is no mean argument for it, that the Fathers thought not of the other, though it would have been so useful to them in the Novatian controversy. Theodore of Mops. (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. lxx. p. 968), though he wrests the passage from those who wished τὴν μετάνοιαν ἀνελεῖν, never hints at any other meaning. And his explanation is surely the right one: οὐχὶ συγχωρήσεως ἀμαρτημάτων μετανοήσας οὐκ ἔτυχεν ἐκείνος, οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο ἤτει τότε, ἀλλ' εὐλογίαν, ἣν κατὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ τρόπου τῷ ἀδελφῷ δοθείσαν ἀφαιρεθῆναι αὐτῷ οὐδαμῶς οἶδόν τε ἦν καὶ δοθῆναι αὐτῷ πάλιν. It would surely be a most unnatural use of the phrase μετανοίας τόπον εὔρεν (cf. ref. Wisd., κρίνον δὲ κατὰ βραχὺ ἐδίδοκν τόπον μετανοίας: Clem.-rom. ad Corinth. 7, p. 225, μετανοίας τόπον ἔδωκεν ὁ δεσπότης τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπιστραφῆναι ἐπ' αὐτόν: Liv. xlv. 10, "penitentiae relinquens locum": Plin. Ep. x. 97. 10, "ex quo facile est opinari, quæ

turba hominum emendari possit, si sit penitentiae locus:" and other examples in Bleek), to understand by μετανοίας, repentance not in the subject of εὔρεν, but in some one else. And thus referred to Esau himself, it will mean much as Thdr.-mops. above, that he found no way open to reverse what had been done, by repentance: the sin had been committed and the consequence entailed, irrevocably. He might change, but the penalty could not, from the very nature of the circumstances, be taken off. So that μετάνοια, in its full sense, had no τόπος. And such is the meaning of the 'locus penitentiae,' wherever occurring. We do not mean by it an opportunity to repent in a man's own bosom, to be sorry for what he has done, for this may be under any circumstances, and this might have been with Esau: but we mean, *a chance, by repenting, to repair*. So when a condemned criminal has a 'locus penitentiae' allowed him, we do not mean that he may die penitent, but that he is relieved. I see not how else to understand this, and what follows: and thus understood nothing can be plainer), although he earnestly sought (reff.) it (what? not εὐλογίαν, as Thl., τινές in Céc., Calvin, Bengel, C. F. Schmid, Bleek, and even Delitzsch: for this would be, as Ebrard characterizes it, most unnatural, εὐλογίαν being separated from αὐτὴν by a whole intervening clause, which will not bear parenthesizing, because ἐκζητήσας immediately takes up εὔρεν—he found it not, though he sought it. Regarding μετανοίας then as the only admissible antecedent for αὐτήν, the explanation will be very simple. μετανοίας τόπος is, in fact, μετάνοια. He found no place for μετάνοια: if he had found one, μετάνοια would have been secured: this was what he sought. So, when μετανοίας τόπον is taken up again, the mere secondary τόπος disappears, and it is αὐτήν, not αὐτόν, agreeing with the great thing really sought. This as against the arguments alleged in Delitzsch, al., who taking μετάνοια merely subjectively, maintain that it was not what Esau sought) *with tears* (Gen. xxvii. 38. It is obvious, that our passage, rightly understood, cannot by any means favour the exclusion of any sinner from repentance. In Esau's case the μετανοίας τόπος (see above) was closed, by circumstances themselves: the blessing had been given and could not be

a = ch. xi. 6
 ref. Deut.
 iv. 11.
 b Luke xxiv.
 39 Acts
 xvii. 27. 1 John i 1 only. Gen. xxiii 12 c Deut iv. 11. v. 23, also ix 15 Rev xxi. 8. d here
 only. Deut. i c. Zeph. i 15 al. (-φώδης, Exod xix. 10.) e 2 Pet. ii 4, 17. Jude 6, 13 only + Symm,
 Ps. x 2. xc. 6. f here only. Deut. i. c. v. 22 Exod x 22 only.

18. rec aft ψηλαφ. ins *ορει* (to supply the sense as below, ver 22), with D[-gr] KL[P] rel [vulg-ed arm] Ath, Ps-Ath, Thdrst Damasc (Ec [Orig-int,]; bef ψηλαφ. m 116 [Chr₂]; om ACN 17 [47] am (with demid fuld harl tol F-lat) D-lat Syr coptt aeth Chr-comm (τί τὸ ψηλαφόμενον πῦρ πρὸς τὸν ἀψηλάφητον θεόν;) Thl [Euthal-ms Orig-int,] Primas.
 om 1st και D¹[-gr] 67² harl coptt arm. for κεκαυμ., κεκαλυμμενω D¹[-gr] Ps-Ath.
 rec (for ζοφω) σκοτω (from Deut iv. 11; v. 22), with D²⁻³ LN³ rel [Chr Thdrst Damasc]: txt ACD¹[P] 8¹ 17 [Euthal-ms].—om και ζοφω K.

recalled. And this is our warning. It may be so, in many cases, with us. That it is always so, is not even hinted: but warning is given us that a path is not safe where even such a possibility may be encountered. See Prov. i. 24—32).

18—29.] Connected with what has preceded by γάρ. *Take heed that there be not such* (as in vv. 15, 16) *among you: for (not only have we the solemn warning of Esau, but) we are not under the law with its terrors, but under the gospel with its promises,—hearing one who speaks for the last time, who speaks from heaven—and receiving a kingdom which shall not be moved.*

18.] For (see above) *ye have not drawn near* to ('in your approaching unto God (reff.), it has not been to, &c.' The E. V. "ye are not come unto" omits the approach to God implied in *προσέρχασθαι*) that *which was being touched* (understand *δρει*, which is expressed below with *Σιών*, and hence has come in as a gloss here. From the seeming difficulty of this, and from all who omit *δρει* here having taken the two dative participles as agreeing with *πυρί*, and in consequence giving no adequate sense, many even of our critical editors and expositors have here forsaken the testimony of antiquity, and inserted the *δρει*. But if we suppose *Σιών ὅρος* to have been before the Writer's mind from the first, there is no difficulty in his deferring the *ὅρος* so long. *ψηλαφόμενῳ* has been variously interpreted. Some, as Schöttgen, Kypke, Bengel, al., and Bretschneider, and even Palm and Rost, Lex., understand it, "*touched by the fire of God*," cf. Ps. ciii. 32, *ὁ ἀπτόμενος τῶν ὀρέων καὶ καπνίζονται*. But this seems hardly consistent with the present part., nor indeed at all with the sense of the word itself, which is to touch by feeling about, as a blind man does, *contrecto, palpo*—Isa. lix. 10, *ψηλαφήσουσιν ὡς τυφλοὶ τοῖχον*: Gen. xxvii. 12, *μήποτε ψηλάφησεν με ὁ πατήρ*: ib. 21, 22: Judg. xvi. 26, *ἤφες με καὶ ψηλάφησεν τοὺς κίονας*: Deut. xxviii. 29, *καὶ ἔσθ ψηλαφῶν μεσημβρίας*,

ἂν τις ψηλαφήσαι τυφλὸς ἐν τῷ σκοτει: Job v. 14, *τὸ δὲ μεσημβριὸν ψηλαφήσαι-σαν ἴσα νυκτί*: xii. 25, *ψηλαφήσαισαν σκοτός καὶ μὴ φῶς*: Exod. x. 21, *γεννηθήτω σκοτός . . . ψηλαφητὸν σκοτός*. And this sense will I believe fit our passage very well. Mount Sinai was a material mountain, which not only *might be touched*,—as many (Knapp, Böhme, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Ebrard, Bispington, al.), identifying *ψηλαφόμενον* with *ψηλαφητόν*,—but *was being touched*, would have been touched by the people had it not been forbidden. So that the part. pres. (or imperf.) is in that peculiar sense of incompleteness in which we so often find the imperf. itself, inviting after it an *εἰ μή* in Greek, or a 'nisi' in Latin. Unless we bear this in mind, we are open to the objection that, while it was forbidden to be touched, it yet was touched. The other objection, brought by Delitzsch, that the Writer mentions this fact of *touching* below in other terms, with *θγγάνειν*, is readily answered, that he is there using the very words of the prohibition in Exodus, whereas here he is giving scope to the graphic and rhetorical style of the passage. For the whole, cf. Exod. xix. 12, 13, where *οὐχ ἄψεται αὐτοῦ χεῖρ* leads very naturally to *ψηλαφόμενον*, and which was burnt with fire (cf. the same expression in reff. Deut., where nearly the same words, *σκοτός, γνόφος, θύελλα*, following, put it beyond all doubt that *πυρί* is used here ablatively, not as a dative with *κεκαυμένῳ*, as Erasmus, Calvin, Beza, Bengel, Knapp, and more recently Delitzsch. (Such a connexion is perfectly allowable, against Ebrard, who ventures here one of his rash assertions: "*κεκαυμένῳ* cannot be an attribute of *πυρί*: for to designate a fire as 'a burning fire' would be superfluous, unless a burning fire is to be contrasted with a painted fire, which is not the case here.") And this in the face of *πῦρ διαπαντός καυθήσεται ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον*, Levit. vi. 13: see numerous other examples in Bleek.) The perfect participle, in either case, is somewhat startling. The present would

^εσάλπιγγος ^hἤχῳ, καὶ ⁱφωνῇ ⁱῥημάτων, ¹⁹ἧς οἱ ἀκού- ^g Exod. xix.
σαντες ^jπαρητήσαντο μὴ ^kπροσθεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον ^{15.} Matt.
²⁰οὐκ ¹ἔφερον γὰρ τὸ ^mδιαστελλόμενον, ²¹Καὶ θηρίον ^h = Acts ii. 12.
^ο θίγγι τοῦ ὄρους, ^pλιθοβοληθήσεται. ²¹καί, οὕτως ^{16.} al.
xxi. 25. i Deut. iv. 12 j ver. 25 bis. Luke xiv. 18, 19. 1 Tim iv 7 al. Esth. iv. 8. constr.,
here only. k Deut. v. 25. xxviii. 16 = Gal. iii. 19. l = Rom ix 22. m Matt xvi.
20 Mark v. 43 al. Acts xv 24 only. Ezek. xiii. 18 n Exod. xix. 12, 13 (freely) o Col.
ii. 21. ch. xi. 28 only. Exod. i. c. only. p Matt xxi. 35. Acts vii 58, 59 al. Exod. i. c. viii. 25 al.

M Βολη-
θησεται

ACDKL
MPN ab
c d e f g
h k l m o
17. 47

19. om μὴ N¹[P Chr-2-mss.]. προσθεῖναι A.
20. rec at end ins (from LXX) ἡ βολιδι κατατοξευθήσεται, with ο (but aft κ. οὕτως
ver 21): om ACDKLM[P]N rel [vss Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc Thl Ec-comm].
21. rec οὕτω, with AN¹ rel: ου D¹: txt CD²⁻³[MP]N³ k l m.

seem the more natural. But if in the case where it is taken with *πυρί* it is rendered 'kindled' (see Del.), there can be no reason why it should not in the other be rendered 'lit up.' 'Consumed' would be κατακεκαυμένη: cf. Exod. iii. 2, ὅρα ὅτι ὁ βᾶτος καίεται πυρί, καὶ ὁ βᾶτος οὐ κατεκαίετο), and to blackness and darkness and tempest (cf. reff. Deut.), and to sound of trumpet (see ref. Exod. The Writer avoids the *φωνή* there used, having so soon to use *φωνῇ ῥημάτων*. As regards the method of declining ἤχος, see Winer, § 9, Remark 2. This form, which is blamed by Thomas Magister, is very commonly used by the classics. When Delitzsch states that it is the only form known to common Greek, he is as wrong the other way: see Aristoph. Av. 215: Plato, Rep. vii. p. 435: Herod. ix. 34: Callim. Hymn. in Jov. 53: Pind. Ol. 14. 29. Cf. Palm and Rost's Lex.) and the voice of words (ref.),

19.] which they who heard (ἧς, referring to *φωνῇ*, is governed by ἀκούσαντες, not as Storr, by λόγον) entreated (παραιεῖσθαι τι = αἰτεῖσθαι τι παρὰ τινος, in all senses, but more usually in the deprecatory sense. Hence simply to *deprecate* (Thuc. v. 63, ὁ δὲ παρητεῖτο, μηδὲν τούτων δρᾶν): hence further, to *refuse* or *forbid*, as in Acts xxv. 11, and even more directly in ver. 25 below) that (more) discourse should not be added to them (αὐτοῖς might agree with τοῖς ῥήμασι, but much more probably agrees with τοῖς ἀκούσασιν, from the form of construction in Deut. i. c., where they say that they should die, εἰαν προσθάμεθα ἡμεῖς ἀκοῦσαι (Δ, προσθῶμεν ἀκοῦσαι ἡμεῖς) τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἔτι. Calvin explains the sense, "Cæterum quod dicit populum excusasse, non ita debet accipi quasi populum renuerit audire Dei verba, sed deprecatus est, ne Deum ipsum loquentem audire cogeretur. Persona enim Mosis interposita horrorem non-nihil mitigabat"):

20, 21.] *Par-
enthetical, explaining the reason of this
horror on the part of the hearers.*
20.] for they could not bear that which

was commanded (Ec. and Thl. take this as an independent sentence, said of the general fearful character of the commands: *τούτέστι τὸ διαλαλούμενον παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἡδύναντο τοῖς ὡσὶ στέγειν ὡς φοβερόν*. And so Schlichting. But this would be exceedingly harsh, and finds no justification in the reason assigned by Schlichting, viz. that thus "sequentia verba tanquam per se posita, ad exaggerandum magis speculaculi illius terrorem pertinebunt." It is manifest, from the retention of the future *λιθοβοληθήσεται*, that the words are a citation, and this clause the introduction of it. But among those who agree thus far, there is another wide difference about the *voice* of the participle, as to whether *διαστελλόμενον* is middle or passive. Storr, Heinrichs, Schulz, Delitzsch, take it middle, in an active sense, "that which ordered," viz. the divine voice. But surely this is, if admissible grammatically (see Mark vii. 36 and viii. 15, where only *διστάλλετο* is found, all the other cases having the 1 aor. *διατείλασθαι*, which stands on its own ground), yet contextually most improbable: 1. that God, or the voice of God, should be thus described by a neuter part.: 2. that with τὸ φανταζόμενον just below, in strict parallelism, τὸ διαστελλόμενον should signify any thing but that which was commanded). Even if a beast (much more if a man) touch the mountain, it shall be stoned (an abbreviation of Exod. xix. 12, 13, καὶ ἀφοριεῖς τὸν λαὸν κύκλῳ, λέγων, Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ ἀναβῆναι εἰς τὸ ὄρος καὶ θγεῖν τι αὐτοῦ· πᾶς δ' ἀνάνειος τοῦ ὄρους θανάτῳ τελευτήσει. οὐχ ἔψεται αὐτοῦ χεῖρ· ἐν γὰρ λίθοις λιθοβοληθήσεται ἡ βολιδι κατατοξευθήσεται· ἐάν τε κτήνος ἐάν τε ἄνθρωπος, οὐ ζήσεται):

21.] and (this clause is diversely punctuated. Before Beza, there was no comma at καί, and the sense was read straight on, "and so terrible was the sight, (that) Moses said," as in E. V. So the Fathers: so some mss. of the vulg. So Mill, Bengel, Michaelis, and Lachmann. And thus, as Bl. well observes, should we

κλησία^a πρωτοτόκων^b ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς, καὶ^a ^{ch. i. 6. Rom. vii.}
^{29 al. = here only. see Num. iii. 40-43. b Luke ii. 1, 3, 5 only. Judg. viii. 14 A. Prov.}
^{xvii 20 only. 3 Macc. iv. 14. (γραφή, Acts v. 37)}

rec εϛ ουρανοῖς bef ἀπογεγρ., with K rel [Cosm.] Damasc: txt ACDLM[P]X m 17 [47]
 latt Syr coptt [æth arm] Clem₁ Orig₃[int₂] Eus₄ Chron₁ [Euthal-ms Cosm₁].

I. καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει,
 καὶ . . .

a. καὶ μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει,
 καὶ . . .

b. καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει,
 καὶ . . .

II. καὶ μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων, πανηγύρει
 καὶ . . .

III. καὶ μυριάσιν, ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει
 καὶ . . .

According to I., which is found in most uncial MSS., &c., and is adopted by Erasmus, and by Tischendorf, the inner relation of the words of which the clause consists is left uncertain: all is undefined, for we punctuate as if it were καὶ μυρίων as in D¹, or as it might certainly be, καὶ μυριάδων ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει. This inaccuracy precludes both I. a (Griesbach, Knapp, Seb. Schmidt, Wolf, Böhme, Kuinoel, Tholuck), as making μυριάσιν in apposition with ἀγγέλων πανηγύρει,—and I. b (Ec. (πανηγύρει ἐν μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων ὑπερεχούσῃ), Thl. (ἡ πανήγυρις οὖν αὕτη ἐν μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων συνίσταται), Syr. ("ad cœtus myriadum angelorum"), D-lat. ("et multitudinem angelorum frequentem"), Ambr. (below), Jerome ("et multorum millium angelorum frequentiam"): E. V. ("to an innumerable company of angels"), and so in A, C, and many cursive mss.), which makes πανηγύρει in apposition with μυριάσιν ἀγγέλων. The former of these two has nothing against it except that one cannot see any reason for μυριάσιν standing first so isolated: the latter is condemned by the unmeaning πανηγύρει lagging at the end. According to II. (Elzev., Beza, Jo. Gregor., Matthæi: also Calov., Kypke, Carpzov, Cramer, Baumgarten, Storr, De Wette (transl. 2nd edn.)), a new clause begins with πανηγύρει καὶ ἐκκλησίᾳ: for which arrangement Lünemann and Hofmann have decided, the former remarking, that πανήγυρις assembles the company of the firstborn in feast and jubilee, while ἐκκλησία binds them together in unity; the latter, that πανήγυρις and ἐκκλησία answer to the Heb. קָהָל and חֵזָק, the one denoting an assembly for worship, the other an assembly politically ordered. But it is difficult to see why the coupling of clause to clause by καὶ, which prevails through the sentence, should thus be broken through: and while the former of these Hebrew words is only once (ref. Amos) rendered πανήγυρις by

the LXX, the two words never occur together in the O. T. We have then left III. (Bengel, C. F. Schmid, Ernesti, Schulz, Vater, Lachm., De Wette (transl. 3rd edn.), Theile), for which Bleek also decides, remarking rightly, that only on this view is the beginning of the sentence by the simple word μυριάσιν explained. The Writer begins with it, in order afterwards to say *per partes* of what these myriads consist, as in the O. T. also we read of מִלְיוֹת both of angels, ref. Deut., and of the congregation, Num. x. 36. πανήγυρις is the complete, multitudinous, above all, jubilant, festal and blissful assembly: thus Ambrose renders "et decem millibus lætantium angelorum," and Aug. "exultantium." Adopting then this arrangement, the verse will stand,—and to myriads (reff.: commonly used of the angelic company surrounding Jehovah), the festal host of angels and the assembly of the firstborn which are written in heaven (who are these? Why are they put with the angels? Why does the Writer place κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων between the assembly of the firstborn and the spirits of just men made perfect? These, says Delitzsch, are three closely connected questions, and among the very hardest in our Epistle. The answers to them are very various. Many understand them of the first-fruits of the Christian church (ἀπαρχή, Rev. xiv. 4: see also 2 Thess. ii. 13 v. r.): so De Wette, "those who are fallen asleep in the faith of Christ, and possibly also glorified by martyrdom, who have entered earlier than others, as it were the firstborn, into blissful union with God and Christ." As Del. observes, if we hold them to be martyrs, the following words, καὶ κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων, might have a certain propriety from Rev. vi. 9 f., where the souls of the martyrs under the altar cry, ἔως πότε . . . οὐ κρίνεις καὶ ἐκδικεῖς τὸ αἷμα ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν κατοικούντων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; But this view seems altogether to fail when we attempt to explain by it ἀπογεγραμμένων ἐν οὐρανοῖς. Those of whom our Lord says, Luke x. 20, χαίrete ὅτι τὰ δνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, are yet living on earth. According to St. Luke's manner of speaking, the firstborn are hereby designated as enrolled (see reff. Luke) in the heavenly roll: and Scripture usage seems to demand that we consider one thus described, as not yet in possession of everlasting life in the fullest

c = James iv. 12 ieff. ^c κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων, καὶ ^d πνεύμασιν ^e δικαίων ^f τετε- ACDEKL
 d = Luke xxiv. 37, 39. Acts vii. 59. 1 Pet. iii. 19. e Cant. Tr. Puer. 63. f = Matt. xlv. 37, MPN a b
 46. Wisd. iii. 1. g ch. ii. 10 ieff. xi. 40 h k l m o
 17. 47

πνευματι D¹(and lat) [demid Cosm.].
 μενοις N¹.—τεθεμελιωμενον D¹, *funditorum*

for δικαίων τετελειωμενων, τελίων δεδικαιω-
 D-lat, *fundatorum* Hil.

sense, but as destined to life (cf. Isa. iv. 3: Acts xiii. 48). This would forbid us from thinking of the 144,000 whom St. John saw with the Lamb on the heavenly Sion, who bore on their foreheads the name of the Lamb and of the Father. For this sealing was among the insignia of their eternal glorification: whereas the being enrolled in the book of life is the token to us, while here below, of our heavenly citizenship, and seems to lose all its significance, as soon as we have entered the heavenly city and need no assurance of our citizenship either for ourselves or for others. So that though we are tempted, both by the fact of their being classed with the angels, and by their being πρωτότοκοι (cf. ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρχῇ, Rev. xiv. 4), to identify these with the χιλιᾶδες seen by St. John, we must give up the parallel, these ἀπογεγραμμένοι ἐν οὐρανοῖς being not yet citizens of heaven who have taken up their full citizenship by passing through death, but persons to whom their citizenship is assured, they being as yet here below. Add to which, that they are distinguished from the spirits of just men made perfect, by the term ἐκκλησία: and that it would be difficult or rather impossible, on this hypothesis, to give any account of the sense or arrangement of the two following clauses. Just as inadmissible is it, or even more so, to understand, with Lünem., by the πρωτότοκοι the patriarchs and saints of the O. T., and then by πνεύμασι δικαίων τετελ., not, as De W., the O. T. but the N. T. saints. So that, to say nothing of other varieties of interpretation not worth mentioning, there is no way left but to see, in the ἐκκλησία πρωτότοκων ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἀπογεγραμμένων, THE CHURCH BELOW. And this view, far from being a last refuge, is justified by every consideration. For, 1. thus ἐκκλησία is explained, which every where when used of men and not of angels, Ps. lxxxviii. 5, designates the assembly of saints on earth: 2. the adjunct ἀπογεγρ. ἐν οὐρ. is accounted for, indicating as it does the heavenly charter of the church below, the invisible side of their sonship and citizenship (cf. 1 John iii. 2), with which in this description of heaven we are mainly concerned: 3. we get an explanation of the choice of the term πρωτότοκων to describe Christian believers. The Writer having given the warning example of Esau, who for a morsel of meat sold his birthright, has prepared the way for such a

designation, while at the same time, as Knapp rightly remarks, the long sentence beginning at ver. 18 aims at this, "ut Christiani contra ἀπιστίαν muniantur et bona sua (τὰ πρωτοτόκια αὐτῶν) nosse discant." There is no distinction between firstborn and later-born Christians, but, as Hofmann also acknowledges, all Christians as such are called πρωτότοκοι because of their heritorship of the heavenly inheritance. We may also remark that thus the analogy with the firstborn of Israel is completely fulfilled. They were dedicated to God specially as his priests (Exod. xiii. 1, 2, 11—15), and royal succession was in the firstborn: so that in πρωτότοκοι we have that which St. John says: ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλεῖαν, ἱερεῖς τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ. This prinogeniture, which belonged to Israel as such (Exod. iv. 22), belongs to Christians as such, and to every one of them: they are enrolled not merely in an earthly register, cf. Num. iii. 42, but in the book of life in heaven. We also thus, 4. obtain an explanation of the juxtaposition in the sentence of the myriads of angels and the myriads of the firstborn: the key to it being found in ch. i. 14, where God is said to have apportioned the angels as λειτουργικά πνεύματα to minister to the heirs of salvation. Thus we have the heavenly spirits and the firstborn whose names are in heaven, the jubilant choir above and the militant church below, ranged together. But, 5. we also get, what we find on no other hypothesis, an explanation of the sequence of κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων on ἐκκλησία πρωτότοκων, and of that of πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων on κριτῇ θεῷ πάντων. The key to the words is in ch. x. 30, κύριος κρινεῖ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ. The church militant here below brings to mind those enemies and persecutors, for deliverance and righting from whom she looks to the righteous judgment of God. And he who is in fellowship (1 John i. 7) with the great Judge has no judgment to fear, but is δεδικαιωμένος; thereby leading on to the πνεύμασιν δικαίων τετελειωμένων which follows. Thus, according to Delitzsch's note, which in the main I have here followed, the connexion between the clauses is established, and the arrangement justified: and I own this interpretation seems to me the only one which in any way fulfils those requirements. A summary of other interpreta-

λειωμένων, ²⁴ καὶ ^h διαθήκης ^{hi} νέας ^k μεσίτη Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ^h here only.
1 Luke v. 39 1 Cor. v. 7. Col. iii. 10. Lev. xxiii. 16. (see note.)
 k ch. viii. 6 reff.

24. μεσίτης D¹[-gr] 109.

tions may be seen in Bleek and Lünemann. There is a monograph by Mosheim, De Ecclesia Primogenitorum in Cælo adscriptorum ex Hebr. xii., Helmst. 1733, which I have not seen. He takes them, in common with Bleek, De W., al., as the first converts to Christianity already entered into glory. Estius most nearly approaches the interpretation given above. His whole note is very good; the conclusion especially so: "Sensus igitur hujus partis est: aggregati estis et adscripti in societatem eorum qui præ cæteris mortalibus electi sunt a Deo et ab aliis separati, tanquam primogeniti, et in cælis, tanquam beatitudinis cælestis hæredes, conscripti. Hæc vero dicens significat et ipsos esse primogenitos et conscriptos in cælis"), and to
 * God the judge of all (not, as many moderns,—Erasm.(annot. appy.), Hermann de Wall, Bengel, Wetst., Cramer, Michaelis, C. F. Schmid, Storr, Knapp, Dindorf, Vater, Paulus, De Wette, Bleek, Stuart, Lünem., Delitzsch,—“to the (a) judge, the God of all.” For, 1. the order of the words in the clause is the natural one where a predicate is brought out into prominence for any reason, whether to be affirmed, or made the subject of attention: cf., for the first, 1 Thess. iv. 6, διότι ἕκδικος κύριος περὶ πάντων τούτων, and for the second James i. 5, παρὰ τοῦ δίδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν: 2. all the Greek expositors, and the ancients without exception, took the words so, e. g. as Thl., πάντων γάρ, οὐχὶ Ἰουδαίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πιστῶν ἐστὶ κριτής: 3. if they meant, “to a judge, the God of all,” surely they would have been otherwise expressed,—κριτὴ (τῶν) πάντων θεῷ or the like: 4. thus only, by uplifting the universal right judgment of God, does the clause fit the context, coming between the mention of the elect, written in heaven, and the spirits of the just, shewing that the ἀπογραφὴ is no arbitrary selection,—the διακρίσις no unreasonable procedure. It is not improbable that the Writer may have had in view Abraham’s question Gen. xviii. 25, “Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?” I only stop to protest, even for those who adopt the θεῷ πάντων view, against the idea of Delitzsch, al., that πάντων is neuter. God could not be said to be θεὸς πάντων in the neuter sense of πάντα. He is ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων θεός, Rom. ix. 5, which is widely different: δι’ ὃν τὰ πάντα καὶ δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα, ch. ii. 10, which again is widely different: He is θεὸς

τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός: but He is not θεὸς τοῦ κόσμου, nor θεὸς τῶν πάντων (neut.). He is God of πάντες, but not of πάντα; the God not of the dead, but of the living. Primas, (Æc., Thl., Faber Stap., Braun understand this of Christ: but it is a characteristic of this Epistle that all judgment is formally, and in words, referred to God the Father: see ch. iv. 11 f.; x. 30 f.; ver. 29; ch. xiii. 4), and to the spirits of just men who have been perfected (i. e. the whole number of the just who have passed into their rest, from righteous Abel downwards; not yet δίκαιοι τετελειωμένοι, because they are as yet disembodied and awaiting the resurrection, but πνεύμασιν δίκαιων τετελειωμένων. This τελείωσις has been through sufferings, through trials, through running and having ended their race. All is accomplished, their probation, their righteousness, God’s purposes respecting them. They are not sleeping, they are not unconscious, they are not absent from us: they are perfected, lacking nothing, except, and that is our defect because we are as yet imprisoned in an unspiritual body, communion with us: their spirits are perfect, and therefore not suspended from the spirit life, but waiting only for bodily perfection also. The exposition of this clause has been much disturbed by the mistaken views taken of the former ones. It has been variously explained; of the N. T. saints only (Grot., Mosh., Bengel, Sykes, Baumgarten, C. F. Schmid, Storr, al.), of the O. T. saints (Corn. a-Lap., Schlicht., Wolf, Schulz, Bleek, De W., Ebrard). It is understood as above by Knapp, Böhme, Tholuck, Bisping, Delitzsch. The Greek expositors also give it a general reference: e. g. Thl., τούτῃ, ταῖς ψυχαῖς τῶν εὐδοκίμησάντων καὶ τελείων φανέντων παρὰ θεῷ, διὰ πίστεως δηλαδὴ, ὡς ἀπέδειξεν. This perfection of the just is the result of the (anticipated) just judgment of God, and thus aptly follows κριτὴ θεῷ πάντων), 24.] and to the mediator of the latter covenant (νέας, not = καινῆς. νέος is recens; καινός, novus: νέος, the more objective word, καινός, the more subjective. But this must not be taken exclusively. νέος carries with it the freshness of youth, and is the livelier, more graphic word. See reff., esp. Col. In ch. ix. 15 our Lord is characterized as διαθήκης καινῆς μεσίτης), Jesus (the mention of the δίκαιοι τετελειωμένοι at once introduces that of Him who was Himself τετελειωμένος, ch.

1 p Pet 1 2 only t. Num. ix. 9, & c Zech xiii 1 (not F.). N³⁸ only. (τίθειν, ch. ix. 13.) m ch. i. 4 reff. n ch ix. 23 reff. o ch. iii. 12 reff. p ver. 19 reff. ACCKL MPN ab c d e f g h k l m o 17. 47

αἵματι ¹ ῥαντισμοῦ ^m κρείττον λαλοῦντι ⁿ παρὰ τὸν Ἀβελ. 25 ὁ βλέπετε μὴ ^p παραιτήσησθε τὸν λαλοῦντα. εἰ γὰρ ἐκείνοι οὐκ ^p ἐξέφυγον ἐπὶ γῆς ^a παραιτήσάμενοι τὸν

rec κρείττονα, with 17 [47 Thdrt Cosm.] : txt ACCKLM[P]N rel.

25. aft λαλοῦντα ins υμιν D¹ harl¹ [sah æth], in vobis D-lat. rec (for ἐξεφ.) ἐφυγον, with D³ KLMN³ rel Thdrt Damasc, ἐφυγαν D¹ : txt AC[P]N¹ 17 Chr, Cyr, Damasc-comm, effugerunt vulg (and F-lat) D-lat. rec ins της βεφ γης, with Cyr [Damasc] : om ACCKLM[P]N rel [arm Chr, Euthal-ms Cyr, Thdrt]. rec τον βεφ επι γης παρ., with KL[P]N³ rel [Chr Thdrt Damasc] : txt ACDMN¹ m 17 [Euthal-ms] Cyr.,

ii. 10, and who is the τελειωτής τῆς πίστεως, ver. 2. Cf. ch. vii. 22. Our Writer especially loves to use the name JESUS. To Christ, all that is predicated of our Lord belonged officially: but when it is predicated of Jesus, it becomes personal fact, realized in one whom we know and who loves us. That Christ is the mediator of the new covenant, is a theological truth: that Jesus is, is a glorious token of God's love manifested to us men), and to the blood of sprinkling (naturally following on the mention of διαθήκη, for no διαθήκη is consecrated without blood, ch. ix. 18, 22. And if Moses had blood wherewith to sprinkle the people, much more Jesus, of whom Moses was a shadow. And therefore the Writer, enumerating the great differences of our Sion from their Sinai, though he has not recounted their blood of sprinkling, as not being worthy of mention in the face of the terrors of God's law, mentions ours, by which we were redeemed unto God, and assigns it a place in the heavenly city, next to, but separate from, Jesus Himself in His glorified state. If we come to enquire how this can be, we enter on an interesting but high and difficult subject, on which learned and holy men have been much divided. Our Lord's Blood was shed from Him on the Cross. And as His Body did not see corruption, it is obvious to suppose, that His Blood did not corrupt as that of ordinary men, being as it is so important a portion of the lo.ly. Hence, and because His resurrection Body seems to have been bloodless,—see Luke xiv. 39 : John xx. 27, and notes,—some have supposed that the Blood of the Lord remains, as it was poured out, incorruptible, in the presence of God. On such a matter I would neither affirm nor deny, but mention, with all reverence, that which seems to suit the requirements of the words before us. By that Blood we live, wherever it is: but as here it is mentioned separately from the Lord Himself, as an item in the glories of the heavenly city, and as “yet speaking,” it seems to require some such view to account for the words used. Bengel

has here a long excursus on the point, in which he takes strongly the above view. Chrys. also seems to have done so, Hom. xxxiii. on Heb. xiii., vol. xii. p. 229, where the text is in some confusion, but Mutianus seems to have expressed the sense (p. 447): “Foris quippe passus est, sed ad cælum sanguis sublatu est” (εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ αἷμα ἀννήχθη). The blood of Christ is called αἷμα ῥαντισμοῦ, inasmuch as, like that sacrificial blood of old materially, it is spiritually sprinkled on the conscience of those who come unto God by Him, cf. ch. ix. 13 ff.; x. 22; xiii. 12) speaking better (κρείττον adverbially: as in 1 Cor. vii. 38, κρείσσον ποιεῖν is opposed to καλῶς ποιεῖν. And the adverb refers not to the manner of the speaking (as Thdrt., διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων φβεγγόμενον: Chrys., τοῦτο γὰρ πάντας ἐκάθηρε, καὶ φωνὴν ἀφίσει λαμπροτέραν καὶ εὐσημοτέραν, ὅσα μείζονα τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἔχει τὴν διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων: and Schol.-Matthæi, τὸ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ Ἀβελ ἄδεται μόνον, τοῦτο δὲ ἐνεργεῖ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίαν. This accords with their understanding of λαλεῖ above in ch. xi. 4), but to the matter spoken. So, after Cyr.-alex. de Adorat. in Spir., and ver. xv., vol. i. p. 528, Ec., τὸ μὲν γὰρ Ἀβελ αἷμα κατακεκράγει τοῦ φονευτοῦ, τὸ δὲ χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν λαλεῖ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα: “ille flagitabat ultionem, hic impetrat remissionem,” Erasm (par.). And so most later Commentators. Delitzsch unites both views) than Abel (not, “than that of Abel:” for in ch. xi. 4, it is Abel himself who speaks, in his blood: see note there).

25.] This voice of the blood of sprinkling, just mentioned, leads naturally to the caution not to despise that voice, nor put it by as they of old did the φωνὴ ῥημάτων from Sinai. Take heed (more forcible without any inferential particle such as οὐν) that ye decline not (see above on ver. 19) him that speaketh (i. e. God in Christ, see below). For if they did not escape (how? in one of two senses: either, 1. they did not escape hearing the voice on account of this their παραίτησις: or, 2., which seems more probable, they did

^r χρηματίζοντα, ^s πολὺν ^s μᾶλλον ἡμεῖς οἱ τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ^{r = ch. viii. 5}
^t ἀποστρεφόμενοι. ²⁶ οὗ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ^u ἐσάλειψεν τότε, ^{t = Matt. v. 42.}
 15. Tit. i. 14. Wisd. xvi. 3. u Acts iv. 31. xvi. 26 al. Judg. v. 5. Ps. cxlii. 7.

rec πολλῶ, with D³KLM[P] rel [Chr Euthal-ms Cyr, Thdrt Damasc]: txt
 ACD¹N 17. υμεῖς C 43[-7. ουρανὸν MN [b c d f h k l] Chr].

not escape God's vengeance in punishment: the Writer taking this their *παραίτησις* of the divine voice as a sort of sample of their disobedient and unbelieving spirit), declining as they did (not 'who declined,' οἱ παραιτ.) him who spoke (χρηματίζειν, see on ch. viii. 5, of an oracular command given by the Deity: and here the χρηματίζων is God, see below) on earth (on Mount Sinai. The construction is a trajectory not unusual with our Writer: cf. ch. ix. 15, 16, and ver. 11), much more we (shall not escape), who are turning away from (ἀποστρεφόμενοι, 'aversantes: ' so we have an accusative after ἐκστῆναι, ὑπεκστῆναι, ὑπεκτρέπεσθαι, ἐκτρέπεσθαι, ἀφίστασθαι, &c. See Kühner, § 551, Anm. 3. Cf. ἐξαναχωρεῖν τὰ εἰρημένα, Thuc. iv. 28) him (who χρηματίζει) from (the) heavens (we now come to the somewhat difficult question, the answer to which we have taken for granted in the rendering of this verse: viz. *who are intended by the various objects, τὸν λαλοῦντα, τὸν ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζοντα, τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν*. Let us take the second of these first, as furnishing the key to the others. τίνα λέγει; (says Chrys.) ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, Μωυσῆν. And so Gc., Carpzov, al. But this cannot well be. For παραιτήσάμενοι manifestly refers back to ver. 19: where it was not Moses, but God, whom they παρητήσαντο. It must be laid down then as certain, that δ ἐπὶ γῆς χρηματίζων is God. Then if so, who is δ ἀπ' οὐρανῶν, or in other words who is δ λαλῶν, for these two are manifestly the same? Clearly, not Jesus: for by οὗ ἡ φωνή, which follows, the voice of this same speaker shook the earth at the giving of the law: and it can by no ingenuity be pretended, that the terrors of the law proceeded from the Son of God; especially in the face of the contrast drawn here, and in ch. ii. 2 ff. And it would be against all accuracy and decorum in divine things, to pass from the speaking of the God of Israel to that of our Lord Jesus Christ in the way of climax as is here done, with πολὺν μᾶλλον, 'much more shall we not escape.' Add to which, that, if Christ is to be understood as the subject of vv. 26 ff., we shall have Him uttering the prophetic words ἐτι ἅπας κ.τ.λ., whereas both from our Writer's habit of quoting prophecy (cf. ch. i. 1; iv. 7; vi. 13; viii. 8; xi. 11)

and from the context of the prophecy itself, they must be attributed to the Father. How then are these difficulties to be got over? Simply by taking as above, the speaker in both cases to be God: in the first, as speaking from Mount Sinai by His Angels: in the second, as speaking from His heavenly throne through His exalted Son. Thus it is true we lie open to one objection, viz. that the giving of the law is ever regarded in the O. T. as a speaking from heaven: so Exod. xx. 22, ὑμεῖς ἑωράκατε, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λελάληκα ὑμῖν: cf. Deut. iv. 36: Neh. ix. 13. But this objection, though at first sight weighty, is by no means decisive. The οὐρανός spoken of is surely nothing but the material heaven, as apparent to the Israelites in the clouds and darkness which rested on Sinai, and totally distinct from the οὐρανός here, the site of our blessed Lord's glorification, who is spoken of, ch. iv. 14, as διεληλυθὼς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς. Thus the words have been explained from early times: e.g. by Theodoret (παρακελεύεται αὐτοῖς μὴ ζηλωσαι τὴν ἐκείνων παχύτητα, μηδὲ παραπλησίως ἐκείνοις καταλιπεῖν τὸν δεσπότην, καὶ πρὸς τὸν οἰκέτην δραμεῖν, καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν Μωυσέα λαβεῖν, καὶ ἀντὶ τῶν καινῶν προσμῖναι τοῖς παλαιοῖς. καίτοι, φησὶν, οὐκ οὐρανῶν αὐτοῖς ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ Σινᾷ ὄρει τὴν νομοθεσίαν ἐδίδου ἡμεῖς δὲ τὴν ἀπ' οὐρανῶν ἐπιφάνειαν προσδεχόμεθα τοῦ δεσπότης, καὶ διδάσκων ὡς αὐτὸς καὶ τούτων κἀκείνων νομοθέτης γεγενῆται, ἐπήγαγεν: where it is true in the last clause he seems rather to incline to believe that the Second Person of the Trinity is throughout spoken of), Calvin, Schlichting, Owen (in the main: "God himself, or the Son of God"), Grot. ("Utrovis modo legas, τὸν quod hic legitur et quod sequitur, non distinguit eum cui parendum sit, sed modum quo is se revelavit"), Limborch, Bengel, Peirce, Carpzov, Wetst., Baumgarten, al., Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Lünemann, Delitzsch, al.); 26.] whose voice (see on last verse) shook the earth then (ὅτε, φησὶ, ἐνομοθετεῖ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Σινᾷ. So in ref. Judg., in Deborah's Song, γῇ ἐσεισθη . . . ὅρη ἐσαλεύθησαν ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἐλωί, τοῦτο Σινᾶ ἀπὸ προσώπου κυρίου θεοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. Cf. ref. Ps. In Exod. xix. 18, where the E. V. has after the Heb.,

v perf. act.,
Rom. iv. 21
(pass., Gal.
iii. 13) only.
1 aor., James
i. 12 al.
4. Rev. vi. 13 only.

νῦν δὲ ὁ ἐπὶ γὰρ λέγων ἔτι ἅπαξ ἐγὼ σείσω οὐ
μόνον τὴν γῆν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν οὐρανόν. 27 Τὸ δὲ ἔτι ἅπαξ

W Hae. ii. 6, 7 (freely).

x ch. vi. 4 reff.

γ Matt. xxi. 10. xxviii. 51. xxviii.

ACD KI
MPNab
c d e f g
h k l m o
17, 47

26. εγω bef απαξ D¹(and lat). rec σείω, with DKL[P] rel Ath-2-mss Chr₁ [Quaest₁
Euthal-ms Damasc] Thdrt: txt ACMN 17 [47] vulg Syr coptt [æth] Ath₁ Cyr₁ Cosm₁
Andr₂ Areth₂. add λεγει D¹(and lat).

"the whole mount quaked greatly," the LXX render, καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα: reading, perhaps, with some Hebrew mss., שָׁרַר instead of רָרַר. σαλεύειν is intransitive as well as transitive in the classics (e.g. Soph. Œd. Tyr. 23), but in Hellenistic Greek transitive only: see reff. Some take this shaking of the earth to be meant of a figurative excitement of men's minds: so Justiniani ("Ait Apostolus divinam vocem tunc movisse terram, cum angeli opera tam multa signa in monte Sinai edidit, quæ non modo ingentem admirationem pepererunt, sed non exiguum incusserunt terrorem: nonnullam etiam lætitiā attulerunt bonis, quod legem ab ipso Deo immortalī acciperent"), Estius. But there can be little doubt, that the material explanation is the true one. The so-called pentameter, οὐ ἡ φωνὴ τὴν γῆν ἐσάλευσε τότε, could hardly have been observed, but by one whose eye was quicker than his ear), but now (νῦν, not only *ut res nunc se habent*, but here in a more temporal sense, as opposed to τότε: now, under the prophetic revelations since the captivity,—under the N. T. dispensation in which those prophecies will find their fulfilment) hath He (God: see above) promised (perf. pass., in middle sense, see ref. and Winer, § 39. 3. Cf. also Acts xiii. 2; xvi. 10; xxv. 12; Exod. iii. 18 al. Böhme and Vater would render it passive, "hath it been promised:" but λέγων following, though it might suit the style of the Apocalypse, will not agree with the careful precision of our Epistle, saying, Yet once (more), and I will shake not only the earth, but also the heaven. The prophecy in Haggai is uttered, like the whole of his prophecies, with reference to the second temple, which was then rising out of the ruins of the first, smaller indeed and poorer, but destined to witness greater glories. It was to be the scene of the last revelation of Jehovah to His people: and the house of David, then so low, was to rise above the ruins of the thrones of the earth, and endure as the signet on God's right hand (Hag. ii. 21—23). It is this ruin of earthly powers, this antitypical shaking of the earth and all that is in it, after the typical material shaking at Sinai, of

which the Prophet speaks. And the result of this shaking was to be, that the best treasures of all nations (not to be understood personally of Christ, but as LXX, ἥξει τὰ ἐκλεκτὰ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν), should be brought to adorn that temple. The expression here (as in LXX) rendered ἔτι ἅπαξ κ.τ.λ. is in the Heb. י וְהָיָה עֲרֹךְ הַיּוֹם, i. e., as in E. V. (see Hofmann, Weissag. u. Erfüll. i. 330, and Hitzig in loc.), "Yet once, it is a little while, and," i. e. the period which shall elapse shall be but one, not admitting of being broken into many; and that one, but short. Thus the prophecy seems to point to the same great final bringing of all the earth under the Kingdom of God, which is spoken of in Zechariah xiv. when the Lord shall come and all his saints with Him, the great antitype of Sinai (cf. Deut. xxxiii. 2), so often the subject of ancient prophecy. See this more fully entered upon in Hofmann, as above, and in Delitzsch's note here. It is clearly wrong, with some interpreters, to understand this shaking of the mere breaking down of Judaism before the gospel, or of any thing which shall be fulfilled during the Christian æconomy, short of its glorious end and accomplishment. The οὐ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καί, which the Writer has substituted for the simple καί of the LXX, is adopted for the sake of bringing out the point which is before him, the earth, and the speaking from the earth, on the one hand, the heaven, and the speaking from the heaven, on the other. But the οὐρανός here, that is to be shaken, is the material heaven stretched above this earth.

27.] But (now) this yet once (more) (Hengstenberg's idea that the Writer lays no stress on ἔτι ἅπαξ, but, in citing these words, means in fact the whole of the prophecy ("this, ἔτι ἅπαξ κ.τ.λ."), is evidently absurd. It is on these words that the Writer's argument depends, there being nothing in the following words of the prophecy to imply this removing, but only in the ἔτι ἅπαξ. Still as Delitzsch well argues, the argument does not stand and fall with the ἔτι ἅπαξ of the LXX. The great final shaking which is to introduce the accomplished kingdom of God is at all events that after

^z δηλοῖ τὴν τῶν ^u σαλευομένων ^a μετάθεσιν ὡς πεποιημένων, ^z ch. ix. 8 reff.
^u ἵνα ^b μένῃ τὰ μὴ ^u σαλευόμενα. ²⁸ διδὲ ^c βασιλείαν ^b = ch. x. 34
 reff.

c DAN. vii. 18. v. 31. Herod. ii. 126. iii. 68 (al. in Bl.).

27. rec τῶν σαλ. bef τὴν, with D³KL[P] rel Ath., [Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc]: om τὴν D¹M: ins in both places N³: txt ACN¹ 17 [Cosm¹]. om ἵνα μένῃ τα μὴ σαλ. A.

which there shall be no other. At this the words *ἐτι ἄπαξ* point: but it does not rest on them for its proof) indicates (see ch. ix. 8, note) the removal of the things shaken, as of things which have been made, in order that the things which are not (i.e. cannot be, which the *μή* hints at) shaken may abide (three ways of taking this sentence are grammatically and philologically possible. 1. That given above, to the consideration of which I will presently return. 2. We may join *ἵνα* &c., not with the fact pointed at, the *μετάθεσις τῶν σαλευομένων*, as its purpose, but with *πεποιημένων*, 'as of things which have been made in order that the things which cannot be shaken may remain:' i.e. the scope of Creation has been, the establishing of the kingdom of Redemption: that it, the transitory and baseless, may pass away when its work is fulfilled, and give place to that which shall never pass away. This view is strongly taken by Delitzsch, after Grotius, Bengel, Tholuck, al. Before discussing it, we may notice and dismiss (3), which is a mere variety of it, and consists in taking *μένειν* in the sense of "to await," or "wait for," "as of things which have been made in order that they should wait for the things which cannot be shaken." So Paul Bauldry in 1699 (see Wolf, Curæ, p. 795, h. l.), Storr, Böhme, Kuinoel, Klee. But, though *μένειν* does undoubtedly occur in this sense in Acts xx. 5, 23, yet the usage of this Epistle is for the other sense, cf. ch. vii. 3, 24; x. 34; xiii. 14. And another objection to this meaning seems to me to be, that in this case it would not be the aorist *μένῃ*, indicating the final purpose as expressed once for all, but the present *μένῃ*, indicating the continuous attitude of expectancy. So that, although the sense would thus be good, and altogether according to St. Paul in Rom. viii. 18—25, we must pass this by, for the *absolute* sense of *μένῃ*, may abide, endure: cf. Acts xxvii. 41, *ἔμεινεν ἀσάλευτος*: and Isa. lxvi. 22, *ὃν τρόπον ὁ οὐρανὸς καινὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καινὴ, ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ, μένει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ κ.τ.λ.* Nor again can I accede to (2), beautiful as is the thought, and strictly true, that Creation was made but to subserve Redemption: the things removeable, to give place to the things unremoveable. For, α. the word *μένῃ* will thus have an

exceedingly awkward elliptic sense, "that the things which cannot be shaken may remain," i.e. "may come into the place of those removed, and thus abide for ever:" for things which cannot be shaken *remaining* merely, would be a matter of course. This is confessed by Grot.: "nam in id facta est hæc quam videmus machina, ut olim alteri meliori et non immutandæ locum faciat." But certainly this does not lie in the word *μένῃ*. β. The logical propriety as well as the rhythm of the sentence is thus destroyed. For we should on this rendering have the *ἵνα* clause entirely subordinated to the *πεποιημένων*, and indicating, not the purpose of the main action of the sentence, but that of the creation, a matter lying quite out of the present record. Certainly, if this were the meaning, we should have had the part. *πεποιημένων* introduced with a *καί*, as is generally done when an outlying circumstance is taken into account by the way: as e.g. in 1 Pet. ii. 8, *οἱ προσκίπτονσιν, τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθούντες, εἰς δὲ καὶ ἐτέθησαν*. Besides which, I should have expected in this case the aor. part., not the perf., the *ἵνα* of purpose relating to the time when the Creation took place, rather than to its subsistence since then. So that it seems to me, we must fall back on (1), viz. the making *ἵνα* belong to *μετάθεσιν*, the action of the sentence. This, it is true, is not without difficulty. For, α. even thus we must go some little out of our way for a sense for *μένῃ*, though not so far as in the other case. *μένῃ* must then mean, *may remain over*, when the *σαλευόμενα* are gone: may be permanently left: to which sense there is no objection in Greek any more than in English, but it does not exactly fit the requirements of the sentence: β. if *πεποιημένων* be taken absolutely, "as of things which have been made," we might be met by the *ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ* in the citation from Isa. lxvi. 22 above, to shew that the new heavens and the new earth are also *πεποιημένα*: see also Isa. lxxv. 17, 18. The answer to this must be, though I own it is not altogether a satisfactory one, that the *ποιεῖσθαι* is not the same in the two cases: that this word carries rather with it *χειροποίητος, ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*, as that word is explained ch. ix. 11: whereas the other *ποιῶ* rests in the almighty power of God, by which

d Acts xxvii. 41 d ἁσάλευτον ° παραλαμβάνοντες ° ἔχωμεν ° χάριν, δι' ἧς ACDEKL
only. Exod. only. MPNa b
xiii. 16. Deut. vi. 8. ° λατρεύωμεν ° εὐαρέστως τῷ θεῷ ἡμετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ c d e f g
x. 18 only. k δέους. 29 καὶ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν πῦρ καταναλίσκον. h k l m o
e - Luke xvii. 9. 1 Tim. i. 12. 2 Tim. i. 3. 2 Macc. iii. 33. f ch. viii. 5 reff. g here only +. (-τος, ch. xiii. 21. -τείν, h here only +. 2 Macc. iii. 17, ch. xi. 6, 6.) 30 al³. 1 ch. iv. 16 reff. i ch. v. 7 (reff.) only. m here only. Deut. l. c. Zeph. i. 18 al.

28. εχομεν K[P]N a c d e² f k m 17 vulg (and F-lat, not demid) D-lat æth Ath, Cyr, Antch, [Cosm.]: Chr[-txt]-inss vary. λατρευομεν KM[P]N rel Ath, Chr-3-inss [Euthal-ms] Thl Ec: txt ACDL f 1 17 [Chr, Cyr, Thdrt Cosm, Damasc-comm], serviamus vulg (and F-lat) D-lat. for εὐαρέστως, ευχαριστως D[-gr¹] f 52-6. [μετ' D Cosm.]. rec (for εὐλ. κ. δεους) αιδους κ. εὐλ., with KL rel Chr, [Thdrt (Cosm.) Damasc]: εὐλ. κ. αιδους D^{2,3}M[P]N^{sa}, metu et verecundia D-lat, metu et reverentia vulg (and F-lat): txt ACD¹N^{13b} 17 coptt [(appy) Syr arm Chr-ms, Euthal-ms]. 29. for καὶ, κυριος D¹ (and lat).

the spirit-world as well as the world of sense was called into existence. See by all means, on the whole, Luke xxi. 26).

28.] Wherefore (διό gathers its inference, not from the whole preceding paragraph, but from the yet once more shaking and consequent removing of earthly things before those things which shall remain) receiving as we do a kingdom which cannot be shaken (the pres. part., with the slightly ratiocinative force. παραλαμβάνοντες, not, as Calvin, "Modo fide ingrediamur in Christi regnum;" and so Schlichting, Limborch, Bengel, Semler; nor does the participial clause belong to the exhortation: but it indicates matter of fact, from which the exhortation sets out, and means (as in Dan. vii. 18, καὶ παραλήψονται τὴν βασιλείαν ἄγιοι ὑψίστου, which probably was in the Writer's mind,—and in other reff.) being partakers of, coming into possession of, βασ. or ἀρχὴν παραλαμβάνειν, 'regnum capessere.' The participle then will be descriptive of our Christian state of privilege and expectation: proleptically designating us as in possession of that, whose firstfruits and foretastes we do actually possess), let us have thankfulness (τουτέστιν, εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ θεῷ, Chrys.: τουτέστι μὴ ἀλγῶμεν μηδὲ δυσπετῶμεν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἤδη δόντι καὶ μελλόντι δώσειν, Thl. And so Elsner, Wolf, Bengel, Böhme, Kuinoel, Bleek, De Wette, Lünemann, Ebrard, Delitzsch. Others render, "let us hold fast grace." So Syr., Beza, Jac. Cappell., Est., Schlichting, Grot., al. But this is impossible: ἔχωμεν would be κατέχωμεν (ch. iii. 6, 14; x. 23) or κρατῶμεν (ch. iv. 14), and the words would probably be in inverted order; besides that χάριν would hardly be anarthrous. On the sense see Ps. l. 23, "whoso offereth me thanks and praise, he honoureth me;" and on χάριν ἔχειν, besides reff., Jos. Antt. vii. 9. 4: Polyb. v.

104. 1: Xen. Mem. i. 2. 7; ii. 6. 21; iii. 11. 2, and many other examples in Bleek), by which (thankfulness) let us serve (the indicative readings, ἔχομεν and λατρεύομεν, are weakly supported, and do not suit the sense nor the inferential διό. And λατρεύομεν cannot be taken, as in E. V., "by which we may serve," but must be hortatory like the other) God well-pleasingly (the dative τῷ θεῷ belongs to the verb, not to εὐαρέστως as Valcknaer) with reverent submission and fear (see on ch. v. 7 for εὐλάβεια. The rec. reading has against it, 1. the frequent conjunction in ordinary Greek of αἰδώς and εὐλάβεια, of which Bleek gives many examples, and, 2. the fact that δέος occurs no where else in the N. T. or LXX).

29.] For moreover our God is a consuming fire (καὶ γὰρ, as in ch. iv. 2; v. 12, and in Luke xxii. 37, introduces the reason rendered by γὰρ as an additional particular not contained in what went immediately before,—answering to the Latin 'etenim.' It is quite impossible that the Writer should have meant, "For our God also, as well as the God of the Jews:—" as even Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, and Bisping make him say. Besides the utter incongruity of such a mode of expression with any thing found in our Writer or in the N. T., this would certainly have been expressed καὶ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός. The words are taken from Deut. iv. 24, θεὸς κύριος ὁ θεός σου πῦρ καταναλίσκον ἑστὶ, θεός ζηλωτής. Cf. ib. ix. 3. And thus the fact that God's anger continues to burn now, as then, against those who reject his Kingdom, is brought in; and in the background lie all those gracious dealings by which the fire of God's presence and purity becomes to his people, while it consumes their vanity and sin and earthly state, the fire of purity and light and love for their enduring citizenship, of his kingdom).

XIII. ¹ Ἡ ^α φιλαδελφία ^ο μενέτω. ² τῆς ^ρ φιλοξενίας ^η Rom. xii. 10. ^{μῆ} ^α ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, διὰ ταύτης γὰρ ^ι ἔλαθόν τινες ^ς ξενί- 1 Thess. iv. 9. ^{σαυτες} ^α ἀγγέλους. ³ ^υ μιμνήσκεισθε τῶν ^ν δεσμίων ὡς ^ω συν- 1 Pet. i. 22. ^{δεδεμένοι} ^{ων} ^κ κακονχομένων, ὡς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὄντες ^υ ἐν 2 Pet. i. 7 bis only τ. (-φος, 1 Pet. iii. 8) ^ο = 1 Cor. xiii. 13 al. ^{only} τ. (-vos, 1 Pet. iv. 9.) ^q ch. vi. 10 reff. ^r constr., here only †. (Mark vii. 24. Luke viii. 47. Acts xvi. 26. 2 Pet. iii. 5, 8 only. Job xxviii. 21.) in Gr., passim. ^s = Acts x. 6, &c. (xvii. 29.) ^u = 1 Cor. ii. 2. 2 Tim. i. 4. Prov. xxxi. (xxiv.) 7. (see Gal. ii. 10. Col. iv. 18.) ^t Gen. xviii. 1. xix. 1, 2. ^v ch. x. 34. Eph. iii. 1. iv. 1 al. Lam. iii. 34. ^w here only. = 1 Kings xviii. 1 A (B def.). ^x ch. xi. 37 (reff.) only. ^y 2 Cor. v. 6. xii. 2, 3.

CHAP. XIII. 2. την φιλοξενιαν Δ¹.

3. for δεσμιων, δεδεμενων D¹. Antch₁]; κακωχομενων C.

κακωχομενων D¹KLM[P] d m [Euthal-ms

CHAP. XIII. 1—16.] *Various exhortations to Christian virtues: more especially to the imitation of the faith of their leaders who had departed in the Lord: to firmness in the faith: and following of Jesus, who suffered outside the camp to teach us to bear His reproach.*

1.] Let brotherly love (φιλαδελφία in the classics, the love of brothers and sisters for one another: in the N. T., the love of the Christian brethren. In ref. 2 Pet. it is expressly distinguished from ἀγάπη, the more general word) remain (we learn from the Acts,—on the hypothesis of this Epistle being addressed to the church at Jerusalem (on which however see Prolegg.),—how eminent this brotherly love had been in that church, and, without any hypothesis as to the readers, we see from our ch. x. 32 ff. that the persons here addressed had exercised it aforesaid, and from ch. vi. 10, that they still continued to exercise it. Let it then remain, not die out. And it is put first, as being the first of the fruits of faith. The exhortations in ch. iii. 12 f.; x. 24 f.; xii. 12 ff., point the same way).

2, 3.] φιλαδελφία is now specifically urged in two of its departments, hospitality, and care of prisoners.

2.] Forget not hospitality to strangers (so in ref. 1 Pet., after recommending ἀγάπην ἐκτενῆ εἰς αὐτούς, he proceeds φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους. Cf. also ref. Rom., and Titus i. 8: 1 Tim. iii. 2. Bleek remarks that the notices found in the writings of the enemies of Christianity shew how much this virtue was practised among the early believers: and refers to Julian, Ep. 49, and Lucian de Morte Peregrini, ch. 16): for thereby (by exercising it) some unawares entertained angels (viz. Abraham, Gen. xviii., Lot, Gen. xix. Certainly it would appear at first sight from the former account, that Abraham regarded the “three men” from the first as angels: but the contrary view has nothing against it in the narrative, and was taken by the Jewish expositors: cf. Philo de Abr. § 22, vol. ii. p. 17, θεασάμενος τρεῖς ὡς ἄνδρας

δοδοπορῶντας, οἱ δὲ θειοτέρως ὄντες φύσεως ἐλελήθεισαν; and Jos. Ant. i. 11. 2, θεασάμενος τρεῖς ἀγγέλους . . . καὶ νομίσας εἶναι ξένους, ἡσπασάτο τε ἀναστάς, καὶ παρ’ αὐτῶν καταχθέντας παρεκάλει ξενίῳ μεταλαβεῖν. On the motive propounded, Calvin remarks, “Si quis obijciat rarum illud fuisse, responsio impromptu est, non angelos tantum recipi, sed Christum ipsum, quum pauperes in ejus nomine recipimus.” He further notices, “In Græcis elegans est allusio (ἐλαθον and ἐπιλανθάνεσθε) quæ Latine exprimi non potest.” On ἐλαθον ξενίσαντες, Chrys. says, τί ἐστιν ἐλαθον; οὐκ εἰδότες φησὶν ἐξένισαν: and Thl., ἀντὶ τοῦ ἡγνόησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι ἡσαν οἱ ξενιζόμενοι, καὶ ὁμῶς φιλοτίμως αὐτοὺς ἐξένισαν. Cf. Herod. i. 44, οἰκίῳσι ὑποδεξάμενος τὸν εἰδὼν φονέα τοῦ παιδὸς ἐλάνθανε βόσκων. The vulg. rendering, “latuerunt quidam angelis hospitio receptis,” has led some R.-Cath. expositors mentioned in Estius to imagine that Lot’s escape by the men of Sodom being smitten with blindness is alluded to. Bleek refers to, and with reason, a very beautiful sermon of Schleiermacher’s, vol. i. p. 645, “Ueber die Christliche Gastfreundschaft.” He there sets forth, how the motive, though no longer literally applying to us, is still a real one, inasmuch as angels were the messengers of God’s spiritual purposes, and such messengers may be found in Christian guests, even where least expected).

3.] Remember (cf. ch. ii. 6) them that are in bonds, as if bound with them (cf. 1 Cor. xii. 26: as fully sympathizing with them in their captivity: not, as Böhme, al., “quippe ejus naturæ et conditionis homines, qui ipsi quoque pro captivis sint, nimirum in ecclesia pressa degentes,” which is travelling too far from the context): those in distress (κακωχομένους) is the general idea, including captives and any other classes of distressed persons: as (Ec. and Thl., ἡ ἐν φυλακαῖς ἡ ἐν λυγρῇ ἡ ἐν ἐτέρᾳ θλίψει), as also yourselves being in the body (i. e. as in reff., bound up with a body which has the same capacity of

z = Acts v. 34. ¹ Cor. iii. 12. ² Tit. ii. 9, 10 al. ³ Eccl. i. 19. ⁴ al. ⁵ Prov. i. 15. ⁶ Tit. ii. 9, 10 al. ⁷ Eccl. xii. 16 reff. ⁸ a = here only (see note). ⁹ Luke xi. 7. ¹⁰ Rom. ix. 13 only. ¹¹ Luke xviii. 11. ¹² 1 Cor. vi. 9 only. ¹³ Job xxiv. 15. ¹⁴ b = 1 Tim. iii. 11. ¹⁵ 2 Tim. iv. 26. ¹⁶ d ch. vi. 26. ¹⁷ g = ch. x. 30. ¹⁸ 17. 47

σώματι. ⁴ ^z τίμιος ὁ ^a γάμος ^b ἐν πᾶσιν, καὶ ἡ ^c κοίτη ^{ACD KL} ἀμίαντος. ^e πόρνους γὰρ καὶ ^f μοιχοὺς ^g κρινεῖ ὁ θεός. ^{MPN a b c d e f g h k l m o}

4. rec (for γαρ) δε, with CD³KL rel Syr æth-rom [arm] Clem., Cæs., Eus., Ephr., Epiph., Did., Amphil., Chr Thdrt, autem F-lat Ambr.: txt AD¹M[P]N copt [Euthal-ms] Primas, enim vulg D-lat.

suffering. The words have been differently rendered. Calvin says, "Refero ad ecclesiæ corpus, ut sit sensus, Quandoquidem estis ejusdem corporis membra, communiter vos affici decet alios aliorum malis:" and so Braun, al. But this cannot be extracted from the words ἐν σώματι, without the article. Beza renders, "ac si ipsi quoque corpore addicti essetis:" and says, "ἐν σώματι prorsus videtur illud declarare quod in vernaculo sermone dicimus *en personne*:" in other words, says Bleek, as Philo expresses it, De Spec. Legg. ad 6. 7, § 30, vol. ii. p. 326, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἐτέρων σώμασιν αὐτοὶ κακοῦμενοι. But this is equally out of the question: and there can be no doubt that the simple meaning is the true one. So Ec., (εἰ γὰρ τις ἀναλογίσαιτο, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς περικείται ὁμοιοπαῖδες ἐκείνοις σώμα, ἐλεήσει μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς διὰ τε τὴν συμπάθειαν καὶ διὰ τὸν φόβον μὴ τὰ ὅμοια ἐκ τῆς ἀπανθρωπίας πάθῃ), Thl., and most Commentators).

4.] *Exhortation to chastity. Let your marriage* (γάμος, elsewhere in N. T. in the sense of a *wedding*, here has its ordinary Greek meaning) *be (held) in honour in all things* (see below) *and your marriage bed be undefiled: for fornicators and adulterers God shall judge*. There are several debateable matters in this verse. First, is it a command or an assertion? The latter view is taken in Syr. "Honourable is marriage among all, and their bed is undefiled:" Beza, Grot., our E. V., al. And so Chrys. (πῶς τίμιος ὁ γάμος; ὅτι ἐν σωφροσύνῃ, φησί, διατηρεῖ τὸν πιστόν), Ec., Thdrt. (apparently). But against this is the following clause, καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἀμίαντος: for it is impossible to keep to the same rendering in this case: cf. Syr. above: the E. V. has evaded this difficulty by rendering, "and the bed undefiled," leaving it, as its guide Beza does, uncertain whether "undefiled" is an epithet, as usually taken by English readers, or a predicate, as the Greek absolutely requires. For had the meaning been, "Marriage is honourable among all, and the (an) undefiled bed," certainly the article could not have stood before κοίτη without standing also before ἀμίαντος: it must have been καὶ κοίτη ἀμίαντος or καὶ ἡ κοίτη ἡ ἀμίαντος. So that the indicative supplement,

ἐστίν, must be dismissed, as inconsistent with the requirements of the latter clause; and, I might add, with the context: in which, besides that the whole is of a hortatory character, the very same collocation of words immediately follows in ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ τρόπος, where no one suggests ἐστίν as our supplement. The imperative view has accordingly been taken by very many Commentators: as e.g. by Thl. (see below), and the great mass of moderns. Delitzsch holds that no supplement is wanted, the clause being an exclamation carrying with it a hortatory force. But surely this is equivalent to supplying ἐστω. The next question respects ἐν πᾶσιν, whether it is to be taken as masculine, 'among all men,' or as neuter, 'in all things.' The doubt was felt as early as Thl., who thus expresses it: ἐν πᾶσιν οὖν, μὴ ἐν τοῖς προβεβηκόσι μὲν, ἐν δὲ τοῖς νέοις οὐ, ἀλλ' ἐν πᾶσιν. ἢ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τρόποις καὶ ἐν πᾶσι καιροῖς, μὴ ἐν θλίψει μὲν, ἐν ἀνέσει δὲ οὐ, μὴ ἐν τούτῳ μὲν μέρει τίμιος, ἐν ἄλλῳ δὲ οὐ, ἀλλ' ὅλος ἐν ὅλῳ τίμιος ἐστω. The masculine is taken by Erasmus, Cajetan, Luther, Calvin, Beza, and most Commentators, especially Protestants, and in later times by Schulz, Böhme, De Wette, Wahl, Kuinoel, Tholuck. And it is variously interpreted: either, α. as by Luther, that all should keep marriage in honour, by not violating it; β. as by Böhme, Schulz, al., that the unmarried should not despise it, but it should be held in honour by all; or γ. as Calvin, al., that it is allowed to all conditions of men, not denied to any, as e.g. it is to the Romish priesthood. But it is altogether against the masculine sense, 1. that ἐν πᾶσιν would not be the natural expression for it, but παρὰ πᾶσιν: cf. Matt. xix. 26 (bis), and ||: Acts xxvi. 8: Rom. ii. 13: 2 Thess. i. 6: James i. 27 (ἀμίαντος παρὰ τῷ θεῷ); and, 2. that our Writer uses ἐν πᾶσιν in this very chapter for 'in all things,' ver. 18. See also reff., and Col. i. 18: Phil. iv. 12. So that the neuter view is to be preferred: and so Ec., Corn. a-Lap., Calmet, the R.-Cath. expositors generally, Bleek, De Wette, Lünem, Delitzsch, al. For the phrase κοίτη ἀμίαντος, Wetst. quotes from Plutarch de Flaviis, p. 18, ὑπὸ τῆς μητρυῆας φιλούμενος, καὶ μὴ θέλων μιαίνειν τὴν

^h ἀφιλάργυρος ὁ ⁱ τρόπος, ^k ἀρνούμενοι τοῖς ¹ παροῦσιν. ^h 1 Tim. iii. 3 only v.
 αὐτὸς γὰρ εἶρηκεν ^m Οὐ μὴ σε ⁿ ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ^o ἐγ-
 καταλείπω. ⁶ ὥστε ^p θαρβύνοντας ἡμᾶς λέγειν ^q Κύριος
 ἐμοὶ ^r βοηθός, [καὶ] οὐ φοβηθήσομαι· τί ποιήσει μοι
 ἄνθρωπος; ⁷ ^s Μνημονεύετε τῶν ^t ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, ^u οἷ-

Bleek. (constr., Rom. xii. 9) k & constr., Luke iii. 14. 1 Tim. vi. 8 (Matt. xxv. 9 al.)
 v. 15. w ἐπί, 3 John 10. 1 = here only. Gr., freq. Xen. Symp. iv. 42 al. m Bl. m Josh.
 i. 5 (also Gen. xxviii. 15 1 Chron. xxviii. 20. Deut. xxxi. 6, 8. see note). n Acts xvi. 28. xxvii.
 40. Eph. vi. 9 only. LXX, as above, Deut. 1 Chron. o ch. x 25 reff. LXX, as above (m).
 p (-pō-) elsw. Paul (2 Cor. v. 6. 8 vii. 16. x. 1, 2) only. Prov. i. 21 (xxxii. 11 [N] Ald.) only. q Psa.
 cxvii. 6. r here only. Isa. i. 7 al fr. (-θεῖν, ch. ii. 18. -θεῖα, ii. 16.) s = (see note) Luke
 xiii. 32. John xi. 20. xvi. 4. Acts xx. 35. 1 Chron. xvi. 15. t = Luke xxii. 26. Acts iii.
 10. xi. 22. vv. 17, 24. Jer. iv. 22. u = ch. viii. 5 reff.

5. [for εἶρηκεν, εφη C-corr.] rec εγκαταλίπω (see LXX-B¹), with D¹ rel [Clem,
 Chri Thdrt Damasch^hl. Thl] : txt ACD³KLM[P]N c d f h m o 17 Chr-2-mss [Euthal-
 ms Damasc-ms Ec].

6. λέγειν bef ημας D[-gr: ita audiente (sic) dicite D-lat] : om ημας M. om
 και C[P] N¹ (not in LXX-N) 17 vulg (and F-lat) D-lat Syr copt [æth].

7. πρὸς ἡγουμένων D¹ [præpositorum latt].

κοίτην τοῦ γεννήσαντος. The latter clause carries the idea the anticipation of *condemnation* in κρινεῖ. Man may, or may not, punish them : one thing is sure: they shall come into judgment, and if so into condemnation, when God shall judge all.

5, 6.] St. Paul usually couples with filthy desire, *filthy lucre*, as both of them incompatible with the kingdom of God: e. g. 1 Cor. v. 10, 11; vi. 9 f.: Eph. v. 3, 5: Col. iii. 5. 5.] Let your manner of life (reff.) be void of avarice: contented * (sufficed) with things present (the construction is precisely as in ref. Rom., ἡ ἀγάπη ἀνυπόκριτος· ἀποστηγόντες τὸ πονηρὸν κ.τ.λ. On ἀρνούμενος and τοῖς παροῦσιν, see Bleek's examples. Among them, we have the very phrase in Teles. in Stobæus, serm. 95, βιάσθ' ἀρνούμενος τοῖς παροῦσι, τῶν ἀπόντων οὐκ ἐπιθυμῶν: Democrit. in Stobæus, serm. 1, τοῖς παροῦσιν ἀρκεῖσθαι: Phocyl. 4, ἀρκεῖσθαι παροῦσι, καὶ ἀλλοτρίων ἀπέχεσθαι. The construction ἀρκεῖσθαι τινι occurs in Herod. ix. 33, οὐδ' οὕτω ἐφη ἔτι ἀρκεῖσθαι τοῦτοισι μύνοισι, and al. (Bl.): see also reff.): for He (viz. ὁ ἐπαγγελιάμενος, of ch. x. 23, God, already named ver. 4. "In post-biblical Hebrew," says Delitzsch, "אני and אני are used as the mystical names of God") hath said, I will not leave thee, no nor will I forsake thee (passages bearing some resemblance to this are found in the O. T., but no where the words themselves: see reff. But in Philo, Confus. Ling. § 32, vol. i. p. 431, we have, λόγιον τοῦ Ἰεω θεοῦ μεστὸν ἡμερότητας ἐλπίδας χρηστὰς τοιογράφον τοῖς παιδείας ἑρασταῖς ἀνήρηται οὐκ ὀδε, Οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω. This is certainly singular, and cannot be mere coincidence. Bleek and Lünemann suppose the Writer to have

made the citation direct from Philo (see Prolegg. § i. par. 156), whereas Delitzsch believes that the expression was taken from Deut. xxxi. 6 A, οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλείπη, and had become inwoven into some liturgical or homiletic portion of the services in the Hellenistic synagogue. οὐδ' οὐ μὴ occurs again Matt. xxiv. 21): 6.] so that we say (not 'can say' nor 'may say,' both which weaken the confidence expressed) with confidence, The Lord (יהוה in the Psalm, and probably used of the Father, as in other citations in this Epistle, e. g. ch. vii. 21; viii. 8—11; x. 16, 30; xii. 5 al., and without a citation ch. viii. 2) is my helper (in the Heb. only יְהוָה), [and (not in Heb., see also digest)], I will not be afraid: what shall man do unto me (such is the connexion, both in the Heb. and here: not, "I will not be afraid what man shall do unto me," as the English Prayer Book after the vulg., "non timebo quid faciat mihi homo," which is ungrammatical (τί ἐν ποιῇ or ποιήσει)? 7.] Remember (may be taken in two ways, as Thl., βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς ἐν ταῖς σωματικαῖς χρείαις, . . . ἡ καὶ πρὸς μίμησιν αὐτῶν ἐπαλείφει τοῦτους. The former meaning would agree with μιμησκεισθε in ver. 3: but it is plain from what follows here (e. g. ἐλάλησαν and ἔκβασιν) that the course of these ἡγούμενοι is past, and it is remembering with a view to imitation that is enjoined) your leaders (ἡγούμενοι, vv. 17, 24, are their leaders in the faith: cf. also προηγούμενοι, in Clem.-rom. ad Cor. i. c. 21, p. 256. It is a word of St. Luke's, cf. reff., answering to the προϊστάμενοι of St. Paul, 1 Thess. v. 12. It is found in later Greek, —in Polyb., Herodian, Dioc. Sic. al., —in this same sense. See also Sir. ix. 17; x. 2

δίαν, οὐ^k βρώμασιν,¹ ἐν οἷς οὐκ^m ὠφελήθησαν οἱ¹ * περι-^{k = ch ix. 10}
 πατήσαντες.¹⁰ Ἐχομεν¹⁰ θυσιασθησίων, ^{note.)} ἢ ἐξ οὗ^{no} φαγεῖν^{1 = Eph. ii. 10.}
^{7. Prov. vii. 20. m pass., Matt. xvi. 26 ¶ L. 1 Cor. xiii. 3. Jer. ii. 11.}
^{26, 30, 51. Rev. ii. 7. o 1 Cor. ix. 4. n John vi.}

* περιπατοῦντες AD¹N¹ vulg: περιπατησάντες CD³KLM[P]³N³ rel [arm Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc].

φέρεισθαι, as the prep. indicates, is to be carried out of the right course. So Plato, Phædr. p. 265 B, ἴσως μὲν ἀληθοῦς τινος ἐφαπτόμενοι, τάχα δ' ἂν καὶ ἄλλοσε παραφερόμενοι: Plut. Timoleon 6, αἱ κρίσεις σείονται καὶ παραφέρονται βραδίας ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων ἐπαίων καὶ ψόγων, ἐκκρούμενοι τῶν οἰκείων λογισμῶν. Ælian has ὑπὸ τοῦ οἴνου παραφερόμενος. Ec. says, τὸ δὲ παραφ. ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν μαινομένων τῶν τῇδε κάκεισε παραφερομένων εἴρηται. The fixed point from which they are not to be carried away, is clearly that given in the last verse, viz. Jesus Christ) by various (ποικίλαις, παντοδαπαῖς· αἱ τοιαῦται γὰρ οὐδὲν βέβαιον ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' εἰσι διάφοροι· μάλιστα δὲ τὸ τῶν βρωμάτων διάφορον. Chrys. Thl. says, τουτέστιν παρὰ τοῦδε τόδε καὶ παρὰ τοῦδε τῶδε ἡ γὰρ ἀλήθεια μονοειδής, καὶ πρὸς ἓν ἀφορῶσα. The reference, from what follows, is to teachings about various meats) and strange (τουτέστιν, ἀλλότριαι τῆς ἀληθείας, Thl. The use of ἕτερος is similar, from which ἑτεροδοξία has its technical sense) doctrines (teachings: so διδασκαλία, Matt. xv. 9: Col. ii. 22: 1 Tim. iv. 1): for it is good that the heart be confirmed (reff.) with grace (God's grace, working on us by faith: δείκνυσιν ὅτι τὸ πᾶν πίστις ἐστίν· ἂν αὐτῇ βεβαιώσῃ, ἡ καρδία ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ἔστηκεν, Chrys.), not with meats (it is a question whether βρώμασιν be meant of meat eaten after sacrifices, or of "meats" as spoken of so much by St. Paul, meats partaken of or abstained from as a matter of conscience: cf. 1 Cor. viii. 8, βρῶμα ἡμᾶς οὐκ ἐπὶ ἐκρίσιν τῷ θεῷ: ib. ver. 13; ib. vi. 13: Rom. xiv. 15, 20, μὴ ἐνεκεν βρώματος κατὰ λυε τὸ ἔργον τοῦ θεοῦ. The former view is taken by Schlichting, Bleek, Lünemann, al., on the grounds, 1. that the expression will not suit meats *abstained from*, only those partaken of: "Cor non reficitur cibis non comestis, sed comestis. Ciborum ergo usus, non abstinentiæ, opponitur hic gratia," Schlicht.; 2. that ver. 10, which is in close connexion with this, speaks of an altar and of partaking of meats sacrificed: and, 3. that this same reference, to meats offered in sacrifice, is retained throughout, to ver. 15. The other view is taken by Chrys., Thdrt., Ec., Thl., Primas., Faber Stap.,

Erasm., Calv., Beza, the great body of later Commentators, and recently by Böhme, Tholuck, and Delitzsch. It is defended against the above objections, 1. by remembering that in the other passages where βρώματα occurs with this reference, it is used not merely in the concrete, for meats absolutely partaken of, but in the abstract, for the whole department or subject of βρώματα, to be partaken of or abstained from: 2. see below on the verse: (3) stands or falls with (2). And besides, it is supported by the following considerations: 4. that βρώματα is a word not found in the law where offerings are spoken of (in Levit. xix. 6 and xxii. 30, we have βρωθήσεται of peace-offerings and thank-offerings): but in the distinction of clean and unclean, Levit. xi. 34: 1 Macc. i. 63: 5. that in all N. T. places, where βρῶμα is used in a similar connexion, it applies to clean and unclean meats: 6. that διδαχαῖς ποικίλαις καὶ ξένοις μὴ παραφέρεσθε must refer, not to meats eaten after sacrifices, but to some doctrines in which there was variety and perplexity, as to those concerning clean and unclean. And I own these reasons incline me strongly to this view, to the exclusion of the other. Two 'monstra interpretationis' need only be mentioned: that of the R.-Cath. Bisping, who interprets χάριτι "by the eucharist:" and that of Ebrard, who renders βεβαιώσθαι, "cling fast to," and χάριτι and βρώμασιν as datives), in which (the observance of which, βρώματα, as above, being used for the observance of rules concerning meats and drinks &c.) they who walked were not profited (the ἐν belongs, not to ὠφελήθησαν, but to περιπατήσαντες, according to the very usual construction, περιπατεῖν ἐν τινι, for to observe, to live in the practice of any thing: see reff. and Acts xxi. 21. So Chrys., τουτέστιν, οἱ διὰ παντὸς φυλάξαντες αὐτά. These, who walked in such observances, are the whole people of God under the O. T. dispensation (notice the historic aorists), to whom they were of themselves useless and profitless, though ordained for a preparatory purpose: so that Calvin's objection is answered, "Certe patribus qui sub lege vixerunt utilis fuit pædagogia cujus pars erat ciborum discrimen." Yes, and so was the shedding of the blood of bulls and goats part of the

p w. inf., Heb. *οὐκ ὡς ἔχουσιν ὡς ἐξουσίαν οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ ἡ λατρεύοντες.*
 here only
 Matt. ix. 6 ||. Luke xii. 5. Acts ix. 14 al. 1 Macc. x. 35. q constr., ch. viii. 5.

ACDK
 MPNa b
 c d e f g
 h k l m o
 17. 47

10. om *ἐξουσίαν* (*from similarity to ἐχουσιν*?) D¹(and lat) M Damasc.

paedagogia: but it was useless to take away sin. Cf. Thl., οἱ τῇ τῶν βρωμάτων τηρήσει στοιχήσαντες διὰ παντός οὐδὲν εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ὠφελήθησαν, ὥς τῆς πίστεως ἔξω ὄντες καὶ τῷ νόμῳ τῷ ἀνωφελεῖ δουλεύοντες. But he understands it of τοὺς τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν παρατήρησιν τῶν βρωμάτων εἰσάγοντες).

10.] *What is the connexion with ver. 9?* It is represented as being entirely done away by our interpretation of βρώματα. If I regard it aright, it is not only not done away, but established in its proper light. Those ancient distinctions are profitless: one distinction remains: that our true meat is not to be partaken of by those who adhere to those old distinctions: that Christianity and Judaism are necessarily and totally distinct. See more below. We have an altar (to what does the Writer allude? Some have said (Schlichting, Sykes, Michaelis, Kuinoel, and even Tholuck) that no distinct idea was before him, but that he merely used the term *altar*, to help the figure which he was about to introduce. And this view has just so much truth in it, that there is no emphasis on *θυσιαστήριον*; it is not *θυσιαστήριον* ἔχομεν. The altar bears only a secondary place in the figure; but still I cannot think that it has not a definite meaning. Others understand by the altar, *Christ himself*. So Suicer, Wolf, al. So Cyr.-alex. de Adoratione, ix. vol. i. p. 310, αὐτὸς οὖν ἔρα ἐστὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον, αὐτὸς δὲ τὸ θυμίαμα, καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς. This again has so much truth in it, that the Victim is so superior to the altar as to cast it altogether into shade; but still is not Himself the altar. Some again (Corn. a-Lapide, Bohme, Bähr, Ebrard, Bisping, Stier, al.) understand, *the table of the Lord*, at which we eat the Lord's Supper. This is so far true, that that table may be said to *represent* to us the Cross whereupon the Sacrifice was offered, just as the bread and wine, laid on it, represent the oblation itself: but it is not the altar, in any propriety of language, however we may be justified, in common parlance, in so calling it. Some again, as Bretschneider, have interpreted it to mean *the heavenly place*, where Christ now offers the virtue of His Blood to the Father for us. This again is so far true that it is the antitype of the Cross, just as the Cross is the antitype of the Lord's table: but we do not want, in this word, the heavenly thing represented by, any

more than the enduring ordinance representing, the original historic concrete material altar: we want that altar itself: and that altar is, the Cross, on which the Lord suffered. That is our altar: not to be emphasized, nor exalted into any comparison with the adorable Victim thereon offered; but still our altar, that wherein we glory, that for which, as "pro aris," we contend: of which our banners, our tokens, our adornments, our churches, are full: severed from which, we know not Christ; laid upon which, He is the power of God, and the wisdom of God. And so it is here explained by Thos. Aquinas, Jac. Cappell., Estius, Bengel, Ernesti, Bleek, De Wette, Stengel, Lüdem., Delitzsch) to eat of which (cf. esp. 1 Cor. ix. 13, οἱ τὰ ἱερὰ ἐργαζόμενοι ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἔσθουσιν: οἱ τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ προσεδρεύοντες τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ συμμερίζονται) they have not licence who serve the tabernacle (who are these? Some, as Schlichting, Morus, and strange to say more recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1. 322 ff., understand by them the same, viz. Christians, as the subject of ἔχομεν. We Christians have an altar whereof (even) they who serve the (Christian) tabernacle have no right to eat: i.e. as explained by Hofmann, as the high priest himself did not eat of the sin-offerings whose blood was brought into the tabernacle, but they were burnt without the camp, so we Christians have no sacrifice of which we have any right to eat, no further profit to be derived from that one sacrifice, by which we have been reconciled to God. But this is, 1. false in fact. We have a right to eat of our Sacrifice, and are commanded so to do. All that our Lord says of eating His Flesh and drinking His Blood (explain it how we will) would be nullified and set aside by such an interpretation. And, 2. it is directly against the whole context, in which the βρώματα, whatever they are, are pronounced profitless, and they who walked in them contrasted with us who have higher privileges. To what purpose then would it be to say, that we have an altar of which we cannot eat? that we have a sacrifice which brings us no profit, but only shame? I pass over the interpretation which understands by the words some particular class of Christians among the Hebrews, because it involves the anachronism of a distinction between clergy and laity which certainly then had no place: and also because it

11 ὃν γὰρ ^r εἰσφέρεται ^s ζῶων τὸ αἷμα εἰς τὰ ^t ἅγια διὰ τοῦ ^r = Luke v. 18, 19. 1 Tim. vi. 7 only. ἀρχιερέως, τούτων τὰ σώματα ^u κατακαίεται ἕξω τῆς ^v παρεμβολῆς· ¹² ^w διὸ ^w καὶ Ἰησοῦς, ἵνα ^x ἀγάσῃ διὰ ^s 2 Pet. ii. 12, Jude 10 only, exo Rev. iv. 6 & passim. τοῦ ^y ἰδίου αἵματος τὸν ^z λαόν, ἕξω τῆς πύλης ^a ἔπαθεν. ^z Ezek. x. 20. ^a (Acts xxi. y ch. t = ch. viii. 2 reff. u Exod. xxix. 14. 2 Pet. iii. 10 reff. 34. ch. xi. 4.) l. c. Lev. iv. 12 al. fr. w ch. xi. 12 reff. ix. 12 reff. z ch. ix. 17 reff. a ch. ix. 26 reff. v = Rev. xx 9 only. x ch. ii. 11 reff. y ch.

11. rec aft αιμα ins περι αμαρτίας, with [C³]DKM[P]N rel vulg Chr-comm₁ Thdr_t: aft αγια C¹ Syr copt [arm]: om A æth-rom. for κατακαίεται, καταναλίσκονται D¹: κατα (sic) m: καίεται k o.

12. om επαθεν N¹.

would furnish no sense at all suiting the passage, referring as it then would to some Christians only, not to all. The only true reference of our words, as also that which has been all but universally acknowledged, is that to the Jewish priesthood, and in them to those who have part with them in serving the rites and ordinances of the ceremonial law. These have no right to eat of our altar: for just as the bodies of those beasts whose blood was brought into the sanctuary were burnt without the camp, so Jesus suffered altogether without the gate of legal Judaism. Let us then not tarry serving that tabernacle which has no part in Him, but go forth to Him without the camp, bearing His reproach. For we cleave not to any abiding city, such as the earthly Jerusalem, but seek one to come. Let us then not tarry in the Jewish tabernacle, serving their rites, offering their sacrifices; but offer our now only possible sacrifice, that of praise, the fruit of a good confession, acceptable to God through Him. Thus and thus only does the whole context stand in harmony. Thus the words in οἱ τῇ σκηνῇ λατρεύοντες keep their former meanings: cf. ch. viii. 5, where we have λατρεύοντες ὑποδείγματι καὶ σκιᾷ τῶν ἐπουρανίων: and remember that ἡ σκηνή, barely so placed, cannot by any possibility mean any part of the Christian apparatus of worship, nor have an antitypical reference, but can only import that which throughout the Epistle it has imported, viz. the Jewish tabernacle: cf. ch. viii. 5; ix. 21 al. Bengel, with his keen sight for nice shades of meaning, has noticed, "est aculeus, quod dicit τῇ σκηνῇ, non ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ"). 11.] For (reason why this exclusion has place: because our great Sacrifice is not one of those in which the servants of the tabernacle had any share, but answers to one which was wholly taken out and burnt: see below) of the animals of which the blood is brought into the holy place by the high priest, of these the bodies are consumed by fire outside the camp (there was a distinction in the sacrifices as to the subsequent participation

of certain parts of them by the priests. Those of which they *did partake* (I take these particulars mainly from Delitzsch) were: 1. the sin-offering of the rulers (a male kid), and the sin-offering of the common people (a female kid or lamb), Levit. iv. 22 ff., 27 ff. (compare the rules ib. ch. vi. about eating and not eating the sacrifices); 2. the dove of the poor man, Levit. v. 9: 3. the trespass-offering, Levit. vii. 7: 4. the skin of the whole burnt-offering, ib. ver. 8: 5. the wave-breast and heave-shoulder of the peace-offerings: 6. the wave-offerings on the feast of weeks, entire. But those of which they *did not partake* were, 1. the sin-offering of the high priest for himself, Levit. iv. 5—7, esp. ver. 12: 2. the sin-offerings for sins of ignorance of the congregation, Levit. iv. 16—21, cf. Num. xv. 24: 3. the sin-offering for high priest and people combined, on the great day of atonement, the blood of which was brought not only into the holy but into the holiest place, Levit. xvi. 27. Besides which we have a general rule, to which doubtless the Writer here alludes, Levit. vi. 30, "No sin-offering, whereof any of the blood is brought into the tabernacle of the congregation to reconcile withal in the holy place, shall be eaten: it shall be burnt in the fire." As regards particular expressions: τὰ ἅγια here, as in ch. ix. 8, 12, 24, 25, and x. 19, probably means not the holy place commonly so called, but the holy of holies, into which the blood of the sin-offering was brought on the day of atonement, and which only typified heaven, whither Christ as High Priest is entered with His Blood. ἕξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς refers to the time when Israel was encamped in the wilderness: the enclosure of the camp was afterwards replaced by the walls of Jerusalem, so that ἕξω τῆς πύλης below answers to it).

12.] Wherefore (as being the antitype of the sin-offering on the day of atonement: "ut ille typus veteris testamenti impletur, illa figura quæ est de carnibus extra castra comburendis," Est.) Jesus also, that He might sanctify (see on ch. ii. 11)

b Luke xx. 25. 13^b τοῖνυν ἐξερχώμεθα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς^v παρεμβολῆς, ACDEK
 1 Cor. ix. 26. τὸν^c ὀνειδισμόν αὐτοῦ φέροντες. 14^a οὐ γὰρ ἔχομεν^d ὡδὲ
 (James ii. 24 v. r.) only. ἔμενουσαν^f πόλιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν^g μέλλουσαν^h ἐπιζητοῦμεν. 17. 47
 position, Isa. iii. 10. v. 13
 al
 c ch. xi. 26 reff. d = 1 Cor. iv. 2. e = ch. xii. 27. f = ch. xi. 10. g = ch. x.
 1 reff. h ch. xi. 14 reff.

13. ἐξερχώμεθα D[-gr] K[P 47¹] k Cyr₁ [Euthal-ms].

the people (see on ch. ii. 17) through His own blood, suffered (see on ch. ix. 26 on the *absolute* meaning of παθεῖν) outside the gate (ἔξω τῆς πόλεως Ἱερουσαλήμ, Ec.). It is necessary in order to understand this rightly, to trace with some care the various steps of the symbolism. The offering of Christ consists of two parts: 1. His offering on earth, which was accomplished on the cross, and answered to the slaying of the legal victim and the destruction of its body by fire, the annihilation of the fleshly life: and, 2. His offering in the holy place above, which consisted in His entering heaven, the abode of God, through the veil, that is to say His flesh, and carrying His blood there as a standing atonement for the world's sin. This, the sanctifying of the people through His own blood, was the ulterior end of that sacrifice on earth: and therefore whatever belonged to that sacrifice on earth is said to have been done in order to that other. This will sufficiently account for the telic clause here, without making it seem as if the ultimate end, the sanctification of God's people, depended on the subordinate circumstance of Christ's having suffered outside the gate. It did depend on the entire fulfilment by Him of all things written of Him in the law: and of them this was one).

13.] So then (τοῖνυν commonly in Greek stands second at least in a sentence. But in later writers as in the LXX (reff.), it is not uncommonly put first, as here; and sometimes even in classical Greek: cf. Lobeck on Phrynichus, p. 342 f., who gives an example from Aristoph. Acharn. 904, ἐγὼ δ' αὖ τοῖνυν συκοφαντήν ἔξαγε: and several from later authors) let us go forth to Him outside the camp (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔξω τῆς κατὰ νόμον γενώμεθα πολιτείας, Thdr. This is certainly intended, and not the meaning given by Chrys. (τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ αἰρώμεν καὶ ἔξω κόσμου μένωμεν, in his second exposition in Hom. xxxiii. His first exposition is very similar, not as quoted by Bleek, that we should follow the Lord in his sufferings: this latter is the explanation of τὸν ὀνειδισμόν αὐτοῦ φέροντες: see below. I may mention that the fact of Chrys. having given two expositions of the passage, as of some others, has much bewildered the Commentators.

Delitzsch, e. g., charges Bleek with error in saying that Chrys. omits *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in ver. 11. He does omit it the second time, but not the first), Limborch, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, al., nor that of Schlichting ("exilia, opprobria, &c., cum illo subeamus"), Grot., Michaelis, Storr, al. Both these may be involved in that which is intended; the latter particular is presently mentioned: but they are not identical with it. Possibly there may be a reference to Exod. xxxiii. 7, ἐγένετο, πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν κύριον ἐξεπορεύετο εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν τὴν ἔξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς. Bleek objects that if so, we should not expect ἡ σκηνή to have been so shortly before mentioned as representing the Jewish sanctuary, in distinction from the Christian. But this seems hardly sufficient reason for denying the reference. The occasion in Exod. xxxiii. was a remarkable one. The people were just quitting Sinai, the home of the law; and the πᾶς ὁ ζητῶν τὸν κύριον seems to bear more than ordinary solemnity, bearing His reproach (see on ch. xi. 26. τούτ' ἐστι, τὰ αὐτὰ πάσχοντες. κοινωνούντες αὐτῷ ἐν τοῖς παθήμασιν, Chrys., Ec.).

14.] For (reason why such going forth is agreeable to our whole profession: not, as Bengel, al., why the word παρεμβολή, and not πόλις, is used above) we have not here (on earth: not, as Heinrichs, in the earthly Jerusalem. ὡδὲ in a local sense is said by Böhme, after Aristarchus, to be hardly Greek: but it is a mistake; the sense being found in the classics from Homer downwards. Palm and Rost, sub voce, maintain the correctness of Aristarchus's view: but it seems beyond question that in such expressions as Ἠφαῖστε προμῶλ' ὡδὲ, the local meaning must be recognized) an abiding city, but we seek for (ἐπιζητεῖν, see on ref.) that (abiding city) which is to come ("Euturam civitatem hanc vocat, quia nobis futura est. Nam Deo, Christo, Angelis jam præsens est." Schlichting. Yet this is not altogether true. The heavenly Jerusalem, in all her glory, is not yet existing, nor shall be until the number of the elect is accomplished. Then she shall come down out of heaven as a bride prepared for her husband, Rev. xxi. 2. This verse certainly comes with a solemn tone on the reader, considering how short a time the μένουσα

15 ⁱ Δι' αὐτοῦ οὖν ^k ἀναφέρωμεν ^l θυσίαν ^m αἰνέσεως ⁿ διὰ ⁱ παντὸς τῷ θεῷ, ⁿ τούτέστιν ^o καρπὸν ^{op} χειλέων ^q ὁμολογούντων τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. ¹⁶ τῆς δὲ ^r εὐποιίας καὶ ^s κοινωνίας μὴ ^t ἐπιλανθάνεσθε, τοιαύταις γὰρ θυσίαις ^u εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός.

17 Πείθεσθε τοῖς ^v ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ ^w ὑπέεικετε· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ^x ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ^y ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ^z λόγον ^z ἀποδώσαντες, ἵνα ^a μετὰ χαρᾶς τοῦτο ποιῶσιν καὶ μὴ

xxxi. 31 A [not F.] BN.
21. 1 Pet. ii. 10 (ch. xi. 12) only.
Matt. xi. 25. Ps. cxxxv. 1. cxxxviii. 1.
13 only. (1 John i. 3 al)
w here only +. Gr. freq.
2 Cor. xi. 27.
40. 1 Pet. iv. 5. Dan. vi. 2. Theod.

p = Matt. xv. 8 || Mk., from Isa. xxix. 13. Rom. iii. 13. 1 Cor. xiv. q dat., = here only. (w. ἐν, Matt. x. 32 al. fr.) ἐξου., r here only +. s = Rom. xv. 26. 2 Cor. ix. u ch. xi. 5, 6 (reff.) only. v ver. 7.
x Mark xiii. 33. Luke xxi. 36. Eph. vi. 18 only. Prov. viii. 34 al. (-ντία, z Matt. xli. 36. Luke xvi. 2. Acts xix. 40. 1 Pet. iv. 5. Dan. vi. 2. Theod. a ch. x. 34 reff.

15. om οὖν D¹N¹ [P Syr].

16. ins της bef κοινωνίας D.

17. aft υπεικετε ins αυτοις N³. ως λογ. αποδ. bef υπερ τ. ψυχ. υμ. A vulg[(and F-lat) Orig-int,] Primas. [αποδωσονται D¹-gr. add περι υμων D¹(and lat) copt.]

πόλις did actually remain, and how soon the destruction of Jerusalem put an end to the Jewish polity which was supposed to be so enduring). 15.]

Through Him (placed first, as carrying all the emphasis—through Him, not by means of the Jewish ritual observances) therefore (this οὖν gathers its inference from the whole argument, vv. 10—14) let us offer up (see on ref.) a sacrifice of praise (θυσία αἰνέσεως is the term for a thank-offering in the law: see Levit. vii. 12 (5, LXX). Cf. reff. and Ps. xlix. 23, θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με, and cxv. 17 (cxvi. 8), σοὶ θύσω θυσίαν αἰνέσεως. The Commentators quote an old saying of the Rabbis, “Tempore futuro omnia sacrificia cessabunt, sed laudes non cessabunt.” Cf. Philo de Victim. Offer. § 3, vol. ii. p. 253, τὴν ἀρίστην ἀνάγουσι θυσίαν, ὕμνοις τὸν εὐεργέτην καὶ σωτήρα θεὸν γεραίροντες) continually (not at fixed days and seasons, as the Levitical sacrifices, but all through our lives) to God, that is, the fruit of lips (καρπὸν χειλέων is from Hosea (ref.), where the LXX give ἀνταποδώσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν as the rendering of כִּרְפֻּן שִׁפְתָּי קִרְפֻּן, “we will account our lips as calves” (for a sacrifice): E. V., “we will render the calves of our lips.” The fruit of the lips is explained by the next words to be, a good confession to God) confessing to His name (i. e. the name of God, as the ultimate object to which the confession, δι' αὐτοῦ, Jesus, is referred. For the construction, see reff.). 16.] But (q. d. the fruit of the lips is not the only sacrifice: God must be praised not only with the lips but with the life. So Thdrt., ἐδείξε τὴν τῆς αἰνέσεως θυσίαν ἀρεσκουσάν τῷ θεῷ συνέζευξε δὲ αὐτὴ καὶ τὴν τῆς εὐποιίας ἣν κοινωνίαν

εἰκότως ἐκάλεσε) of beneficence (εὐποιία is a word of later Greek: Wetstein gives many examples of it. Pollux says εὐεργεσία, χάρις, δωρεά. τὸ γὰρ εὐποιεῖν οὐ λίαν κέκριται) and communication (of your means to others who are in want, see reff.: an usage of the word which, as Bleek remarks, sprung up in the primitive Christian church, as also the corresponding one of the verb: see on ch. ii. 14) be not forgetful (ver. 2): for with such sacrifices (viz. εὐποιᾶ καὶ κοινωνίᾳ, not including ver. 15, which is complete in itself) God is well pleased (εὐαρεστοῦμαι τινι (ref.) is not elsewhere found in N. T. or LXX, but in the later Greek writers, e. g. Diog. Laert. iv. 6. 18: Diod. Sic. iii. 54; xx. 18: Clem.-alex. Strom. vii. 7, § 45, p. 858, ib. 12, § 74, p. 876 P.: and so in Polyb. iii. 8. 11, δυσηρεστοῦντο τοῖς ὑπ' Ἀννίβου πραττομένοις).

17—END.] Concluding exhortations and notices. 17.] Having already in ver. 7

spoken of their deceased leaders in the church, and thereby been reminded of their steadfastness in the faith, he has taken occasion in the intervening verses to admonish them respecting the danger of apostasy to Judaism, and to exhort them to come fearlessly out of it to Christ. Now he returns to their duty to their leaders. Obey your leaders (περὶ ἐπισκόπων λέγει, Ec., Thl.), and submit (to them) (πειθεσθαι, in the regular course of your habits, guided by them, persuaded that their rule is right: ὑπέεικεν, where that rule interferes with your own will: πείθεσθαι has more of free following, ὑπέεικεν of dutiful yielding): for they (on their part, brought out by the αὐτοῖς) keep watch on behalf of your souls (not = ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν as Böhme, but rather = ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν εἰς σωτηρίαν: the

b Mark vii. 34. ^b στενάζοντες, ^c ἄλυσιτελές γὰρ ὑμῖν τοῦτο. ¹⁸ ^d Προς- ^{ACDK}
 Rom. viii. ^e εὐχεσθε ^a περὶ ^e ἡμῶν ^e πειθόμεθα γὰρ ὅτι ^f καλὴν ^f συνει- ^{MPN a b}
 23. 2 Cor. ^c δησιν ἔχομεν, ^g ἐν πάσιν καλῶς ^h θέλοντες ⁱ ἀναστρέφεισθαι ^{c d e f g}
 v. 2, 4. ^h ^h περισσotέρως δὲ ¹ παρακαλῶ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ⁱ ὥνα ^{h k l m o}
 James v. 9 ¹⁹ ^k τάχιον ⁿ ἀποκατασταθῶ ὑμῖν. ^{17. 47}
 only. Isa. ²⁰ ^o ὁ δὲ ^o θεός ^o τῆς ^o εἰρήνης, ^o ^p ἀναγαγὼν ἐκ νεκρῶν
 xiv 7. ^c here only t. ²¹ ^p ²² ²³ ²⁴ ²⁵ ²⁶ ²⁷ ²⁸ ²⁹ ³⁰ ³¹ ³² ³³ ³⁴ ³⁵ ³⁶ ³⁷ ³⁸ ³⁹ ⁴⁰ ⁴¹ ⁴² ⁴³ ⁴⁴ ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ ⁴⁷ ⁴⁸ ⁴⁹ ⁵⁰ ⁵¹ ⁵² ⁵³ ⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ ⁶⁰ ⁶¹ ⁶² ⁶³ ⁶⁴ ⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ ⁶⁷ ⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ ⁷⁰ ⁷¹ ⁷² ⁷³ ⁷⁴ ⁷⁵ ⁷⁶ ⁷⁷ ⁷⁸ ⁷⁹ ⁸⁰ ⁸¹ ⁸² ⁸³ ⁸⁴ ⁸⁵ ⁸⁶ ⁸⁷ ⁸⁸ ⁸⁹ ⁹⁰ ⁹¹ ⁹² ⁹³ ⁹⁴ ⁹⁵ ⁹⁶ ⁹⁷ ⁹⁸ ⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰ ¹⁰¹ ¹⁰² ¹⁰³ ¹⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁹ ¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹ ¹¹² ¹¹³ ¹¹⁴ ¹¹⁵ ¹¹⁶ ¹¹⁷ ¹¹⁸ ¹¹⁹ ¹²⁰ ¹²¹ ¹²² ¹²³ ¹²⁴ ¹²⁵ ¹²⁶ ¹²⁷ ¹²⁸ ¹²⁹ ¹³⁰ ¹³¹ ¹³² ¹³³ ¹³⁴ ¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ ¹³⁷ ¹³⁸ ¹³⁹ ¹⁴⁰ ¹⁴¹ ¹⁴² ¹⁴³ ¹⁴⁴ ¹⁴⁵ ¹⁴⁶ ¹⁴⁷ ¹⁴⁸ ¹⁴⁹ ¹⁵⁰ ¹⁵¹ ¹⁵² ¹⁵³ ¹⁵⁴ ¹⁵⁵ ¹⁵⁶ ¹⁵⁷ ¹⁵⁸ ¹⁵⁹ ¹⁶⁰ ¹⁶¹ ¹⁶² ¹⁶³ ¹⁶⁴ ¹⁶⁵ ¹⁶⁶ ¹⁶⁷ ¹⁶⁸ ¹⁶⁹ ¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹ ¹⁷² ¹⁷³ ¹⁷⁴ ¹⁷⁵ ¹⁷⁶ ¹⁷⁷ ¹⁷⁸ ¹⁷⁹ ¹⁸⁰ ¹⁸¹ ¹⁸² ¹⁸³ ¹⁸⁴ ¹⁸⁵ ¹⁸⁶ ¹⁸⁷ ¹⁸⁸ ¹⁸⁹ ¹⁹⁰ ¹⁹¹ ¹⁹² ¹⁹³ ¹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁵ ¹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁸ ¹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰ ²⁰¹ ²⁰² ²⁰³ ²⁰⁴ ²⁰⁵ ²⁰⁶ ²⁰⁷ ²⁰⁸ ²⁰⁹ ²¹⁰ ²¹¹ ²¹² ²¹³ ²¹⁴ ²¹⁵ ²¹⁶ ²¹⁷ ²¹⁸ ²¹⁹ ²²⁰ ²²¹ ²²² ²²³ ²²⁴ ²²⁵ ²²⁶ ²²⁷ ²²⁸ ²²⁹ ²³⁰ ²³¹ ²³² ²³³ ²³⁴ ²³⁵ ²³⁶ ²³⁷ ²³⁸ ²³⁹ ²⁴⁰ ²⁴¹ ²⁴² ²⁴³ ²⁴⁴ ²⁴⁵ ²⁴⁶ ²⁴⁷ ²⁴⁸ ²⁴⁹ ²⁵⁰ ²⁵¹ ²⁵² ²⁵³ ²⁵⁴ ²⁵⁵ ²⁵⁶ ²⁵⁷ ²⁵⁸ ²⁵⁹ ²⁶⁰ ²⁶¹ ²⁶² ²⁶³ ²⁶⁴ ²⁶⁵ ²⁶⁶ ²⁶⁷ ²⁶⁸ ²⁶⁹ ²⁷⁰ ²⁷¹ ²⁷² ²⁷³ ²⁷⁴ ²⁷⁵ ²⁷⁶ ²⁷⁷ ²⁷⁸ ²⁷⁹ ²⁸⁰ ²⁸¹ ²⁸² ²⁸³ ²⁸⁴ ²⁸⁵ ²⁸⁶ ²⁸⁷ ²⁸⁸ ²⁸⁹ ²⁹⁰ ²⁹¹ ²⁹² ²⁹³ ²⁹⁴ ²⁹⁵ ²⁹⁶ ²⁹⁷ ²⁹⁸ ²⁹⁹ ³⁰⁰ ³⁰¹ ³⁰² ³⁰³ ³⁰⁴ ³⁰⁵ ³⁰⁶ ³⁰⁷ ³⁰⁸ ³⁰⁹ ³¹⁰ ³¹¹ ³¹² ³¹³ ³¹⁴ ³¹⁵ ³¹⁶ ³¹⁷ ³¹⁸ ³¹⁹ ³²⁰ ³²¹ ³²² ³²³ ³²⁴ ³²⁵ ³²⁶ ³²⁷ ³²⁸ ³²⁹ ³³⁰ ³³¹ ³³² ³³³ ³³⁴ ³³⁵ ³³⁶ ³³⁷ ³³⁸ ³³⁹ ³⁴⁰ ³⁴¹ ³⁴² ³⁴³ ³⁴⁴ ³⁴⁵ ³⁴⁶ ³⁴⁷ ³⁴⁸ ³⁴⁹ ³⁵⁰ ³⁵¹ ³⁵² ³⁵³ ³⁵⁴ ³⁵⁵ ³⁵⁶ ³⁵⁷ ³⁵⁸ ³⁵⁹ ³⁶⁰ ³⁶¹ ³⁶² ³⁶³ ³⁶⁴ ³⁶⁵ ³⁶⁶ ³⁶⁷ ³⁶⁸ ³⁶⁹ ³⁷⁰ ³⁷¹ ³⁷² ³⁷³ ³⁷⁴ ³⁷⁵ ³⁷⁶ ³⁷⁷ ³⁷⁸ ³⁷⁹ ³⁸⁰ ³⁸¹ ³⁸² ³⁸³ ³⁸⁴ ³⁸⁵ ³⁸⁶ ³⁸⁷ ³⁸⁸ ³⁸⁹ ³⁹⁰ ³⁹¹ ³⁹² ³⁹³ ³⁹⁴ ³⁹⁵ ³⁹⁶ ³⁹⁷ ³⁹⁸ ³⁹⁹ ⁴⁰⁰ ⁴⁰¹ ⁴⁰² ⁴⁰³ ⁴⁰⁴ ⁴⁰⁵ ⁴⁰⁶ ⁴⁰⁷ ⁴⁰⁸ ⁴⁰⁹ ⁴¹⁰ ⁴¹¹ ⁴¹² ⁴¹³ ⁴¹⁴ ⁴¹⁵ ⁴¹⁶ ⁴¹⁷ ⁴¹⁸ ⁴¹⁹ ⁴²⁰ ⁴²¹ ⁴²² ⁴²³ ⁴²⁴ ⁴²⁵ ⁴²⁶ ⁴²⁷ ⁴²⁸ ⁴²⁹ ⁴³⁰ ⁴³¹ ⁴³² ⁴³³ ⁴³⁴ ⁴³⁵ ⁴³⁶ ⁴³⁷ ⁴³⁸ ⁴³⁹ ⁴⁴⁰ ⁴⁴¹ ⁴⁴² ⁴⁴³ ⁴⁴⁴ ⁴⁴⁵ ⁴⁴⁶ ⁴⁴⁷ ⁴⁴⁸ ⁴⁴⁹ ⁴⁵⁰ ⁴⁵¹ ⁴⁵² ⁴⁵³ ⁴⁵⁴ ⁴⁵⁵ ⁴⁵⁶ ⁴⁵⁷ ⁴⁵⁸ ⁴⁵⁹ ⁴⁶⁰ ⁴⁶¹ ⁴⁶² ⁴⁶³ ⁴⁶⁴ ⁴⁶⁵ ⁴⁶⁶ ⁴⁶⁷ ⁴⁶⁸ ⁴⁶⁹ ⁴⁷⁰ ⁴⁷¹ ⁴⁷² ⁴⁷³ ⁴⁷⁴ ⁴⁷⁵ ⁴⁷⁶ ⁴⁷⁷ ⁴⁷⁸ ⁴⁷⁹ ⁴⁸⁰ ⁴⁸¹ ⁴⁸² ⁴⁸³ ⁴⁸⁴ ⁴⁸⁵ ⁴⁸⁶ ⁴⁸⁷ ⁴⁸⁸ ⁴⁸⁹ ⁴⁹⁰ ⁴⁹¹ ⁴⁹² ⁴⁹³ ⁴⁹⁴ ⁴⁹⁵ ⁴⁹⁶ ⁴⁹⁷ ⁴⁹⁸ ⁴⁹⁹ ⁵⁰⁰ ⁵⁰¹ ⁵⁰² ⁵⁰³ ⁵⁰⁴ ⁵⁰⁵ ⁵⁰⁶ ⁵⁰⁷ ⁵⁰⁸ ⁵⁰⁹ ⁵¹⁰ ⁵¹¹ ⁵¹² ⁵¹³ ⁵¹⁴ ⁵¹⁵ ⁵¹⁶ ⁵¹⁷ ⁵¹⁸ ⁵¹⁹ ⁵²⁰ ⁵²¹ ⁵²² ⁵²³ ⁵²⁴ ⁵²⁵ ⁵²⁶ ⁵²⁷ ⁵²⁸ ⁵²⁹ ⁵³⁰ ⁵³¹ ⁵³² ⁵³³ ⁵³⁴ ⁵³⁵ ⁵³⁶ ⁵³⁷ ⁵³⁸ ⁵³⁹ ⁵⁴⁰ ⁵⁴¹ ⁵⁴² ⁵⁴³ ⁵⁴⁴ ⁵⁴⁵ ⁵⁴⁶ ⁵⁴⁷ ⁵⁴⁸ ⁵⁴⁹ ⁵⁵⁰ ⁵⁵¹ ⁵⁵² ⁵⁵³ ⁵⁵⁴ ⁵⁵⁵ ⁵⁵⁶ ⁵⁵⁷ ⁵⁵⁸ ⁵⁵⁹ ⁵⁶⁰ ⁵⁶¹ ⁵⁶² ⁵⁶³ ⁵⁶⁴ ⁵⁶⁵ ⁵⁶⁶ ⁵⁶⁷ ⁵⁶⁸ ⁵⁶⁹ ⁵⁷⁰ ⁵⁷¹ ⁵⁷² ⁵⁷³ ⁵⁷⁴ ⁵⁷⁵ ⁵⁷⁶ ⁵⁷⁷ ⁵⁷⁸ ⁵⁷⁹ ⁵⁸⁰ ⁵⁸¹ ⁵⁸² ⁵⁸³ ⁵⁸⁴ ⁵⁸⁵ ⁵⁸⁶ ⁵⁸⁷ ⁵⁸⁸ ⁵⁸⁹ ⁵⁹⁰ ⁵⁹¹ ⁵⁹² ⁵⁹³ ⁵⁹⁴ ⁵⁹⁵ ⁵⁹⁶ ⁵⁹⁷ ⁵⁹⁸ ⁵⁹⁹ ⁶⁰⁰ ⁶⁰¹ ⁶⁰² ⁶⁰³ ⁶⁰⁴ ⁶⁰⁵ ⁶⁰⁶ ⁶⁰⁷ ⁶⁰⁸ ⁶⁰⁹ ⁶¹⁰ ⁶¹¹ ⁶¹² ⁶¹³ ⁶¹⁴ ⁶¹⁵ ⁶¹⁶ ⁶¹⁷ ⁶¹⁸ ⁶¹⁹ ⁶²⁰ ⁶²¹ ⁶²² ⁶²³ ⁶²⁴ ⁶²⁵ ⁶²⁶ ⁶²⁷ ⁶²⁸ ⁶²⁹ ⁶³⁰ ⁶³¹ ⁶³² ⁶³³ ⁶³⁴ ⁶³⁵ ⁶³⁶ ⁶³⁷ ⁶³⁸ ⁶³⁹ ⁶⁴⁰ ⁶⁴¹ ⁶⁴² ⁶⁴³ ⁶⁴⁴ ⁶⁴⁵ ⁶⁴⁶ ⁶⁴⁷ ⁶⁴⁸ ⁶⁴⁹ ⁶⁵⁰ ⁶⁵¹ ⁶⁵² ⁶⁵³ ⁶⁵⁴ ⁶⁵⁵ ⁶⁵⁶ ⁶⁵⁷ ⁶⁵⁸ ⁶⁵⁹ ⁶⁶⁰ ⁶⁶¹ ⁶⁶² ⁶⁶³ ⁶⁶⁴ ⁶⁶⁵ ⁶⁶⁶ ⁶⁶⁷ ⁶⁶⁸ ⁶⁶⁹ ⁶⁷⁰ ⁶⁷¹ ⁶⁷² ⁶⁷³ ⁶⁷⁴ ⁶⁷⁵ ⁶⁷⁶ ⁶⁷⁷ ⁶⁷⁸ ⁶⁷⁹ ⁶⁸⁰ ⁶⁸¹ ⁶⁸² ⁶⁸³ ⁶⁸⁴ ⁶⁸⁵ ⁶⁸⁶ ⁶⁸⁷ ⁶⁸⁸ ⁶⁸⁹ ⁶⁹⁰ ⁶⁹¹ ⁶⁹² ⁶⁹³ ⁶⁹⁴ ⁶⁹⁵ ⁶⁹⁶ ⁶⁹⁷ ⁶⁹⁸ ⁶⁹⁹ ⁷⁰⁰ ⁷⁰¹ ⁷⁰² ⁷⁰³ ⁷⁰⁴ ⁷⁰⁵ ⁷⁰⁶ ⁷⁰⁷ ⁷⁰⁸ ⁷⁰⁹ ⁷¹⁰ ⁷¹¹ ⁷¹² ⁷¹³ ⁷¹⁴ ⁷¹⁵ ⁷¹⁶ ⁷¹⁷ ⁷¹⁸ ⁷¹⁹ ⁷²⁰ ⁷²¹ ⁷²² ⁷²³ ⁷²⁴ ⁷²⁵ ⁷²⁶ ⁷²⁷ ⁷²⁸ ⁷²⁹ ⁷³⁰ ⁷³¹ ⁷³² ⁷³³ ⁷³⁴ ⁷³⁵ ⁷³⁶ ⁷³⁷ ⁷³⁸ ⁷³⁹ ⁷⁴⁰ ⁷⁴¹ ⁷⁴² ⁷⁴³ ⁷⁴⁴ ⁷⁴⁵ ⁷⁴⁶ ⁷⁴⁷ ⁷⁴⁸ ⁷⁴⁹ ⁷⁵⁰ ⁷⁵¹ ⁷⁵² ⁷⁵³ ⁷⁵⁴ ⁷⁵⁵ ⁷⁵⁶ ⁷⁵⁷ ⁷⁵⁸ ⁷⁵⁹ ⁷⁶⁰ ⁷⁶¹ ⁷⁶² ⁷⁶³ ⁷⁶⁴ ⁷⁶⁵ ⁷⁶⁶ ⁷⁶⁷ ⁷⁶⁸ ⁷⁶⁹ ⁷⁷⁰ ⁷⁷¹ ⁷⁷² ⁷⁷³ ⁷⁷⁴ ⁷⁷⁵ ⁷⁷⁶ ⁷⁷⁷ ⁷⁷⁸ ⁷⁷⁹ ⁷⁸⁰ ⁷⁸¹ ⁷⁸² ⁷⁸³ ⁷⁸⁴ ⁷⁸⁵ ⁷⁸⁶ ⁷⁸⁷ ⁷⁸⁸ ⁷⁸⁹ ⁷⁹⁰ ⁷⁹¹ ⁷⁹² ⁷⁹³ ⁷⁹⁴ ⁷⁹⁵ ⁷⁹⁶ ⁷⁹⁷ ⁷⁹⁸ ⁷⁹⁹ ⁸⁰⁰ ⁸⁰¹ ⁸⁰² ⁸⁰³ ⁸⁰⁴ ⁸⁰⁵ ⁸⁰⁶ ⁸⁰⁷ ⁸⁰⁸ ⁸⁰⁹ ⁸¹⁰ ⁸¹¹ ⁸¹² ⁸¹³ ⁸¹⁴ ⁸¹⁵ ⁸¹⁶ ⁸¹⁷ ⁸¹⁸ ⁸¹⁹ ⁸²⁰ ⁸²¹ ⁸²² ⁸²³ ⁸²⁴ ⁸²⁵ ⁸²⁶ ⁸²⁷ ⁸²⁸ ⁸²⁹ ⁸³⁰ ⁸³¹ ⁸³² ⁸³³ ⁸³⁴ ⁸³⁵ ⁸³⁶ ⁸³⁷ ⁸³⁸ ⁸³⁹ ⁸⁴⁰ ⁸⁴¹ ⁸⁴² ⁸⁴³ ⁸⁴⁴ ⁸⁴⁵ ⁸⁴⁶ ⁸⁴⁷ ⁸⁴⁸ ⁸⁴⁹ ⁸⁵⁰ ⁸⁵¹ ⁸⁵² ⁸⁵³ ⁸⁵⁴ ⁸⁵⁵ ⁸⁵⁶ ⁸⁵⁷ ⁸⁵⁸ ⁸⁵⁹ ⁸⁶⁰ ⁸⁶¹ ⁸⁶² ⁸⁶³ ⁸⁶⁴ ⁸⁶⁵ ⁸⁶⁶ ⁸⁶⁷ ⁸⁶⁸ ⁸⁶⁹ ⁸⁷⁰ ⁸⁷¹ ⁸⁷² ⁸⁷³ ⁸⁷⁴ ⁸⁷⁵ ⁸⁷⁶ ⁸⁷⁷ ⁸⁷⁸ ⁸⁷⁹ ⁸⁸⁰ ⁸⁸¹ ⁸⁸² ⁸⁸³ ⁸⁸⁴ ⁸⁸⁵ ⁸⁸⁶ ⁸⁸⁷ ⁸⁸⁸ ⁸⁸⁹ ⁸⁹⁰ ⁸⁹¹ ⁸⁹² ⁸⁹³ ⁸⁹⁴ ⁸⁹⁵ ⁸⁹⁶ ⁸⁹⁷ ⁸⁹⁸ ⁸⁹⁹ ⁹⁰⁰ ⁹⁰¹ ⁹⁰² ⁹⁰³ ⁹⁰⁴ ⁹⁰⁵ ⁹⁰⁶ ⁹⁰⁷ ⁹⁰⁸ ⁹⁰⁹ ⁹¹⁰ ⁹¹¹ ⁹¹² ⁹¹³ ⁹¹⁴ ⁹¹⁵ ⁹¹⁶ ⁹¹⁷ ⁹¹⁸ ⁹¹⁹ ⁹²⁰ ⁹²¹ ⁹²² ⁹²³ ⁹²⁴ ⁹²⁵ ⁹²⁶ ⁹²⁷ ⁹²⁸ ⁹²⁹ ⁹³⁰ ⁹³¹ ⁹³² ⁹³³ ⁹³⁴ ⁹³⁵ ⁹³⁶ ⁹³⁷ ⁹³⁸ ⁹³⁹ ⁹⁴⁰ ⁹⁴¹ ⁹⁴² ⁹⁴³ ⁹⁴⁴ ⁹⁴⁵ ⁹⁴⁶ ⁹⁴⁷ ⁹⁴⁸ ⁹⁴⁹ ⁹⁵⁰ ⁹⁵¹ ⁹⁵² ⁹⁵³ ⁹⁵⁴ ⁹⁵⁵ ⁹⁵⁶ ⁹⁵⁷ ⁹⁵⁸ ⁹⁵⁹ ⁹⁶⁰ ⁹⁶¹ ⁹⁶² ⁹⁶³ ⁹⁶⁴ ⁹⁶⁵ ⁹⁶⁶ ⁹⁶⁷ ⁹⁶⁸ ⁹⁶⁹ ⁹⁷⁰ ⁹⁷¹ ⁹⁷² ⁹⁷³ ⁹⁷⁴ ⁹⁷⁵ ⁹⁷⁶ ⁹⁷⁷ ⁹⁷⁸ ⁹⁷⁹ ⁹⁸⁰ ⁹⁸¹ ⁹⁸² ⁹⁸³ ⁹⁸⁴ ⁹⁸⁵ ⁹⁸⁶ ⁹⁸⁷ ⁹⁸⁸ ⁹⁸⁹ ⁹⁹⁰ ⁹⁹¹ ⁹⁹² ⁹⁹³ ⁹⁹⁴ ⁹⁹⁵ ⁹⁹⁶ ⁹⁹⁷ ⁹⁹⁸ ⁹⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰⁰

18. ins και bef περι D¹(and lat) Chr., rec (for πειθόμεθα) πεποιοθαμεν, with
 C⁸D³K⁸ rel [arm Chr Euthal-ms Thdrt Damasc], *confidimus* vulg: txt AC¹D¹M[P]
 17, *suademus* D-lat. (Σ¹ reads περι ημων οτι καλην. θα γαρ οτι καλην.)

ψυχὴ bringing in the idea of immortality), as having to give an account (Thdrt. well-remarks, *παραίνει μὲν τοῖς μαθηταῖς ὑπακούειν τοῖς διδασκάλους*: διήγειρε δὲ κατὰ ταύτων καὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους εἰς πλείονα προθυμίαν διδάσκει γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἀγρυπνεῖν καὶ τὰς εὐθύνas δειμαίνειν. Chrys. de Sacerdotio, lib. vi. init., vol. i. 2, p. 677 (Migne), says, τὸ γὰρ πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγ. κ.τ.λ. . . . ἀποδιδόντες, εἰ καὶ πρότερον εἶπον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ νῦν σιωπήσομαι· ὁ γὰρ φόβος ταύτης τῆς ἀπειλῆς συνεχῶς κατασεῖ μιν τὴν ψυχὴν): that they may do this (viz. *watch*, not give an account, for thus the present πῶσιν, and τοῦτο γὰρ ἄλυσιτελές ὑμῖν would be inapplicable) with joy, and not lamenting (over your disobedience): for this (their having to lament over you) is unprofitable for you (*λυσιτελεῖ* is found in Luke xvii. 2. "The exhortation is like Paul in its spirit, cf. 1 Thess. v. 12, 13, but more like Luke in its expression. And as we proceed, St. Luke's and St. Paul's expressions are found mingled together." Delitzsch). 18.] Pray for us (here, as elsewhere, it is probably a mistake to suppose that the first person plural indicates the Writer alone. As Del. observes, the passage from the ἡγούμενοι to the Writer individually would be harsh. And when Bleek finds in ver. 19 a proof that the Writer only is meant, he misses the point, that this ἡμῶν, including the Writer and his companions, is in fact a transition note between ver. 17 and ver. 19. Cf. Eph. vi. 19: Rom. xv. 30: 2 Cor. i. 11): for we are persuaded (*πειθόμεθα*, which is St. Luke's way of speaking, cf. Acts xxvi. 26, has been changed into *πεποιοθαμεν*, which is St. Paul's, cf. Gal. v. 10: Phil. i. 25; ii. 24) that (Bengel, al. pause at *πεποιοθαμεν* (rec.) γὰρ, rendering ὅτι "quia: nam *confidimus* ponitur absolute, uti *audemus*, 2 Cor. v. 8." But the other is the better and more probable rendering, even with the rec.: and with

πειθόμεθα, more necessary still) we have a good conscience (St. Luke's expression, see reff.: and here chosen perhaps to correspond to *καλῶς* below), desiring in all things (not as Chrys., Erasm. (par.), Luth., al., masculine,—οὐκ ἐν ἐθνικοῖς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν,—but as in ver. 4) to behave ourselves with seemliness (*τρυφῶσιν*, ἀπροσκόπως διάγειν σπουδάζοντες καὶ ἀσκανδαλίστως. Thl. This appears to point at some offence of the same kind as we know to have been taken at the life and teaching of St. Paul with reference to the law and Jewish customs). 19.] But I the more abundantly (see on ch. ii. 1) exhort you to do this (*ποῖον τοῦτο*; τὸ εὐχεσθαι περὶ ἡμῶν, OE.), that I may be the sooner (*τάχιον* is the form of the comparative usual in later Greek: in Attic *θάσσον* is commoner: Herod. uses *ταχύτερον*: cf. Palm and Rost in *ταχύς*, and Lobeck on Phryn. p. 77, who adds "In vulgari dialecto quantopere hoc nomen vigerit, innumera Diodori, Plutarchi, Dionysii et aequalium, exempla docent, quæ sciens prætermitto") restored to you (reff., and Polyb. iii. 98. 7, ἐὰν ἐξαγαγὼν τοὺς δμήρους ἀποκαταστήσῃ τοῖς γονεῦσι καὶ ταῖς πόλεσιν. Cf. St. Paul's expression Philem. 22, ἐλπίζω γὰρ ὅτι διὰ τῶν προσευχῶν ὑμῶν χαρισθήσομαι ὑμῖν. On the inferences from this and the other notices in this concluding passage, see Prolegg.). 20, 21.] Solemn concluding prayer. πρῶτον παρ' αὐτῶν αἰτήσας τὰς εὐχάς, τότε καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπέυχεται πάντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ. Chrys. 20.] But (δέ often introduces a concluding sentence, breaking off, as we use *but*: see again ver. 22, and passim at the end of St. Paul's Epistles) the God of peace (so, often, at the end of St. Paul's Epistles: see reff., and 2 Thess. iii. 16. In the presence of so many instances of the expression under different circumstances, it would perhaps be hardly safe to infer from it here any

τὸν ^α ποιμένα τῶν ^β προβάτων τὸν ^γ μέγαν ἐν ^δ αἵματι ^ε δια- ^q John x. 2.
 θήκης ^υ αἰωνίου τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ^ζ Ἰησοῦν, ²¹ ^ν καταρτίσαι ^{15a. lxxii. 11.}
^{xxvi. 31, from Zech. xiii. 7. 1 Pet. ii. 25.} ^{s = ch. iv. 14 reff.}
^{u so Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 40. xxvii. (i.) 5 al.} ^{v = 1 Cor. i. 10. 2 Cor. xiii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 10.} ^{14. Matt. t ch. x. 29 reff} ^{13. Ezra iv. 13.}

20. aft ιησ. ins χριστον D¹ f 17 [47] vulg[not am fuld¹] D-lat Syr copt [æth arm-edd Euthal-ins] Chr Thdrt.

reference to danger of strife within the church addressed. Still the words are not a mere formula, and in all the above places, some reference is made, doubtless, to circumstances either of internal dissension or external tribulation. And certainly both the exhortations in vv. 17—19 point to a state in which there was danger of disobedience within and suspicion towards the Writer and those who were on his part. So that 'peace' was a natural wish for them, even without taking into account those troubles which harassed and threatened them from without, in regard of which it would be also a haven, where they would be), who brought up from the dead (περὶ ἀναστάσεως εἰρηται τοῦτο, Chrys. But perhaps not of the Resurrection only, but of the Ascension also. Delitzsch well remarks that ἀνά is not only *sursum*, but *sursum*: and Bl. refers to Plato, Rep. vii. p. 521 c, πῶς τις ἀνάξει αὐτοὺς εἰς φῶς, ὥςπερ ἐξ ἄδου λέγονται δὴ τινες εἰς θεοῦς ἀνελεῖν; "This is the only place where our Writer mentions the Resurrection. Every where else he lifts his eyes from the depth of our Lord's humiliation, passing over all that is intermediate, to the highest point of His exaltation. The connexion here suggests to him once at least to make mention of that which lay between Golgotha and the throne of God, between the altar of the Cross and the heavenly sanctuary, the resurrection of Him who died as our sin-offering." Delitzsch) the great Shepherd of the sheep (the passage before the Writer's mind has been that in the prophetic chapter of Isaiah (ref.), where speaking of Moses, it is said, ποῦ δ' ἀναβιβάσας ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων, where A and the Codex Marchalianus read ἐκ τῆς γῆς, as 46 Chrys. read here, N and the Complutensian having ἐκ γῆς. In Isa. the shepherd is Moses; and the comparison between Moses and Christ is familiar to our Writer, ch. iii. 2—6. The addition of τὸν μέγαν as applied to Christ, is correspondent to His title ἱερεὺς μέγας, ch. x. 21. To deny this reference, with Lünemann, seems impossible, with the remarkable conjunction of τὸν ποιμένα τῶν προβάτων. The connexion here in which this title of our Lord is brought in, may be, that οἱ ἡγούμενοι having been just mentioned, and himself

also, and his labours and theirs for the settlement of the Church in peace being before his mind, he is led to speak of Him who is the Chief Shepherd (1 Pet. v. 4), who was brought again from the dead by the God of Peace), in the blood of the everlasting covenant (but in what sense? First διαθήκη αἰώνιος is as Thdrt., αἰώνιον δὲ τὴν καινὴν κέκληκε διαθήκην, ὥς ἑτέρας μετὰ ταύτην οὐκ ἐσομένης: ἵνα γὰρ μὴ τις ὑπολάβῃ, καὶ ταύτην δι' ἄλλης διαθήκης παυθήσεσθαι, εἰκότως αὐτῆς τὸ ἀτελεῦ-τητον ἔδειξε. Then, the expression itself can hardly but be a reminiscence of Zech. ix. 11, καὶ σὺ ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης σου ἐξαπείσεις δαεμίους σου ἐκ λακκου οὐκ ἔχοντος ὕδατος: and if so, the import of the preposition here will be at least indicated by its import there. And there it is, by virtue of, in the power of, the blood of thy covenant, i. e. of that blood which was the seal of the covenant entered into with thee. So also we must understand it here. Did the sentence apply only to the exaltation of Christ, the ἐν might be taken as by Bleek after Calv., 'with the blood,' so that Christ took the blood with Him. So Ec. and Thl., ἡγείρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν σὺν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου, ταυτέστι σὺν τῇ ἐγέρσει αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ κεχώρισται ἡμῖν εἰς διαθήκην αἰώνιον: and Calvin, "Videtur mihi apostolus hoc velle, Christum ita resurrexisse a mortuis, ut mors tamen ejus non sit abolita, sed æternum vigorem retineat: ac si dixisset, Deus Filium suum excitavit, sed ita ut sanguis, quem semel in morte fudit, ad sanctionem fœderis æterni post resurrectionem vigeat, fructumque suum proferat perinde ac si semper fluere." But here it is joined to the exaltation only by means of the resurrection. And thus, as Del. maintains, the instrumental, conditioning-element force of ἐν seems to predominate: through, or in virtue of, the blood (Acts xx. 28). It is surely hardly allowable to join the words ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης αἰωνίου with τὸν ποιμένα τὸν μέγαν. Yet this is done by Beza, Estius, Grot., Limborch, Schulz, Böhme, Kuinoel, Lünemann, Ebr., al., some of them joining it with μέγαν. It seems to me that τὸν would in this case be repeated after μέγαν. The idea however is no less true, and is indeed involved in the connexion with

w ch. vii. 25

reff.

x ch. x. 7 reff.

y = Phil i. 6.

ii. 13 al.

z elsw. P.

(Rom. xii.

i, 2 Eph.

v. 10 al.)

only.

Wisd. iv. 10.

ix. 10 only.

(-τως, ch.

xii. 28. -τείν,

ver. 16.)

19.

e = Rom. xii. 8.

ch. xi. 18.

L. P. H.

48. 8.

Plato. Demosth.,

Isocr., in

Weist. & Bl.

ὑμᾶς ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ^w εἰς τὸ ^x ποιῆσαι τὸ ^x θέλημα
αὐτοῦ, ποιῶν ^y ἐν ὑμῖν τὸ ^z εὐάρεστον ^a ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ διὰ
Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων,
ἀμήν.

ACDK

MPN a b

c d e f g

h k l m o

17. 47

22. Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, ^c ἀνέχεσθε τοῦ ^d λόγου
τῆς ^{de} παρακλήσεως· καὶ γὰρ ^f διὰ βραχέων ^g ἐπέστεila
a Heb., ch. iv. 13 only. = Acts vi. 5. 1 Tim ii. 3. 1 John iii. 22. Ps cxiv. 9. b ver.
c Matt. xvii. 17. Acts xviii. 14. 2 Tim. iv. 3. Job vi. 26. d Acts xiii. 15 only. 1 Macc. x. 24.
e = Rom. xii. 8. ch. xi. 18. L. P. H. f (see Acts xiv. 22.) διὰ βραχέων κ. κεφαλωδώς, Polyb. ii.
48. 8. Plato. Demosth., Isocr., in Weist. & Bl. g Acts xv. 20. xxi. 25. 3 Kings v. 8 A (not F) only.

21. ἡμας D¹[-gr]. om ἐργῶ [D¹]N. aft ἐργῶ ius και λογῶ [A] Chr-comm.
aft ποιῆσαι ins ἡμας D¹[-gr]. ins αὐτῶ bef ποιῶν AC¹ N¹(N³ disapproving);
αὐτος 71, ἵπσο faciente D-lat. ἡμιν D[-gr] KMN d e f g k l 17 [47 arm] Syr Thdr̄t
Ec. om τῶν αἰώνων C³ D[-gr] in arm Thdr̄t; ins AC¹KM[P]N rel vulg Syr copt
[æth Chr Euthal-ms Thdr̄t₁ Damasc]. (D-lat def.)
22. om γὰρ N¹. ἀπεστείλα D[-gr] a b¹.

ἀναγαγόν, and thus with the whole sentence. The Lord Jesus did become, in His mediatorial work, the great Shepherd of the sheep, by virtue of that covenant which was brought in by His blood (Acts, ubi sup.): and by virtue of that blood also He was raised up as the great Shepherd, out of the dead, and to God's right hand. Cf. on the whole, reff.; and Isa. lv. 3; lxi. 8: John x. 11—18), even our Lord Jesus (here the personal name, Jesus, is joined with the assertion of His lordship over us: below, where the inworking of the Spirit through Him is spoken of, it is διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, His office as Christ at God's right hand having made Him the channel of the Spirit to us: the anointing on Him, the Head, flowing down to the skirts of the raiment. Cf. Acts ii. 36, ἀσφαλῶς οὐδὲν γνωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ, ὅτι καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ χριστὸν ὁ θεὸς ἐποίησεν, τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε),

21.] perfect you (πληρώσαι, τελειώσαι, Ec. μαρτυρεῖ αὐτοῖς μεγάλα· τὸ γὰρ καταρτιζόμενόν ἐστι τὸ ἀρχὴν ἔχον, εἴτα πληρούμενον, Chrys. Still, as Bleek remarks, the praise of having made a beginning is not necessarily involved in the wish that they may be perfected) in every good work, towards the doing His will (cf. ch. x. 36. The expression here is in the same final sense as there, as the aor. shews: it is not εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν, 'to the habit of doing,' but εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι, 'to the having done,' i. e. 'to the accomplishing'), doing in you (ποιῶν chosen expressly as taking up εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι, in exact correspondence with St. Paul's saying Phil. ii. 13, ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν) that which is well-pleasing in His sight (ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ, an expression of St. Luke's principally. It is a pregnant construction, involving τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὐάρεστον αὐτῷ.

See Eph. v. 10 al.), through Jesus Christ (the reference is variously given: to εὐάρεστον, well-pleasing &c. through J. C.; so Grot., Hammond ("secundum Christi præcepta" &c.), al.: or to the verb, ποιῶν, as Thl., ὥστε, ὅταν ποιῶμεν ἡμεῖς τὸ καλόν, ὁ θεὸς ποιεῖ τοῦτο ἐν ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, τοῦτέστι, μεσότη κ. ἐνέργῳ τούτῳ χρώμενος: so Ec. The latter is by far the more probable, as the former would introduce a superfluity): to whom (i. e. to God, the chief subject of the whole sentence, God, who is the God of peace, who brought up the Lord Jesus from the dead, who can perfect us in every good work, to accomplish His will, and works in us that which is well-pleasing to Him through Jesus Christ. The whole majesty of the sentence requires this reverting to its main agent, and speaks against the referring ᾧ ἡ δόξα to our blessed Lord, who is only incidentally mentioned. See the very similar construction 1 Pet. iv. 11, where however the reference is not by any means equally certain) be (in 1 Pet. i. c. ἐστίν: and possibly also here: but perhaps ἔστω is the more probable supplement) the glory for ever. Amen. 22.]

But ('claudendi,' see above, ver. 20) Ἰ beseech you, brethren, endure (reff.) the word of my exhortation (or, of exhortation. ἀσμένως δέξασθε τὰ παρ' ἐμοῦ γράμματα, Schol.-Matth. Cf. Philo, Quod Omn. Prob. Liber, § 6, vol. ii. p. 451, καὶ πῶς πατὴρς μὲν ἢ μητὴρς ἐπιταγμάτων παῖδες ἀνέχονται; I may observe, that παρὰ κλησις is rendered by the vulg. wrongly "solationem." In that case no ἀνέχεσθε would have been needed. The expression λόγος παρακλήσεως applies without doubt to the whole Epistle, from what follows: not as Beza, Calov., al., to the few exhortations preceding, nor as Grot. to ch. x.—xiii. only: nor as Kuinoel, al., to the exhorta-

ὕμῳ. ²³ Γινώσκετε τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν Τιμόθεον ^h ἀπολε- ^h Epp, here
 λυμένον, μεθ' οὗ, ἐὰν ⁱ τάχιον ἔρχηται, ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς. ^h only. = Acts
²⁴ Ἀσπᾶσασθε πάντας τοὺς ^k ἡγουμένους ὑμῶν καὶ πάντας ⁱ ver. 19 reff.
 τοὺς ⁱ ἁγίους. ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας. ¹ xv. 7, 17.
²⁵ ^m ἡ χάρις μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν, ἀμήν. ¹ Acts ix. 13.
¹⁰ Epp
^{passim} Heb,
^{ch} vi. 10 only.
^m absol., Eph.
^{vi.} 24. Col.
^{iv} 18. 1 Tim.
^{vi.} 21. 2 Tim.
^{iv.} 22. Tit.
^{iii.} 15.

...αμην
 M.

ΠΡΟΣ ΕΒΡΑΙΟΥΣ.

²³. rec om ἡμῶν, with D²⁻³K[P] rel Chr₂ [Euthal-ms] Thdr₂, Damasc: ins ACD¹M
 N¹(N³ disapproving) m 17 [47] vulg Syr copt [æth arm] Euthal, Dial-trin, for
 ἐρχεται, ἐρχησθε N¹.

²⁵. for ὑμῶν, των αμην D¹. om αμην N¹ 17 fuld [arm-zoh].

SUBSCRIPTION. rec *pros ebr. egraphē* (31 adds *εβραϊστι*) *απο της ιταλιας δια τιμοθεου*,
 with d; simlv most of our mss: *pros ebr. egraphē apo ramēs* A: *pros ebr. egraphē*
apo italias [P 47, and adding] *δια τιμοθεου* K [Euthal-ms]: om DM l m: txt CN 17.

tions scattered up and down in the Epistle. It is St. Luke's expression, see reff.): for also (besides other reasons, there is this) in (by means of, in the material of) few (words) (few in comparison of what might have been said on such a subject. *τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν ὅμως βραχεία ταῦτά φησιν*, ὅσον πρὸς ἃ ἐπεθύμει λέγειν. Thl.: for the expression, see reff.) I have written (the epistolary aorist, as 'dabam,' ἔγραψα, freq. in St. Paul, al. The word is elsewhere peculiar to St. Luke in N. T., see reff.) to you. ^{23.} Know (γινώσκετε

can hardly but be imperative, standing as it does at the beginning of the sentence. In τὴν δὲ δοκιμὴν αὐτοῦ γινώσκετε, Phil. ii. 22, it is otherwise arranged. When the knowledge already exists, the *fact* is the prominent thing: when the knowledge is first conveyed, the *information*) that our brother Timotheus is dismissed (the construction is good Greek: Del. gives as instances ἤκουσε τὴν χάραν δρομένην, Xen. Anab. v. 5. 7: πυθόμενοι βασιλέα τεθηγκότα, Thuc. iv. 50: γνῶτε ἀναγκαῖον ὃν ὑμῖν ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς γενέσθαι, ib. vii. 77. It is in fact the original government of the accus. and inf. with a participial predicate substituted for the infinitive: 'Know him being,' for 'know him to be.' ἀπολύειν, on which see Prolegg. § ii. 24, does not occur in St. Paul, but

is frequent in St. Luke; e. g. Luke xxii. 68; xxiii. 16 ff.: Acts iii. 13; iv. 21, of dismissal from prison or custody; Acts xiii. 3; xv. 30, of official sending away; Acts xv. 33, of solemn dismissal, and Acts xix. 41; xxiii. 22, of simple dismissal), with whom, if he come (πρὸς με . . . εἰκὸς γὰρ ἦν, ἀπολεῖσθαι μὲν αὐτόν, μήπω δὲ ἀπεληλυθέναι πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον. (Ec.) soon (Luther, Schulz, al. take this in the Attic sense of ἐὰν θᾶπτον or ἐπειδὴν θᾶπτον, "as soon as," "simul atque;" but such can hardly be the sense here), I will see you (πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐρχόμενος. (Ec.).

^{24.} Salute all your leaders, and all the saints. They from Italy salute you (on this, see Prolegg. § ii. 13). ^{25.} Grace (the grace, viz. of God. "Non exprimit, cujus gratiam ac favorem, unde omnis felicitas oritur, illis optet, quippe rem Christianis notissimam, Dei nimirum, Patris nostri, et Jesu Christi, Domini nostri." Schlichting. Where ἡ χάρις is not put thus barely, as in the similar places of St. Paul, it is always filled up by τοῦ κυρίου (ἡμῶν) Ἰησοῦ (χριστοῦ), e. g. (Rom. xvi. 24) 1 Cor. xvi. 23: 2 Cor. xiii. 13 al. fr.) be with all of you (πάντων first, carrying the emphasis. ὑμῶν πάντων would express more the totality of the church: πάντων ὑμῶν, every individual). Amen.

ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ.

j...

^a so Rom i. 1. I. ¹ Ἰάκωβος θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ^a δοῦλος ^{ABCKL}
Phil. i. 1. ταῖς ^b δώδεκα ^b φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ ^c διασπορᾷ ^d χαίρειν. ^{PN a b c}
(Tit. i. 1.) ^{d f g h j}
² Pet. i. 1. ^{k l m o}
Jude i. ¹³
^b Matt. xix. 28. Luke xxii. 30. (see Acts xxvi. 7.) Exod. xxiv. 4. ^c John vii 35. 1 Pet. i 1 only. Ps.
cxlv. 2. ^d = Acts xv. 23. xxiii. 26. (2 John 10, 11. Isa. xlviii. 22. lvi. 21.)^z. Esdr. vii.
9. 2 Macc. ix. 19.

TITLE. Steph *ιακωβου καθολικη επιστολη*, with g h: *επ. ιακ. καθ.* k o: *επ. καθ. ιακ.* a c: *ιακ. επ. καθ.* 13: *καθ. επ. ιακ.* j: *elz ιακ. του αποστ. επ. καθ.*, with (but omg του) [P] 1: *επιστ. τ. αγ. αποστ. ιακ. καθ.* m: *επ. καθ. τ. αγ. αποστ. ιακ.* L: *γραμμα προς εβραίους ιακωβου αδελφοθεν* f: txt BK, also A in subscr. (In ACN the title is wanting.)

CHAP. I. 1.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. **James** (for all questions who the Author of this Epistle was, see the Prolegomena. I assume here that which I have there endeavoured to establish, that it is "James the Lord's brother," the first president or bishop of the church at Jerusalem, an Apostle, but not one of the Twelve), **servant** (not necessarily, as Huther, an official appellation; but implying, as he also confesses, devotion to God and His work alone, irrespectively of self-will or other men's will. Ec. says, *ἐπὲρ πᾶν δὲ κοσμικὸν ἀξίωμα οἱ τοῦ κυρίου ἀπόστολοι τὸ δούλοι εἶναι χριστοῦ καλλωπιζόμενοι, τοῦτο γνῶρισμα ἑαυτῶν βούλονται ποιῆσαι, καὶ λέγοντες, καὶ ἐπιστέλλοντες καὶ διδάσκοντες*. Similarly Didymus, and Incert. in Catena) **of God, and of the Lord Jesus Christ** (not 'of the God and Lord, J. C.' but as Ec., *θεοῦ μέν, τοῦ πατρὸς· κυρίου δέ, τοῦ υἱοῦ*. Huther remarks, that in all the addresses of Epistles, the whole name Ἰησοῦς χριστός is given. St. James mentions our Lord only here and ch. ii. 1 in this Epistle, and not at all in his speeches in Acts xv. and xxi. Bengel says, "Videri potuisset, si Jesum saepe appellaret, id ex ambitione facere, cum esset frater Domini. Atque eo minus novit Christum secundum carnem"), **to the twelve tribes** (of Israel: nor can there be any reasonable doubt that

this Epistle was addressed to Jewish Christians in the first place. Not however to them, as distinguished from Gentile Christians: for the two classes appear to have been not as yet distinct. If the later date of the Epistle be taken (see Prolegg), then the Jewish Christians are addressed as the nucleus and kernel of all Christendom. But to my mind, the former is more probable) **which are in the dispersion** ("Legimus, occiso a Judæis B. Stephano, quia facta est in illa die persecutio magna in ecclesia quæ erat Hierosolymis, et omnes dispersi sunt per regiones Judææ et Samariæ, præter Apostolos. His ergo dispersis qui persecutionem passi sunt propter justitiam, mittit Epistolam." Bede. This is hardly correct; but more probable than De W.'s view that the words are used merely to describe the scattered and distressed state of the Christians, as *διασπορά* did of the Jews. The most likely reference of *διασπορά* is to the literal and actual Jewish dispersion, as in reff.: and the Epistle must be considered as addressed, from the head of the mother church in Jerusalem, to the Jewish believers, residing among the dispersed tribes of Israel), **greeting** (the formula *χαίρειν* is not found in the address of any other apostolical Epistle; but it occurs in the Epistle drawn up under the direction of James to the

2^o Πᾶσαν χαρὰν ^f ἡγήσασθε, ἀδελφοί μου, ὅταν ^e πει- ^e = Phil. ii. 29.
 ρασμοῖς ^h περιπέσσητε ¹ ποικίλοις, ³ γινώσκοντες ὅτι τὸ ² Cor. xii. 12.
^k δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως ¹ κατεργάζεται ^m ὑπομονήν. ^f = Heb. x. 29
⁴ ἡ δὲ ^m ὑπομονὴ ^{no} ἔργον ^p τέλειον ^o ἐχέτω, ^{ἵνα} ἡτε ^p τέλειον. ^{ref.} 2 Pet.
^{iii.} 15 ^{Eur.}

ἡγοῦ. g = Acts xx. 19. 1 Pet. i. 6. Sir. xxxvi. (xxxiii) 1. h Luke x. 30. Acta
 xxvii. 41 only. 2 Kings i. 6. i Heb. ii. 4. ref. k 1 Pet. i. 7 only. Ps. xi. 6. Prov.
 xxvii. 21 only. (-mōs, ver. 12) l = Rom. iv. 15. v. 3. vii. 8. 2 Cor. iv. 17 al. n = 1 Thess.
 viii. 15. Rom. ii. 7. 2 Thess. i. 4. Heb. xii. 1. ch. v. 11. 2 Pet. i. 6. Ezra x. 2. p Matt. v. 48. xix. 21. James, vv. 17,
 i. 3. 2 Thess. i. 11 al. o ch. ii. 14, 18. 25. ch. iii. 2. Ps. cxxxviii. 22.

CHAPE. I. 3. om της πιστωσης B² 81 lat^{ff} syr: AB¹CKL[P]N rel vulg vind Syr copt
 aeth arm Thl₁ [Aug.] Bede₁.

Gentile churches in Acts xv. 23).
 2—12.] *Exhortations regarding the endurance of trials.* 2.] Think it all joy (χαράν, following up χαίρειν, a characteristic of the style of this Epistle: so ὑπομονήν ἡ δὲ ὑπομονή, ver. 3; λειπόμενοι εἰ δέ τις λείπεται, ver. 4 f.; διακρινόμενος δὲ δὲ διακρινόμενος, ver. 6; ἀπειραστός ἐστι . . . πειράζει δέ, ver. 13; βραδὺς εἰς ὁργήν ὁργὴ γάρ, ver. 19 f.; τὸν ἔμφυτον λόγον . . . γίνεσθε δὲ ποιηταὶ λόγου, ver. 21 f.; τούτου μάταιος ἡ θρησκεία θρησκεία καθαρὰ κ.τ.λ., ver. 26 f.;—yea, and that when &c. *πᾶσαν*, as in *ref.*, not “*all (of it) joy*,” eitel Freude, as Luther: but “*all sorts of*,” “*every kind of*,” “*all conceivable*,” “*rem revera omnique ex parte letam*,” as Theile, in Huther. Bengel’s idea is good, that ‘all’ is used as applying to all kinds of temptations; transferred from the subject to the predicate), *my brethren* (this is the constant address in our Epistle. It betokens community of origin and of faith), *whenever ye fall into* (περιπίπτειν is used of becoming unexpectedly surrounded by adverse circumstances of any kind: so in *ref.*: so ὅστις ἂν τοιαύταις συμφοραῖς περιπέσῃ, Plato, Legg. ix. p. 877 c: μεγάλοις ἀτυχήμασιν ὕπ’ Αἰτωλῶν, καὶ μεγάλας συμφοραῖς περιπεσόντες, Polyb. iv. 19. 13: περιπεσὼν βίαιοις πληγαῖς, ib. iii. 116. 9. Herodotus also uses the expression, cf. vi. 16, and Thuc. ii. 54) *various temptations* (the πειρασμοί here are not only what we properly call *temptations*, but any kind of distresses which happen to us, from without or from within, which in God’s purpose serve as *trials* of us: the latter word being, in this its now common general meaning, a word derived from the Christian life. See *ref.* 1 Pet., which is strictly parallel. *Ec.* says, after Chrys. (in Catena), τὴν κατὰ θεὸν λύπην καὶ τοὺς πειρασμοὺς τούτους καὶ ἐπαινετοὺς οἶδε καὶ χαρὰς ἀξίους· δεσμός γὰρ οὗτοί εἰσιν ἀβραγῆς, καὶ αὐτῆς ἀγάπης καὶ κατανύξεως. Then, after quoting Sir. ii. 1: John xvi. 33: and Matt. vii. 14, . . . οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἐκτός γυμνασίων οὐτε κοσ-

μικῶν οὐτε τῶν κατὰ θεὸν στεφάνων ἀξιωθῆναι): 3.] *Ground of this joy: knowing* (as you do) *that the proof of your faith* (δοκίμιον, or δοκιμείον, Plato, Tim. p. 65 c. Pott explains it, “*quo quid exploratur*,” Heisen, “*quo rei, quæ sub examen vocatur, manifestatur sinceritas, eaque probatur omne id intrinseca virtute possidere, quod extrinsecus specie et nomine præ se fert*.” So in Dion. Hal. Rhetor. ii., δὲ δὲ ὥσπερ κανὼν εἶναι καὶ σταθμὴν τινα καὶ δοκίμιον ὠρισμένον πρὸς ὃ τις ἀποβλέπων δυνήσεται τὴν κρίσιν ποιέσθαι: so, but joining with the idea of a test that of amelioration and perfecting also, Herodian ii. 10. 12, δοκίμιον δὲ στρατιωτῶν κάματος ἀλλ’ οὐ τροφή. The word must be taken here as abstract, ‘the proving,’ not as concrete, ‘the medium of proof,’ viz. the temptations. See further on 1 Pet. i. 7) *worketh* (*ref.*) *endurance* (ὑπομονή, “*perseverantia, quod magis est quam patientia*,” Theile. But does not St. Paul, Rom. v. 3, 4, state precisely the converse, viz. that ἡ θλῆψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκίμην? Doubtless: but it is really the same that is said: θλῆψις there = τὸ δοκίμιον here. As De Wette observes, the thought is not carried to its end as in Rom., but the Apostle breaks away at ὑπομονήν to exhort respecting it): 4.] but (q. d. and be not weary of enduring: but) *let endurance have a perfect work* (σκόπει, οὐκ εἶπε τὴν ὑπομονὴν ὀριστικῶς, ὅτι ἔργον τέλειον ἔχει, ἀλλὰ προστακτικῶς, ἐχέτω· οὐ γὰρ προϋποκειμένην ἀρετὴν ἐξαγγέλλει, ἀλλὰ νῦν ἐγγινομένην ὥς χρὴ γενέσθαι νομοθετεῖ. *Ec.* In fact, from the repetition of ἔργον from κατεργάζεται, it is much as if he had said ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ κατεργάζεσθω σωτηρίαν τέλειον. The allusion seems to be to our Lord’s saying Matt. xxiv. 13, ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος, οὗτος σωθήσεται. So that the words are to be taken simply and literally; ὑπομονή as the abstract, endurance, and ἔργον as the work wrought out (see *ref.*) by ὑπομονή in its continuance: not as by De Wette after Erasmus (“*Tolerantia non*

καὶ ὁλόκληροι, ἐν μηδενὶ ⁵ λειπόμενοι. ⁵ εἰ δέ τις ὑμῶν
q 1 Thess. v. 23 only. Deut. xxv. 6 al. r neut, so Heb. xii. 4 reff. s = ch. ii. 15 (Luke xviii. 22. Tit. i. 6. iii. 13) only. t = ch. iii. 13, 15, 17. ⁵ λέγεται σοφίας, ^{uv} αἰτεῖτω ^v παρὰ τοῦ δίδοντος θεοῦ
u in James (ch. v. 2, 3) and 1 John (ii. 22. v. 14, &c.) always of prayer. v John iv. 9. Acts iii. 2. ix. 2. Zech. x. 1 al. w here only. Prov. x. 5. Wisd. xvi. 27. 2 Macc. vi. 6 only. x Matt. xi. 20 al. Sir. xii. 22. xv. 15. y Matt. vii. 7. z Matt. xxi. 21. Acts x. 20. Rom. iv. 20. xiv. 23. Jude 22. (Jer. xv. 10)
 πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ ^x ὀνειδίζοντος, καὶ ^y δοθήσεται αὐτῷ.
⁶ αἰτεῖτω δὲ ἐν πίστει, μηδὲν ^z διακρινόμενος· ὁ γὰρ

ABCKL
 P S a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m o
 13

5. του θεου hef του διδοντος A: om θεου j.

habebit laudem absolutam, nisi quædammodum in malis tolerandis fortis est et alacris, ita in bonis operibus exercendis sibi constet"), Calov, Morus ("Tolerantia adjunctum habent factum"), Pott ("Perseverantiæ fructus sit perfectum virtutis studium"), al., to be understood as if ὑπομονή were ὁ ὑπομένων, and ἔργον the aggregate of ἔργα. And τέλειος is not to be understood as = εἰς τέλος ὑπομένων, but in its ordinary sense of 'perfect,' fully brought out and accomplished. And as Bengel remarks, "Perfecta est patientia, quæ gaudet"), that ye may be perfect (for the work of God in a man is the man. If God's teaching by patience have had a perfect work in you, you are perfect: His is a λόγος ἐμφυτος, ver. 21. And the purpose of that work is, to make us perfect) and entire (that in which every part is present in its place: so we have ὁλόκληρος καὶ ὕγιής, Plato, Tim. p. 44 C: τὸ βασιλείον δὲν ἐν ὁλοκλήρῳ τῷ γένει, Corp. Insc. 353. 26. The word is much used in Philo (see also Athenæus vii. p. 700 and Pollux i. 1 in Wolf here) of sacrifices and sacrificing priests, in a technical sense, of which however there is no trace here), deficient in nothing (the subjoining a negative corroboration to a positive clause is characteristic of St. James: cf. vv. 5 and 6. The expression here is illustrated by Raphael from Polyb. p. 1202, l. 15, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους εὐνοίᾳ παρὰ πολλὴν τὰ δειλοῦ λειπόμενος. Here however there is no comparison with others, only one implied with that ὁλοκληρία which ought to be their ultimate state). 5.] But (q. d. but this perfection and entireness, this defect in nothing, will not be yet attained; and you will find, when you aim at it, that you are lacking in the very first requisite) if any of you (εἰ is not "quandoquidem," as Estius, but εἰ τις is as usual 'if any,' and nearly = ὅστις ἔν) is deficient in (of, gen. as in ch. ii. 15) wisdom (τὸ αἶτιον τοῦ τελείου ἔργου σοφίαν λέγει, Gc. Huther quotes from the Etym. Mag., γνώσις μὲν ὅτι τὸ εἰδέναι τὰ ὄντα σοφία δέ, καὶ τὸ τὰ ὄντα γινώσκειν καὶ τὸ τὰ γνωστὰ πράττειν. For what is meant by wisdom here, see ch. iii. 15—17), let him ask (either supply 'εἰ,' or take

the verb absolutely, which is better: so E. V., see below) from God who giveth (the part. is put first because it is that which is to be brought out in the sentence: q. d. 'from the giver, God.' Thus asking and giving are put forward as belonging to us and God in the abstract, and we do not want any object, as τὴν σοφίαν, supplied) to all men simply (so Rom. xii. 8, ὁ μεταδίδους, ἐν ἀπλότῃ: but perhaps ἀπλότης may also signify liberality. See note on that place. It is not however necessary here to render "benigne," as Bede, Casaubon, al.: nor "affluenter," as Erasmus, Grot., Est., al.; nor "candidè," "sincere," as Pott, Theile, al.; nor = συντόμιος, καθάπαξ, as Hesychius: but we must interpret by what follows, and understand it of simply giving, and adding nothing afterwards which may take off from the graciousness of the gift) and upbraideth not (in what sense is rather doubtful. Many (Morus, Carpzov, Storr, al.) interpret it of sending away with a refusal: but as Huther remarks, though κατασχέιν may bear this meaning, ὀνειδίζειν is never found so used: certainly not in Sir. xx. 15, ἔφρων . . . ὀλίγα δώσει καὶ πολλὰ ὀνειδίζει. By far the greatest part of Commentators understand it of reproaching by the recounting of benefits bestowed. But this again does not reach the full and general nature of the expression here: nor does it find any justification in that of Demosthenes, p. 316. 10, ὑπομιμνήσκειν τὰς ἰδίας εὐεργεσίας μικρὸν δεῖν ὁμοῖον ἐστὶ τῷ ὀνειδίζειν: for it is one thing to say that such reminding is almost equivalent to ὀνειδίζειν, and another and a widely different one to use ὀνειδίζειν in this sense, which is never done. The real meaning here is just as in Sir. xx. 15 above, and in Sir. xli. 22, μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι μὴ ὀνειδίζει, viz. upbraiding with any kind of reproaches, as God might well do, so unworthy are we to approach Him with any request. This of course would include that other: but as Semler, "Non tantum significat molestam commemorationem beneficiorum, sed etiam qualemcunque reprehensionem." So De Wette and Huther), and it shall be given to him (viz. σοφία, see 3 Kings iii. 9—12.

^a διακρινόμενος ^a ἔοικεν ^b κλύδωνι θαλάσσης ^c ἀνεμιζομένῳ ^a = ver. 23 only. Xen. Mem. i. 6. 10. καὶ ^d ῥιπιζομένῳ. ⁷ μὴ γὰρ ^e οἰέσθω ^f ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος, ^b Luke vii. 24 only. Jon. i. 4, 11, 12. ⁸ ὅτι ^f λήμψεται τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου. ⁸ ἀνὴρ ^g διψυχος, ^c here only. ^d here only. ^e (-πῆ), 1 Cor. i. 13. ^h ἀκατάστατος ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ⁱ ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ. ⁹ ^j καυχάσθω ⁱ = Matt xxi. 16. ^g ch. xv. 16. ^h (Rom ii. 17. v. 3. Gal. ii. 13 [all these w. ἐν]) only. Jer. ix. 23.

7. om τι [C¹(appy: om to para is written over an erasure)] N 36.

The whole verse seems to be written in remembrance of Matt. vii. 7—12. 6.] But let him ask in faith (persuasion that God can and will give: cf. Matt. xxi. 22, πάντα ὅσα ἐὰν αἰτήσῃτε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες λήμψεσθε: and cf. εὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως, ch. v. 15), nothing (μὴδὲν is adverbial, as in Mark v. 26: Luke iv. 35: Acts iv. 21; x. 20, μὴδὲν διακρινόμενος as here: so also xi. 12 al. In all these places it will of course admit of being understood 'in nothing,' the accus. of reference: but it is simpler to believe that it had got past this and become an adverb) doubting (cf. Matt. xxi. 21, from which this is evidently taken, ἐὰν ἔρχητε πιστὶν καὶ μὴ διακριθῆτε, &c. Huther says well, "διακρίνεσθαι is not = ἀπιστεῖν (Luke xxiv. 11), but includes in it the essential character of ἀπιστία: while πίστις says 'Yes,' and ἀπιστία 'No,' διακρίνεσθαι is the union of 'Yes' and 'No,' but so that 'No' is the weightier: it is that inward giving way which leans not to πίστις, but to ἀπιστία. The deep-lying ground of it is pride, and so far Thl. is right in saying, διακρινόμενος δὲ ὁ μεθ' ὑπεροψίας αὐτῶν ὁβριστὴς ὁμολογουμένως ὁ διακρινόμενος: whereas Ec. in the words, λέγων ἐν σεαυτῷ ὅτι πᾶς δύναμαι αἰτῆσαι τι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ λαβεῖν, ἡμαρτηκὼς τοσαῦτα εἰς αὐτόν, brings out a point which belongs not to διακρίνεσθαι, but to a yet weak faith"): for he that doubteth is like (reff.) a wave of the sea (reff.). The verb κλύδωνιζεσθαι occurs Eph. iv. 14 and Isa. lvii. 20, οἱ ἄδικοι . . κλύδωνισθήσονται driven by the wind (a word no where else found. The corresponding ἀνεμοῦσθαι occurs in Hippocr., Plato (Tim. p. 83 A), Ælian, Lucian, al. It explains itself) and tossed about (ῥιπιζεσθαι, from ῥιπῆ (ῥιπαὶ ἀνέμων, Pind. Pyth. ix. 85: Soph. Antig. 137 al.; κυμάτων ἀνέμων τε, Pind. Pyth. iv. 346), to be blown about by wind: so τί δέ, εἰ μὴ πρὸς ἀνέμου ῥιπιζοιτο τὸ ὕδωρ, Philo de Mundo, § 18, vol. ii. p. 620: δῆμος ἄστατον κακόν, καὶ θαλάσση πάνθ' ὅμοιον ὑπ' ἀνέμου ῥιπιζεται, Dio Chrys. Orat. xxxii. p. 368 B. The more usual meaning of the verb (from ῥιπίς), to kindle (ῥιπίζεται, κατακαίεται,

Hesych.), is not applicable here. The word forms a synonym with ἀνεμιζεσθαι; and the use of these synonymous expressions so close to one another is again a characteristic of St. James. A good explanation of the figure is quoted by Wiesinger from Heisen: "Modo ad litus fidei speique jactatur, modo in abyssum diffidentiae revolvitur; modo in sublime tollitur fastus mundani, modo inis arenis miscetur nunc desperationis nunc afflictionis" &c.):

7.] for (takes up and repeats the former γάρ: not as Calvin, "non ergo existimet," nor as Huther, = nämlich) let not that man (said with a certain slight expression of contempt) think (cf. Matt. v. 17, μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι κ.τ.λ.) that he shall receive any thing (sc. τῶν αἰτουμένων: some things, as life, food, raiment, &c., he does continually receive) from the Lord (i. e. as usually in this Epistle, from God. So ch. iv. 10, 15; v. 4, 10, 11: see at each of those places. On the other hand, ὁ κύριος, ch. v. 7, 14, 15, is used of Christ. Hofmann remarks that where the Father is not expressly distinguished from the Son by the context, the Godhead, in its unity, is to be understood by ὁ θεός: and the same may be said of ὁ κύριος).

8.] He is a man with two minds, unstable (cf. Dio Chrys. above. Hippocrates uses it of fevers which observe no fixed periods: Demosth. p. 303, of the wind, ἀκατάστατον ὥσπερ ἐν θαλάττῃ πνεῦμα. We have ἀκατάστατος ch. iii. 16, and in Luke xxi. 9: 1 Cor. xiv. 33: 2 Cor. vi. 5; xii. 20) in all his ways (such is the best way of taking this sentence, making it all predicate and all to apply to ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος as its subject. The common way, to take ἀνὴρ διψυχος as a new subject, as E. V., "a double-minded man is unstable," has this against it, that it makes the very unusual word διψυχος, found here and in ch. iv. 8 for the first time in Greek literature, to be a mere usual epithet and word of passage. Another way, taken by Beza, al., is to make ἀνὴρ διψυχος, ἀκατάστ. κ.τ.λ., all subject, and in apposition with ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος,—"ut qui sit animo duplicei," &c. There is no objection to this, but that it

* Matt. xii. 29. δὲ ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ ^κ ταπεινὸς ἐν τῷ ¹ ὕψει αὐτοῦ, ¹⁰ ὁ δὲ ^{ABCKL}
 Luke i. 52. πλούσιος ἐν τῇ ^m ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὡς ^{no} ἄνθος ^{np} ^{PN a b c} ^{d f g h j} ^{k l m o} ¹³ ^{χόρ-}
 Rom. xii. 16. ² ^{Cor vii. 6.}
 x. 1. ch. iv. 6.
 & 1 Pet. v. 5 (both from Prov. iii. 34) only. Isa. xi. 4. 1 = here only. (Luke i. 78. xiv. 48. Eph. iii. 13.)
 18. iv. 8. Rev. xxi. 16 only. Job v. 11. 1. Luke i. 48. Acts vii. 33 (from Isa. lvi. 8). Phil. iii. 21 only.
 n here bis and 1 Pet. i. 24, from Isa. xl. 6 only. Ps. cii. 15. o as above (n). Job xiv. 2. p as above
 (n). Matt. vi. 30 al.

9. om ο (bef ἀδελφος) B 65 [arm].

does not so well suit the abrupt and predicative style of St. James. How De Wette can say that it would require the article, I cannot imagine: the art. would be only admissible in two cases: 1. if (δ) ἄνθρωπος were subject, and διψυχος, ἀκατάστατος . . . predicate; 2. on the rendering of the E. V., "The (a) double-minded man (generic) is," &c. But then we should surely not have ἄνθρωπος, but ἄνθρωπος. From this passage the use of διψυχος spread onwards in the Fathers: we have very early, in the Apostol. Constt. vii. 11, μὴ γίνου διψυχος ἐν προσευχῇ εἰ ἔσται ἡ οὐ: in Clem.-rom. i. 23, p. 260, ταλαίπωροι εἰσιν οἱ διψυχοι, οἱ διατάζοντες τὴν ψυχὴν. The διακρίνεσθαι arises out of the διψυχία: this causes him, as Sir. ii. 12, ἐπιβαίνειν ἐπὶ δύο τριβους. Cf. also Sir. i. 27, μὴ ἀπειθήσης φόβῳ κυρίου, καὶ μὴ προσέλθῃς αὐτῷ ἐν καρδίᾳ δισσῇ, and Tanchuma Rabba in Deut. xxvi. 17, "Ne habeant (qui preces ad Deum facere velint) duo corda, unum ad Deum, aliud vero ad aliam rem directum").

9.] The connexion appears to be this: we must not pray before God, we must not be before God, double-minded; in our trials, we shall get no heavenly wisdom, if this is so. This double-mindedness, one soul drawn upwards to God, the other drawn downwards to the world, causes nothing but instability, and cannot result in that joy which is to be our attitude in trial. And it arises from misapprehension of our appointed state in trial: the poor and humble forget the exceeding honour thus done to them, which ought to be to them ground of boasting, far more worthy than (see below) the rich in this world have in their riches which shall so soon fade away: whereas (ver. 12) he that is tried shall receive a crown of life from the Lord. But (contrasted with the διψυχία above) let the brother (the Christian believer) who is low (poor and afflicted; not merely, low in station: this explanation goes with the view that δὲ πλούσιος below is Christian also) glory in his exaltation (which he has obtained by being admitted into the fellowship of Christ's sufferings, and which he has further in reversion in the glorious crown of life hereafter, ver. 12): 10.] but the

* rich (not ὁ ἀδελφὸς ὁ πλούσιος, nor is the

πλούσιος to be understood any otherwise than in the rest of the Epistle, cf. ch. ii. 6 f.; v. 1 ff. There are difficulties either way; but on mature consideration I find those on the usual hypothesis, of the πλούσιος being also a brother, insuperable. For in that case, 1. a most unnatural change in the sense is necessary at ὅτι: 'Let the rich brother glory in his humiliation, for, or because, considered merely as a rich man,' &c.: so that ὁ πλούσιος is a Christian brother at first, and then a mere rich man in the next clause: 2. such a meaning will not suit οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς πορείαις αὐτοῦ μαρτυρήσεται, which is simply predicated of ὁ πλούσιος, the subject enunciated in ὁ δὲ πλούσιος above, and cannot with any probability be supposed to be said of him merely quoad his riches. Whereas on the other view the difficulties are no more than arise from a confessedly elliptical parallelism. After ὁ δὲ πλούσιος we must supply, not necessarily καυχᾶσθαι, but rather καυχᾶται: 'Let the ταπεινὸς glory in his exaltation, whereas the rich man glories in his debasement,' cf. Phil. iii. 19, ὧν ἡ δόξα ἐν τῇ αἰσχύνῃ αὐτῶν. The above view, as far as πλούσιος is concerned, is adopted by the author of the Comm. on the Lamentations in Jerome's works ("Quod autem dicit, filium Edom gaudere et lætari quod pervenient ad eam calix Domini, per ironiam legendum est, et est illud in epistola Jacobi apostoli . . . 'dives autem in humilitate sua,' subauditur a superiore gloriatur, quod non tamen ad gloriam, sed ad humilitatem ejus et damnationem pertinet"), Bede, Lyra, Thomas Aq., Beza, Wetst., Pott, Hottinger, Huther, al.: but impugned by De Wette, Wiesinger, Stier, al.) glories (see above) in his humiliation (cf. ref. Phil.: in that which is in reality his debasement, just as in the other case the lowly Christian is called on to boast in what is in reality his exaltation. Thus, and thus only, the parallelism coheres. On the ordinary view, the ὕψος of the ταπεινὸς brother is, that which is really but not apparently his exaltation, whereas the ταπεινώσις of the πλούσιος brother is that which is apparently but not really his debasement); because as a flower of the grass (reff.) he shall pass away.

11.] For (justification of ὡς ἄνθος χόρτου

του ⁹ παρελεύσεται. ¹¹ ἀνέτειλεν γὰρ ὁ ἥλιος σὺν τῷ ^q 2 Pet. in. 10
^s καύσωνι καὶ ^t ἐξήρανε τὸν ^p χόρτον, καὶ τὸ ὄνθος αὐτοῦ ^{ref.}
^u ἐξέπεσεν καὶ ἡ ^v εὐπρέπεια τοῦ ^w προσώπου αὐτοῦ ^x ἀπ- ^{r = Matt xii.}
^ω λητο· οὕτως καὶ ὁ πλούσιος ἐν ταῖς ^y πορείαις αὐτοῦ ^{intr, Heb.}
^z μαραινθήσεται. ¹² μακάριος ἀνὴρ ὃς ^a ὑπομένει ^b πειρασ- ^{u. 14 reff.}
^{μόν}, ὅτι ^c δοκιμος γενόμενος λήμψεται τὸν ^d στέφανον ^{s Matt xx 12.}
^{τῆς} ^{d^f} ζωῆς, ὃν ^e ἐπηγγέιλαι τοῖς ^h ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν. ^{Luka xii. 55}
¹³ μηδεὶς ⁱ πειραζόμενος λεγέτω ὅτι ^k ἀπὸ θεοῦ ⁱ πειράζο ^{on^f, Job. vi}
^{xlx. 2. Lam. i 6.} ^{w = Luke xii 56. Ps. ciii. 30.} ^{x = 1 Pet i 7 reff.} ^{v here only. Ps.}
^{xiii. 22 only.} ^{a = plur., Ps. lxxv. 24. Nah. ii. 5.} ^{z here only. Job xxiv. 24.} ^{y Luke}
^{20 only.} ^{a = & constr., Heb. x. 32 reff.} ^{b = ver. 2.} ^{c Rom xiv.}
^{18. xvi. 10. 1 Cor xi. 19. 2 Cor x. 18. xiii. 7. 2 Tim. ii 15 only.} ^{3 Kings x. 18.} ^{d Rev. ii. 10.}
^{e 2 Tim iv. 8. 1 Pet. v. 4 al. Prov. iv. 9.} ^{f = 1 Pet. iii. 7.} ^{Phil. ii. 16.} ^{g = Heb. x.}
^{23 reff. acc. rei. Rom. iv. 21. dat pers., Heb. vi. 13 al.} ^{h Rom. viii. 28. 1 Cor. ii. 8. ch. ii. 8.}
^{i = 1 Cor. vii 5 x. 13. Gal vi. 1 al.} ^{k = Acts ii. 22. 2 Cor. iiii. 18.}

11. om 2nd αυτου B. ποριαις A[N] 40. 89. 97 Thl. for 3rd αυτ., εαυτου C¹(appy).

12. for ανηρ, ανθρωπος A 70. 104. υπομενει KL[P] fil, υπομενη m; susti-
 nuere^{it} lat-ff; Chrom.; suffert^{it} vulg: υπομεινη 13. rec aft επηγγειλαιτο ins o
 κυριος, with KL[P] rel syr arm-zoh(1805) Thl (Ec, κυριος C 117; o θεος 4. 13(appy).
 27-9. 103 vulg Syr copt æth: om ABN a¹ lat-ff, arm-usc.

13. for απο, υπο N a. rec ins του bef θεου: om ABCKL[P]N rel Eus Cyr [-P₂]
 Damasc Thl Œc.

παρελεύσεται) the sun arose (it is given in the form of a tale, a narration of what happened and ever does happen: see Isa. xl. 7, from which the whole is adapted) with the heat (or, the hot east wind, the $\tau\eta\lambda$: this interpretation seems approved by ref. Jonah, καὶ ἐγένετο ἅμα τῷ ἀνατεῖλαι τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ προσέταξεν ὁ θεὸς (κύριος ὁ θ. Α) πνεύματι καύσωνι (-νος ABN): see Winer, Realw. art. "Wind." But καύσων in ref. Matt. and Isa. xlix. 10, is evidently only heat: and considering, 1. the relation between that Gospel and St. James, and, 2. that the LXX, when the *Kadim* is intended, almost always add ὁ ἄνεμος or τὸ πνεῦμα, I prefer the other meaning, the arid scorching which accompanies the increasing power of the sun), *and dried up the grass, and the flower thereof fell away (all from Isaiah), and the beauty of its appearance (so πρῶσπον in reff., the external appearance of any thing) perished: thus also shall the rich man (the same as was spoken of ver. 10: not ὁ πλούσιος αὐτοῦ, but the πλούσιος himself) wither (reff.: the verb continues the similitude) in his ways (cf. ref. Psalm and Prov. ii. 8. Luther's translation, in seiner Habe, rests on the reading πορίαις). 12.] We now return to the suffering and tempted Christian, who has his μακαρισμός, and a possession more precious and more sure than worldly wealth. Blessed is the man (no stress on ἀνὴρ, cf. vv. 7, 8, 20) who endureth (the emphasis is on ὑπομένει,

which distinguishes this saying from that in ver. 2; it is not the mere περιπεσεῖν πειρασμοῖς, but the ὑπομένειν πειρασμόν, which is felicitated. There is no reason to read ὑπομενει, as Bengel. The blessing is categorical, and as well expressed by the present as by the future) temptation: because when he has become approved (by the trial: when he has undergone the δοκίμιον, ver. 2. This δοκιμος γενόμενος, as connected with that verse, furnishes some support to the reading which omits τῆς πίστεως there. The δοκίμιον is of himself, and it is he that becomes δοκιμος by it) he shall receive the crown of life (τῆς ζωῆς is gen. of apposition: the crown is life eternal: τῆς ζωῆς, 'vitæ illius,' of that life of which we know, which is glorious and eternal. No image derived from athletes must be thought of in the verse, as is done by many: such an image would be foreign to the ideas of Jews, with whom the receiving a crown from God was a familiar image, irrespective of any previous contest for a prize: cf. Ps. xxi. 3: Wisd. v. 16, λήψονται τὸ βασίλειον τῆς εὐπρεπείας καὶ τὸ διάδημα τοῦ κάλλους ἐκ χειρὸς κυρίου), which He promised to them that love Him (ὡς ὁ promised it, is understood: God, repeatedly, in substance: whenever a kingdom is foretold as the future inheritance of His people: τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, cf. 2 Tim. iv. 8, and the same words again in ch. ii. 5. It is a formula frequently occurring in the law and the Prophets: cf.

1 here only †. **μαί.** ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ¹ἀπειράστος ἐστὶν κακῶν, ¹πειράζει δὲ ABCKL
FN a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13
αὐτὸς οὐδένα, ¹⁴ἐκαστος δὲ ¹πειράζεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἰδίας
^mἐπιθυμίας ⁿἐξελκόμενος καὶ ^oδελεαζόμενος. ¹⁵ρεῖτα ἡ
Col. iii. 5. 1 Thess. iv. 5 al. n here only †. (Prov. xxiv. [xix.] 33 only.) ἐξελκύνει, Job xx. 13.
o 2 Pet. ii. 14, 18 only †. p Mark iv. 7. Luke viii. 12. 1 Cor. xv. 24 al.

15. om η (vel ἐπιθυμία) C.

Exod. xx. 6: Deut. vii. 9: Judg. v. 31: Neh. i. 5: Ps. v. 11; cxliv. 20: Dan. ix. 4: Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 16; xlvii. 22).

13—15.] *The truth respecting temptation.*

13.] Let no one when tempted (in the manner hitherto spoken of through the chapter. There is no warrant for changing in the slightest degree the reference of the word. The 'tentatio' is a trying of the man by the solicitation of evil: whether that evil be the terror of external danger, or whatever it be, all *πειράζεσθαι* by means of it arises not from God, but from ourselves—our own *ἐπιθυμία*. God ordains the temptation, overrules the temptation, but does not tempt, is not the spring of the solicitation to sin) say that (ὅτι recitantis) I am tempted from God (by agency proceeding out and coming from God: very different from ὑπὸ θεοῖ, which would represent God as the agent: as indeed He is in *πειράζει δὲ αὐτὸς οὐδένα* below. See Winer, § 47 b. b note. Thus the man would transfer his own responsibility to God. There does not seem to be any allusion to the fatalism of the Pharisees, as Schneckenburger, al. seem to think: the fault is one of common life, and is alluded to Sir. xv. 11, *μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι διὰ κύριον ἀπέστην*):

* For God is unversed in things evil (the meaning usually given, "untempted," or "not able to be tempted," is against the usage of the word. It occurs in four forms, *ἀπειράτος*, *ἀπειρᾶτος*, *ἀπείρητος* (Ion.), and *ἀπειραστος*, and in all of them seems to have but two meanings: 1. *that has not been tried*: so οὐδὲν ἀπειράτον ἐστὶ τι, Dem. p. 310; πόντος ἀπείραστος ὢν τοῖς Ἑλλησι, Luc. Tox. 3: 2. *that has not tried*: so οὐκ ἀπείραστος καλῶν, Pind. Ol. 10 (11). 18; ἀλλοδαπῶν οὐκ ἀπειράτοι δδμοι, id. Nem. 1. 33; κακῶν ἀπείραστος (that has never experienced adversity), Plut. παρρησίας, ἔρωτος ἀπείραστος, unversed in free speaking, in love, Lucian, Plut. See Palm and Rost's Lex., and numerous other examples in Wetstein. And even if we chose here to depart from usage, and suppose that *ἀπειραστος* is not a later form of *ἀπείραστος*, but a verbal from *πειράω*, to be interpreted by the meaning of that verb in the context, we should get a meaning for *ἀπείραστος* entirely foreign from the context: viz. that

God is not tempted of evil, whereas there is no question here of God *being tempted*, but of God *tempting*. Some have endeavoured to escape this by giving *ἀπείραστος* an active sense—"God is not one who tempteth to evil." So Schol. in Cramer's Catena: ὅτι ὁ θεὸς *πειράζων* ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ κακοποιῆσαι διὰ καὶ ἐλέχθη ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀπείραστος ἐστὶ κακῶν: so the Æthiopic version: the vulg., "Deus intentator malorum est." Luther, al. This doubtless it *may have*: we find *μηροὶ καλυπτῆς ἐξέκειντο τιμελῆς*, Soph. Ant. 1011: *τῶμ' τάνδρ' μεμπτός*, id. Trach. 446: *ὑποπτος Τρωϊκῆς ἀλώσεως*, Eur. Hec. 1117. But there are two objections: 1. that this sense would be tautological, the succeeding clause only repeating the assertion: 2. that thus the gen. κακῶν can only mean 'of evil men': 'God is no tempter of evil men,' which is out of the question. It seems then that we must take refuge in the ordinary meaning of the word, and render it 'unversed in,' 'having no experience of.' And thus De Wette and Huther. Ec. takes the words as in the citation from Plutarch above; *τὸ εἶδόν τε καὶ μακάριον οὔτε αὐτὸ πράγματα ἔχει, οὔτε ἑτέροις παρέχει*: which is decidedly wrong. Taken as above, *ἀπείραστος* does not carry a negation of *πειράζει*, but forms a paronomasia with it: and the sentiment is just as in the passage of Sir. above quoted, which goes on *πάν βδέλυγμα ἐμίσησεν κύριος*, but (the δὲ takes up the contrast again from *πειράζομαι*: 'not so, but.' I may observe that the δὲ is against the ordinary acception of *ἀπείραστος*, on which it ought to be καὶ) **HE** tempteth no man (the αὐτός does not, as commonly supposed, bring out God's action in distinction to His not being tempted—as He is not tempted, so neither does He himself tempt any man' (see this urged in Wiesinger): but brings out this, that the temptation indeed takes place, but from another cause. Huther gives the sense well: "Let none say when he is tempted to evil, From God am I tempted: for God hath no part in evil: but as to the temptation, He tempteth no man" &c.): 14.] but each man is tempted, being (slightly causal, 'in that he is') drawn out and enticed by his own lust (the image, if

^m ἐπιθυμία ^q συλλαβοῦσα τίκει ἁμαρτίαν, ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ^q ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ^s ἀποκύει θάνατον. ¹⁶ ^t Μὴ πλανᾶσθε,

^r Luke xiii 32 only ^t. ² Mace xv. 39 only. ³ Plato, Gorg. 503, ἀποτελεῖν ἐπιθυμίαν.
¹⁵ only ^r. ¹ 1 Cor vi. 9. xv. 33. Gal. vi. 7. Isa. xlii. 8.

^s ver.

we are justified in supposing that a fixed one was contemplated from the first, seems to be, as Pott observes (in Huther), “ἐπιθυμία, ἁμαρτία, et θάνατος personarum vim habent: imaginem meretricis suppeditant voces συλλαβεῖν, τίκειν, ἀποκύειν, necnon et ἐξέλκειν atque δελεάζειν.” The participles ἐξερχόμενος and δελεαζόμενος are abundantly illustrated by the Commentators, e. g. in Wetst. by Xen. Mem. ii. 1. 4, τὰ . . . ζωὰ . . . τούτων γὰρ δήπου τὰ μὲν γαστρὶ δελεαζόμενα . . . τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τοῦ φαγεῖν ἀγόμενα πρὸς τὸ δέλεαρ, ἀλίσκεται. And Herod. ii. 70, of taking the crocodile, ἐπεὶν ὧτων ὑὸς δελεάζει περὶ ἄγκιστρον κ.τ.λ. . . . ὁ κροκόδειλος . . . ἐπεὶν ἐξελκυσθῆ ἔς γῆν κ.τ.λ. Schneckenburger says, “ἐξέλκειν et δελεάζειν sunt verba e re venatoria et piscatoria in rem amatoriam et inde in nostrum tropum translata:” only we must not here interpret ἐξέλκειν which precedes δελεάζειν, as in Herod. above, “to draw to land,” but rather as Schulthess, “ellicere bestias ex tuto, ubi latent, in locum hamis retibusque expositum.” But, as Huther observes, it is hardly likely that the original reference of the words would be distinctly before the Apostle as he used them. Cf. Aristot. Polit. v. 10, παρὰ τῆς γυναίκος ἐξελκυσθεῖς, “ab uxore sollicitatus.” In the Test. XII. Patrum, p. 702 (Κυρρε), Joseph says of Potiphar’s wife, εἰς πορνείαν με ἐφέλκυσσάτο. And cf. Homer’s αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλκεται ἄνδρα σίδηρος, Od. π. 294: and, which is the nearest correspondence of all, Plut. de Sera Numinis Vindicta (in Huther), τὸ γλυκὺ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὥσπερ δέλεαρ ἐξέλκει (ἀνθρώπους). With regard to the matter treated, and the proper sense of ἐπιθυμία here, it seems to me that Huther is right in setting aside the difficulties which Hofmann (Schriftb. i. p. 415) and after him Wiesinger, have found in this passage as compared with Rom. vii. 7. St. James is not here speaking of the *original* source of sin in man, but of the actual source of temptation to sin, when it occurs. The ἁμαρτία of St. Paul, the sinful principle in man, is not here in question: we take up the matter, so to speak, lower down the stream: and the ἐπιθυμία here is the ἐπιθυμία there, itself the effect of sin (abstr.) in the members, and leading to sin (concrete) in the conduct):

15.] then lust having conceived, bringeth forth sin: and (δέ) brings out the new subject) sin, when completed, bringeth

forth death (it has been questioned whether ἁμαρτία is here in one, or in two senses. De Wette holds that the first ἁμαρτία is the purpose, or inner act, of sin,—the ἀποτελεσθεῖσα carrying this ἁμαρτία out into an act, which act brings forth death, the wages of sin. But this is decidedly wrong. Wiesinger has disputed it, and insisted rightly that the *inner act* is the union of the will with the ἐπιθυμία, the τίκειν denoting extrusion into outward act: then the second ἁμαρτία,—which Huther rightly maintains to be, not as Wiesinger, after Calvin, “cursus peccandi completus,” but the sinful act when brought to perfection in all its consequences, in a series of results following on one another and bringing a man under bondage to his sin,—being thus perfected, brings forth eternal death. The imagery is throughout consistent. The harlot ἐπιθυμία, ἐξέλκει and δελεάζει the man: the guilty union is committed by the will embracing the temptress: the consequence is that she τίκειν ἁμαρτίαν, sin, in general, of some kind, of that kind to which the temptation inclines: then, ἡ ἁμαρτία, that particular sin, when grown up and mature, —herself ἀποκύει, ‘extrudit,’ as if all along pregnant with it, Death, the final result of sin. So that temptation to sin cannot be from God, while trial is from Him. The one, being δοκίμιον ἡμῶν, κατεργάζεται ὑπομονήν: ἡ δὲ ὑπομονή, ἔργον τέλειον ἔχουσα, τὴν ζωὴν: the other, being ἐξελκυσις κ. δέλεαρ arising from ἐπιθυμία, τίκειν ἁμαρτίαν: ἡ δὲ ἁμαρτία ἀποτελεσθεῖσα ἀποκύει θάνατον. The English reader will not fail to remember Milton’s sublime allegory in Paradise Lost, where Satan, by his own evil lust, brings forth sin: and then by an incestuous union with Sin (which doubtless may be said to lie here also in the background, no cause being assigned for the ἀποκύει) causes her to bring forth Death. As regards the single expressions, συλλαβοῦσα τίκειν is a regular LXX formula for $\text{לָּקַחַת וְיָלְדָה}$: cf. reiff. Gen., also xxx. 17 al. fr. ἀποκύειν, or ἀποκυεῖν (either is allowable, see Winer, § 15) is found principally in later Greek: Wetst. gives examples from Maximus Tyr., Herodian, Lucian, Phlegon,—all with this meaning. For ἀποτελεσθεῖσα, cf. Polyb. ii. 58. 7, τὸ μέγιστον ἀέβημα κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἀπετέλεσται).

16—18.] The idea that God tempts to sin has been as yet only negatively contradicted. But so far

u 2 Pet. iii. 15. ^u ἀδελφοί μου ^u ἀγαπητοί. 17 ^u πᾶσα ^v δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ ^{ABCKL} ^{PN a b c} ^{d f g h j} ^{k l m o} ¹³ ^u πᾶν ^w δώρημα ^x τέλειον ^y ἄνωθεν ἔστιν ^z καταβαίνον ἀπὸ ^u τοῦ ^{ab} πατρὸς τῶν ^{bc} φώτων, ^d παρ' ^e ᾧ οὐκ ^e ἔνι ^f παραλλαγῇ ¹³

^u 2 Pet. iii. 15. ^u ἀδελφοί μου ^u ἀγαπητοί. 17 ^u πᾶσα ^v δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ ^{ABCKL} ^{PN a b c} ^{d f g h j} ^{k l m o} ¹³ ^u πᾶν ^w δώρημα ^x τέλειον ^y ἄνωθεν ἔστιν ^z καταβαίνον ἀπὸ ^u τοῦ ^{ab} πατρὸς τῶν ^{bc} φώτων, ^d παρ' ^e ᾧ οὐκ ^e ἔνι ^f παραλλαγῇ ¹³

^u 2 Pet. iii. 15. ^u ἀδελφοί μου ^u ἀγαπητοί. 17 ^u πᾶσα ^v δόσις ἀγαθὴ καὶ ^{ABCKL} ^{PN a b c} ^{d f g h j} ^{k l m o} ¹³ ^u πᾶν ^w δώρημα ^x τέλειον ^y ἄνωθεν ἔστιν ^z καταβαίνον ἀπὸ ^u τοῦ ^{ab} πατρὸς τῶν ^{bc} φώτων, ^d παρ' ^e ᾧ οὐκ ^e ἔνι ^f παραλλαγῇ ¹³

17. καταβαινων A 13.

for ενι, εστιν [P]N b¹ c d o 36.

is it from this being so, that *He is the Author of all good*. 16.] Do not err

(some have ended the paragraph with these words: some have begun a new one. But Theile (in Huther) rightly remarks of this formula, "Ubi antecedentia respicit, nunquam finit cohortationem, sed ita interpositum est, ut continuet et firmet, nunc illustrando, nunc cavendo." It occurs in ref.: see also 1 John iii. 7 (μηδεὶς πλανᾷτω ὑμᾶς). Still we must not take Theile's further exposition, "Nolite in alterum errorem abstrahi, ut nempe bona quoque a summo numine abjudicetis:" for this does not lie in the context), my beloved brethren (both this earnest address, and the caution, shew how important the Writer feels this to be, which he is about to enunciate): 17.] every good gift (δότης, properly *the act of giving*: but the ideas of the giving and the gift are so convertible, that it as often has the passive meaning: as πράξις, and other similar words. So in ref. Prov., δόσις λάθριος ανατρέπει ὄργαν, δῶρον δὲ ὁ φειδόμενος θυμὸν ἐγείρει ἰσχυρόν) and every perfect gift (we cannot express δότης and δώρημα by two words in English. There is a slight climax in δώρημα, as there is in τέλειον compared with ἀγαθὴ: it brings out the gratuitous and 'proprio motu' element in the gift, as is done again by βουληθεὶς below. πᾶσα and πᾶν are taken by Raphael, Bengel, al. in an exclusive sense, "nothing but good gifts and perfect gifts" &c. This is perhaps allowable, but it weakens the force of the sentence and spoils the context, the object of which is to shew, not that God's gifts are all good, but that all good gifts come from Him. So that πᾶσα and πᾶν are better kept in their ordinary senses, and the stress laid, in each case, on the adjectives, ἀγαθόν and τέλειον) descendeth from above (ἄνωθεν ἔστιν καταβαίνον belong together, not as E. V., Grot., Wolf, al., ἄνωθεν ἔστιν, καταβαίνον. This is shewn by ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη, ch. iii. 15. ἔστιν serves to bring out the essential quality of the gift; is, by its nature, sent down from above. Wies. quotes from Bereschith Rabba, 51. 1, "Dixit R. Chanina, Non est res mala

descendens desuper"), from the Father of the lights (of heaven) (it seems now generally agreed that by τὰ φῶτα here is meant the heavenly bodies, and by πατήρ the creator, originator, as in Job xxxviii. 28, τίς ἐστὶν υἱοῦ πατρὸς; Being this, being the Father of those glorious fountains of light, and thus (see below) purer and clearer than they all, it cannot be that He should tempt to evil. Our very life, as renewed in Christ, is of His begetting, and we are a firstfruit of His new world.

Various meanings have been given to τῶν φώτων—spiritual light, Grot.: illumination, with reference to the Urim, Heisen: "luminum spiritualium in regno gratiæ et gloriæ," Bengel: "omnis perfectionis, bonitatis, sapientiæ et prosperitatis," Wolf, Benson, al.: "omnis et præstantiæ et bene compositi ordinis," Calv. As regards the word φῶτα, we have, Ps. cxxxv. 7 ff., τῷ ποιήσαντι φῶτα μεγάλα . . . τὸν ἥλιον . . . τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας κ.τ.λ.: Jer. iv. 23, ἐπέβλεψα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἵδον οὐθέν, καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ οὐκ ἦν τὰ φῶτα αὐτοῦ. In Gen. i. 14, 16 they are φαστῆρες, with ('chez,' 'apud,' 'bei: see ref.) whom there is (ἐν, abbreviation of ἐνεστί: see ref. Not = ἐστί, but carrying the meaning 'inest,' 'there is in Him') no change (πόθεν δέ, says Arrian on Epict. i. 14, p. 62, πρὸς τὴν αἰξήσιν καὶ μείωσιν τῆς σελήνης, καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου πρόσ- ὀδον καὶ ἄφροδον, τοσαύτη παραλλαγή καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἐναντία μεταβολή τῶν ἐπιγείων θεωρεῖται. This sentence confirms what Gebser (in Huther, al.) has observed, that παραλλαγή never occurs as an astronomical term: seeing it is used in its common sense, even where the heavenly bodies are being spoken of. Besides which, it is not at all probable that St. James should write to the dispersed Jewish Christians in the technical language of astronomy. I take then the word in its ordinary sense, 'change': that uncertainty of degree of light which we see in the material heavenly bodies, but which is not in God their Creator. So in Wetst., we have Theophrastus speaking of a παραλλαγή τις εὐδοσίας καὶ ἀδοσίας: Plato, Rep. vii, of the absurdity of one who looks on the order and

ἡ ἑ τροπῆς ἡ ἀποσκίασμα. 18ⁱ βουλευθεὶς ^k ἀπεκύησεν ἡμᾶς ^g here only.
¹ λόγῳ ¹ ἀληθείας, ^m εἰς τὸ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ⁿ ἀπαρχὴν ^o τινα τῶν
 αὐτοῦ ^p κτισμάτων.

γεννημένων τροπῶν πασῶν. h here only +. i of God, 1 Cor. xii. 11. Heb. vi.
 17. 2 Pet. iii. 9 only. 1 Kings ii. 25. k ver. 15 only +. 12 Cor. vi. 7. Eph. i.
 13. 2 Tim. ii. 15 only. m constr. Heb. vi. 25 ver. 7. n Rom. viii. 23. xi. 16 xvi.
 5. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23 xvi. 15. Rev. xiv. 4 only. Num. xv. 20, 21. o see Heb. x. 27.
 p 1 Tim. iv. 4. Rev. v. 13. viii. 9 only +. Wisd. ix. 2.

τροπ. αποσκιασματος BN¹: vicissitudinis obumbratio vulg, conversionis obumbraculum
 Jer: modicum obumbrationis lat-ft₁: momenti(ροπης) obumbratio Aug^{saepe}.

18. εαυτου AC[P]N^{3b} 105.

symmetry of the heavenly bodies, and νομίζοντα γίνεσθαι τε ταῦτα αἰεὶ ὡσαύτως, κ. οὐδαμῇ οὐδὲν παραλλάττειν σώμα τε ἔχοντα καὶ δρώμενα: Plotinus, Enn. vi. 6. 3, of a παραλλαγή ἡμερῶν πρὸς νύκτας: Diogenes Laert. vii. 145 Zeno, of the moon eclipsing the sun, καὶ πάλιν παραλλάττουσα) or shadow (ἀποσκίασμα, the dark mark of shadow,—σκίασμα, the result of σκιαζεσθαι, cast ἀπὸ, from, any object) of turning (arising from turning. Here again we must look for a common-sense, not for an astronomical meaning of the word. τροπαὶ ἡλίου are, it is true, the solstices: but they have nothing to do with any darkening of the sun. So that I would take τροπή in the general sense of turning, or revolution, in which the heavens are ever found: by means of which the moon turns her dark side to us, in a constant state of παραλλαγή and τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα: by means of which the moon is eclipsed by the shadow of the earth, and the sun by the body of the moon, or, if you will, though this is hardly so likely to have been in view, is hidden from us during the night. From all these God, the Father of lights, is free; as 1 John i. 5, ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἐστίν, καὶ σκοτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐστίν οὐδεμία. It only remains to repudiate altogether, as inadmissible, the meaning given by Ec., the metaphorical acceptance of ἀποσκίασμα, ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐδὲ μέχρις ὑπονοίας τινὸς ὑποβολή, not a shadow of any change. So Hesych. (ἀλλοιώσεως καὶ φαντασίας ὁμοίωμα), Wolf, Lüsner, Morus, Rosenm., al.).

18.] *The greatest example of this position*, that all good and perfect gifts come from Him: mentioned not merely as an example, but as leading on to the following context. Because He willed it (the aor. part. is, 1. contemporary with the verb: 2. slightly causal, involving the condition of the act which follows. It was of His own mere will, 'proprio motu,' and the emphasis is on this word. "Exprimit quod Deus pro suo beneplacito nos genuit, atque ita sibi fuerit causa. Unde sequitur, naturale esse Deo benefacere." Calvin) begat He (ἀποκύειν or -εἶν (see above, ver. 15), here in

the sense *generare*, as there *parere*. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 23: 1 John iii. 9. The spiritual birth, not the natural, is meant, as is evident by what follows) us (ἡμᾶς, twice repeated, signifies the Writer and his readers, not Christians in general: not especially as *Jewish* Christians, Ἰουδαῖοι πρώτοι,—for that is not (see below) the reference here) with the word of truth (the gen. is one of apposition: cf. John xvii. 17, ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι. And the word of truth is the gospel, preached, and ἐμφυτος as below: cf. 1 Pet. i. 23, ἀναγεγεννημένοι. . . διὰ λόγου ζῶντος θεοῦ. The failure of the articles does not alter the sense. It is especially a characteristic of the abrupt sententious style of our Apostle. Cf. ποιῆται λόγου, ver. 22, where λόγος must be 'the word;' and indeed passim. Ec. makes λόγος personal: ἵνα μή τις ὑπολάβῃ ὁμοίως ἡμῖν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἀποτεκεῖν αὐτόν, καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν υἱὸν γεγενῆσθαι, ἐπάγει τό, λόγῳ ἀληθείας, πάντα γὰρ κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἰωάννην διὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ ἐγένετο: and so Athanasius, Sermon. iii. advers. Arianos, vol. ii. p. 483; and Bernard, Sermon. ii. ad Fratres (?): which is clearly wrong), that we should be (aim, but not the primary aim, of the ἀποκυῖναι. His gracious purpose with regard to us in particular was, that we should be, &c. His great purpose with regard to all Christians is not here in question. Hence ἡμᾶς is repeated) a kind of firstfruit ("τινα similitudinis est nota, nos quodammodo esse primitias," Calv. It does not appear to be intended as Bengel, "Quædam" habet modestiam, nam primitiæ proprie et absolute est Christus." Rather, I should say, it would point to the early date of our Epistle, in which an idea afterwards so familiar is thus introduced as it were with an apologetic explanation. The figure in ἀπαρχή is from the appointment of the law by which the firstborn of man, of cattle, of fruits &c., were to be consecrated to God; and the word must be taken with this sacred meaning, not merely as a 'verbum commune' indicating priority. The first Christians, to whom St. James is writing, were as firstborn of the

q Acta xxvi.
Eph. v. 6.
Heb. xii. 17
only t.

19 q ἴστε, ἡ ἀδελφοί μου ἡ ἀγαπητοί· ἔστω δὲ πᾶς ἄνθρω-

r ver. 16.

ABCKL
PN a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

19. rec (for ἴστε) ὡστε, with KL[P] rel syr Thl Æc: *et vos, fratres mei dilecti, quisque ex vobis sit* Syr: *καὶ νυν ἀδελφ. ἡμῶν ἐστω* æth-pl: *εἴτε* ad. ημ. κ. *ἐστω* æth-rom: *ἴστω* N¹: txt ABCN^{3b} latt syr-mg copt arm Bede. (13 def.) aft ἴστε ins δε A. rec om δε, with KL[P²] rel [syrr æth arm] Thl Æc: ins BC[P¹] N latt copt Bede, *καὶ ἐστω* A 13.

great family, dedicated as firstfruits to God. Wiesinger beautifully says, "The thought fully given would be this: they by Regeneration were dedicated as the firstfruits of a sacrificial gift which shall only be completed with the offering up of all κτίσματα") of His creatures (τὰ κτίσματα αὐτοῦ manifestly extends wider than merely to the great multitude of the regenerated whom no man can number; it embraces all creation, which we know shall partake in the ultimate glorious perfection of the sons of God: cf. Rom. viii. 20, 21. Obviously, the κτίσματα are not the *καὶνὴ κτίσις*, as Grot. and many others). Wiesinger has an important note, shewing from this verse what must be the right understanding of much which follows in this Epistle. "This passage," he says, "is among those which reveal the depth of Christian knowledge in which the practical and moral exhortations of the Writer are grounded: lying as it does expressly (διδό, ver. 21) at the basis of them. We will here bring together in a few words the teaching of the passage, for the sake of its important bearing on the rest of the Epistle. It teaches us, 1. as a positive supplement to vv. 14, 15, that the life of man must be renewed, from its very root and foundation: 2. it designates this renewal as God's work, moreover as an imparting of the life of God (ἀπεκύρωσε), as only possible by the working of the Spirit, only on the foundation of the objective fact of our Redemption in Christ, which is the content of the λόγος ἀληθείας: 3. it sets forth this re-generation as an act once for all accomplished (ἀπεκύρωσεν, aor.) and distinguishes it from the gradual penetration and sanctification of the individual life by means of this new principle of life imparted in the re-generation: 4. it declares also expressly that the re-generation is a free act of God's love (Βουλήθεῖς) not induced by any work of man (Eph. ii. 8, 9: Titus iii. 5), so that man is placed by God in his right relation to God, antecedently to all works well-pleasing to God: for this the expression ἀπεκύρωσεν involves: cf. ἐξελέξατο, ch. ii. 5, and in so far as this ἀπεκύρωσεν necessarily implies the justification of the sinner (the δικαιούσθαι of St. Paul), it is plain also, that St. James cannot, without

contradicting himself, make this δικαιούσθαι, in the sense of St. Paul, dependent on the works of faith. 5. λόγος ἀληθείας is specified as the objective medium of re-generation: and herewith we must have πίστις as the appropriating medium on the part of man himself: of the central import of which πίστις in St. James also we have already seen something (vv. 3, 6), and shall see more (ch. ii. 5, 14 ff.). 6. Together with this act of re-generation proceeding from God, we have also the high destination of the Christian, which the Apostle gives so significantly and deeply in εἰς τὸ εἶναι κ.τ.λ. And that which God has done to him, is now in the following verses made the foundation of that which the Christian has on his part to do: by which that which we said under (3) and (4) receives fresh confirmation. This passage is one to be remembered, when we wish to know what the Apostle understands by the νόμος τέλειος (i. 25; ii. 12), and what he means, when (ii. 14 ff.) he deduces δικαιούσθαι from the works of faith. As regards the dogmatical use, which some make of this passage, wishing to shew that regeneration is brought about by the word, as distinguished from the Sacrament of Baptism (Titus iii. 5-7), we may remark, that seeing that λόγος ἀληθείας designates the gospel, as a whole, without any respect to such distinction, nothing regarding it can be gathered from this passage. The word of the Lord constitutes, we know, the force of the Sacrament also. 'Accedit verbum ad elementum et fit Sacramentum.' And is it meant to be inferred that the readers of this Epistle were not baptized?"

19-21.] *Exhortation to receive rightly this word of truth.* (See the general connexion in the Prolegomena.)

19.] First, as to the reading. For the external evidence, see the digest. It is of a kind which can hardly be rejected. And all internal considerations make the same way. It is hardly possible that the simple and obvious ἔστε should have been altered into the difficult ἴστε. Whether the connexion with the last verse was plain, is not a consideration which usually entered into the minds of transcribers. They were much more likely to attempt to establish some connexion, plain or not, especially

πος ^s ταχύς ^t εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, ^u βραδὺς ^t εἰς τὸ λαλήσαι, ^s adj., here only. Sir.
^u βραδὺς ^t εἰς ὀργήν. ²⁰ ὀργή γὰρ ^v ἀνδρὸς ^v δικαιοσύνην ^t Rom. xvi. 19
^v θεοῦ οὐκ ^w ἐργάζεται. ²¹ διὸ ^x ἀποθέμενοι πᾶσαν ^y ῥύ- ^u = here bis
 25) only +. ^v = vv. 12, 23. ch. iii. 2. = Rom. x. 3 (2 Pet. i. 1 reff.). ^w = Acts x.
 35. Rom. ii. 10. Heb. xi. 33 al. Ps. xiv. 2. ^x = Eph. iv. 22, 25 Col. iii. 9. Heb. xii.
 1. 1 Pet. ii. 1 (Matt. xiv. 3. Acts vii. 58) only. (2 Chron. xviii. 26.) ^y here only +. (παρὸς,
 ch. ii. 2. -παίνειν, Rev. xxii. 11. -πος, 1 Pet. iii. 21.)

20. rec ου κατεργάζεται, with C¹KL[P] rel Ath₁ Ps-Ath₂ [Ephr₁] Thl Æc: txt ABC³N¹ l¹ m 31 [Ephr₁].

when so unusual a word as ἴστε admitted of change to so obvious an one as ᾔστε. Next, comes the question how ἴστε is to be taken, whether imperatively or indicatively. If the former, the sense will be, 'Know, my beloved brethren' (either what has preceded or what follows: if the latter, then the introduction of ἔστω κ.τ.λ. with a δέ gives it as a generally received saying, possibly as a reference to ref. Sir., γίνου ταχύς ἐν ἀκρόασει σου, καὶ ἐν μακροθυμίᾳ φθέγγου ἀπόκρισιν: if the former, the imperative sense seems hardly applicable). On the whole I much prefer the indicative sense, for which we have a precedent in reff. Heb. and Eph., the only other places where the form occurs in the N. T. And taking this indicative sense, I refer the word not to what follows, but to what precedes, making it an appeal to their knowledge of the momentous facts which he has just stated: You are well aware of this: but (i. e. and having this knowledge &c.). Thus we bring ἴστε here into strict accord with its meaning in those two other places, where it is, "Ye are aware;" appealing to a well-known fact. Ye know it, my beloved brethren: but (consequently) let every man be swift to hear (the word of truth which has so great power for good and for life: we need not actually *surpriz* τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας as Est., al., De W., Wiesinger do: the verb is absolute and general, having only *reference* to the word of truth), slow to speak (λαλήσαι need not refer only to the caution μὴ πολλοὶ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ch. iii. 1, though it includes that, being general. The meaning is, be eager to listen, not eager to discourse: the former may lead to implanting or strengthening the new life, the latter to wrath and suddenness of temper, so often found in the wake of swift rejoinder and ready chattering. Æc. reminds us that τὸς ἀνὴρ θεὸς φησὶν, δ λαλήσας μετέγνω πολλάκις, δ δέ σιωπήσας οὐδέποτε), slow to wrath (Bengel and others interpret ὀργή, "ira sive impatentia erga Deum," and so nearly Calvin: but the reference is more general, as the precept is. The quick speaker is the quick kindler. See below. We have

in Philo de Confus. Ling. § 12, vol. i. p. 412, βραδὺς ὠφελησαι, ταχύς βλάψαι: but the words occur in contrast only here in the N. T.): 20.] for the wrath (any wrath, all wrath) of man (ἀνὴρ is used by our Apostle without any such definite precision as has been supposed here by Bengel, "Seuus virilis maxime iram alit:" or Thomas, "Non dicit pueri, quæ cito transit." Cf. ἀνὴρ δῖψυχος, ver. 8, and reff.) worketh not (ἐργάζεται and κατεργάζεται would differ here slightly in sense: the latter would signify more 'worketh out,' 'bringeth to issue or existence,' the former, 'practiseth,' 'worketh habitually,' and each of these would throw its own shade of meaning on δικαιοσύνη—see below) the righteousness of God (if ἐργάζεται, = that which is righteousness in God's sight = τὸ δίκαιον ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ: if κατεργάζεται, = that righteousness, to produce which is God's end in begetting us to a new life. In other words, the more general ethical sense is given by ἐργάζεται: the more particular theological one by κατεργάζεται. At all events, we must not interpret δικ. θεοῦ the state of righteousness before God, as some, or that righteousness in another, into which God begets men by his word of truth, as Hofmann (Schriftb. I. 548 f.) and Wiesinger. When this latter asks, What relevance here has the remark that anger doeth not that which is right in the sight of God?—an easy answer can be given. Be not intemperately zealous, hastily rash to speak and to be angered, even in God's behalf (for this is implied): be humble, ready to listen, for your angry zeal, your quick speaking, work not God's righteous purposes—serve not Him, are not carriers forward of that righteousness which is the characteristic of His kingdom, ch. iii. 18. How many an endeavour, which might have ended in ἐργάεσθαι δικαιοσύνην θεοῦ, has been diverted and blighted by hasty speaking and anger, and ended only in disgracing ourselves, and Him whom we would have served, before men! So Bengel, "Ira plane impedit iustitiam Dei; tametsi sibi dum fervet, quam maxime operari eam videatur. Purius sine ira

z Rom. v. 17. ^a *παρίαν καὶ* ^z *περισσεύαν* ^a *κακίας ἐν* ^b *πραΰτητι* ^c *δέξασθε* ABCKL
 2 Cor. vii. 2. P^a a b c
 x. 15 only d f g h j
 Eccl. i. 3 al. k l m o
^a Eph. iv. 31. 13
 Col. iii. 8. 1 Pet. u. 1, 16. 1 Kings xxiv. 12. b Paul. 1 Cor. iv. 21. 2 Cor. x. 1. Gal. v. 23 al⁶. ch. iii.
 13. 1 Pet. iii. 15 only. Ps. xlv. 4. c = Luke viii. 13. Acts viii. 14. 1 Cor. u. 21. 1 Thess. i. 6. 2 Thess.
 ii. 10. Prov. iv. 10. d here only +. Wisd. xii. 10 only.

21. *περίσσευμα* A. 13. 68.

ἐμ πραυτ. N [P adds *σοφίας*].

fit"). 21.] Wherefore (consequence from ver. 20: seeing that *ὁργή* excludes you from having a share in the righteous work of God) putting off (reff.: aor., because it must be done as a single act, antecedently to that which follows. The previous putting off is the condition of the subsequent reception) all filthiness (*ῥυπαρία* is here figurative, as *ῥυπαρός* and *ῥυπαρέων* in ref. Rev.: in the other reff. the word occurs in its literal sense. Some Commentators take it here as standing alone: others join it with *καὶ περισσεύαν*, as belonging to the genitive *κακίας*, which seems better for the context, which concerns not the putting away of moral pollution of all kinds, but only of that kind which belongs to *κακία*: see below. And thus taken it will mean that *κακία* pollutes the soul, and renders it unfit to receive the *ἔμφυτος λόγος*. It is very possible that the agricultural similitude in *ἔμφυτος* may have influenced the choice of both these words, *ῥυπαρία* and *περισσεύα*. The ground must be ridged of all that pollutes and chokes it, before the seed can sink in and come to maturity: must be cleaned and cleared) and abundance ("superfluity" is perhaps too strong; it is, if the above figure be allowed, the rank growth, the abundant crop. Beza, Erasmi. Schmid, al. take it as = *περίσσωμα*, "excrementum;" Pott, Schneckenb., De Wette, al., as "efflorescence," as Lösner, "ramos in vite vel arbore abundantes, falceque reseandos;" Michaelis, al. take it as the remnant of *κακία* surviving from old times = *περίσσευμα* Mark viii. 8. But the usual meaning seems preferable, as being both philologically correct, and suiting in its simplicity the solemn character of the exhortation) of malignity (evil disposition towards one another, as in reff. The word carries on the *ὁργή* above: which springs from (see note on ref. Eph.) *κακία*, evil disposition, which is inherent in our hearts, and requires putting off before we can receive the word of God. That this is so, is evident from *ἐν πραΰτητι* which follows. However the exhortation may apply in the wider sense, it is not its sense here, as the context plainly shews), in mildness (towards one another, reff.: not "modestia et facilitas mentis ad discendum composita," Calv., nor "docili animo," Grot.,

al.: see above on *κακία*) receive (cf. reff. and *παράδχονται*, Mark iv. 20, of the good ground) the implanted word (the word spoken of is beyond doubt the same as the *λόγος ἀληθείας* above—i. e. the gospel, in its fulness. But the epithet makes some little difficulty. First of all, it clearly is not, as Ec. seems to take it, "innate:" *τὸν διακριτικὸν τοῦ βελτίονος καὶ τοῦ χείρονος, δι' ὃ καὶ λογικοὶ ἔσμεν καὶ λεγόμεθα*: and so in the Apostolical Constt. viii. 12, *νόμον δέδωκας ἔμφυτον*, for this would stultify *δέξασθε*, we having it already. Nor must *ἔμφυτος* be taken as proleptic, "ita ut inseratur," as Calvin, Semler, De Wette (but doubtfully), al. Nor again can it mean 'the word which has been planted in the whole of Christendom,' seeing that individuals are here being dealt with: but the allusion is apparently to the parable of the sower, and it is the word implanted (= which has been sown), the word whose attribute and *ἀρετή* it is to be *ἔμφυτος*, and which is *ἔμφυτος*, awaiting your reception of it to spring up and take up your being into it and make you new plants), which is able to save your souls (cf. Rom. i. 16, where the *εὐαγγέλιον* is said to be *δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι*. "Magnificum celestis doctrinæ encomium, quod certam ex ea salutem consequimur. Est autem additum, ut sermonem illum instar thesauri incomparabilis et expetere et amare et magnificare discamus. Est ergo acris ad castigandam nostram ignaviam stimulus, sermonem cui solemus tam negligenter aures præbere, salutis nostræ esse causam. Tametsi non in hunc finem servandi vis sermoni adscribitur, quasi aut salus in externo vocis sonitu inclusa foret, aut servandi munus Deo ablato alio transferretur. Nam de sermone tractat Jacobus, qui fide in corda hominum penetravit: et tantum indicat, Deum salutis auctorem evangelio suo eam peragere." Calvin. Observe *ψυχάς*. It is the *ψυχή* which carries the personality of the man: which is between the *πνεῦμα* drawing it upwards, and the *σάρξ* drawing it downwards, and is saved or lost, passes into life or death, according to the choice between these two. And the *λόγος ἔμφυτος*, working through the *πνεῦμα* and by the divine *πνεῦμα*, is a spiritual agency, able to save

ὑμῶν. ²² γίνεσθε δὲ ^e ποιηταὶ λόγου, καὶ μὴ ^f ἀκροαταὶ ^e = ch. iv. 11
 μόνον ^e παραλογιζόμενοι ^h ἑαυτούς. ²³ ὅτι εἴ τις ^f ἀκρο- ^f ver. 25. Rom.
 ατῆς λόγου ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ ^e ποιητής, ⁱ οὗτος ^k ὅμοιος ἀνδρὶ ^g Col. ii. 4
^l κατανοοῦντι τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς ^m γενέσεως αὐτοῦ ἐν ^g only.
ⁿ ἐξόπτηρ. ²⁴ ^l κατενόησεν γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀπελήλυθεν καὶ ^g Col. ii. 4
^h 2nd pers., ch. ii. 4. Matt. ii. 9. Acts v. 35. Phil. ii. 12. 1 John v. 21 al. ⁱ Matt. v. 19. x. 22. xvi.
⁴ al. fr. ^k ver. 6 only. Xen. Mem. i. 6. 10. ^l Matt. vii. 3. Heb. iii. 1 reff. = Ps. xxxvi.
³² al. ^m = here (ch. iii. 1. Matt. i. 1, 18. Luke i. 14) only. ^{gen.}, Phil. iii. 21. ⁿ 1 Cor.
 xii. 12 only +. ^{Wisd.} vii. 26. ^{Sir.} xii. 11 only.

22. for λόγου, νομον C² c 9. 38 æth [Damasc₁] Thl. rec monon bef ακροαται, with
 A CKL[P]N rel [Damasc₁] Ec: txt B a latt syrr copt [æth arm] Thl. (13 def.)

23. om οτι A 13: *si quis enim* Syr copt. κατανοουντες (sic) N¹.

the ψυχή. And σώσαι, the aor., because the power is to complete the work and to have done it for ever). **22.]** The ταχὺς εἰς τὸ ἀκοῦσαι and δέξασθε are qualified, at the same time that they are enforced, by a caution. But be ye (not, 'become ye,' any more than in Matt. vi. 16; x. 16; xxiv. 44: John xx. 27: Rom. xii. 16. In all these places no other meaning will suit the context but simply "be ye:" with reference indeed to some future act by which the word γίνεσθαι gets its propriety; but 'become' in English carries a very different meaning, viz. that of *change into* the state mentioned from some other previous one, which is in none of these cases implied) doers of the word (viz. of the λόγος ἐμφυτος, the λόγος τῆς ἀληθείας. Theile remarks well, "Substantiva plus sonant quam participia;," the substantive ποιητής carries an enduring, a sort of official force with it: 'let this be your occupation.' For the expression, see reff.), not hearers only (ἀκροατής in classical Greek carries rather the idea of attentive observance with it, which cannot be the case either here or in ref. Rom.), **deceiving yourselves** (see note on ref. Col. παραλογίζεσθαι is used here probably as allusive to λόγος, and means, to deceive by a false logical conclusion. The 'hearer only' does this, when he infers that the mere sound of the word received in his outward ear will suffice for him. Cf. ἀπατῶν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, ver. 26. Hesych. gives ἀπάτη λογισμοῦ as the explanation of παραλογισμός. See Suicer, sub voce). **23—25.]** *Justification of παραλογιζόμενοι, and of the foregoing exhortation.* **23.]** Because, if any is a hearer of the word and not (the hypothesis being one of fact, that he ἀκούει καὶ οὐ ποιεῖ, οὐ is used, where we should rather expect μή, and where in the exhortation, μή has been used. Strictly, it is 'if any one is a hearer, and a not-doer') a doer, this man (the demonstrative pronoun points more markedly at the individual in whom the hearing and not-doing

are united: see reff.) is like to a man (ἀνδρὶ general again: see vv. 8, 12, &c. Huther quotes a curious comment from Paes: "Viri obiter tantum solent specula intueri, muliebri autem est curiose se ad speculum componere") **contemplating** (reff. Probably the example was meant to have a general reference: for though it may be true, as De Wette says, that many men remember well their appearance in the mirror, the common rule is that men forget it. Had a particular case of one who looks and forgets been intended, the next sentence would not surely have been introduced with the aor. and γάρ, but with καὶ and participles) **the** countenance of his birth (i. e. as E. V., "his natural face:") the face he was born with. The expression is to be explained apparently as Wiesinger: "Not that he can see in the glass any other than his natural face, but the addition τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ serves more plainly to point out the sphere of mere material perception from which the comparison is taken, as distinguished from the ethical sphere of ἀκροάσθαι, and at the same time hints at the easy translation of the remark from the one department to the other, in which 'the word of God is a mirror in which we may and ought to see our moral visage,' as De Wette." Various other explanations have been given: by Pott, "Formam vultus nativam transeundo animadvertit: supple, non item maculas vultui haud ἐκ γενέσεως insitas, sed propria culpa adspersas;" Luther, Michaelis, Benson, Knapp imagine a contrast to be intended between his natural face and τὸ τοῦ πνεύματος πρόσωπον: Schulthess, between the natural face and a mask: &c. Whether the gen. αὐτοῦ (not αὐτοῦ) belongs to πρόσωπον or to τῆς γενέσεως, is uncertain as the words stand: more probably however to the latter: cf. τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, Col. i. 13) in a mirror (see reff.: and Pind. Nem. vii. 20): **24.]** for (this seems to stamp the example as a general one, apply-

ο Heb. vi. 10
 reff constr,
 here only
 p Acts xxi. 29
 1 Cor. iii. 13.
 Gal ii. 6
 1 Thess. i. 9
 only +
 q Luke xxiv.
 12 John xx
 5, 11. 1 Pet. i. 12 only.
 21. 2 Cor. iii. 17.
 23 (reff.).
 xxiii 6.
 εὐθέως ° ἐπελάθετο ° ὅποῖος ἦν. 25 ὁ δὲ ° παρακύψας εἰς ἈΒCΚL
 ὁ νόμον ° τέλειον τὸν τῆς ° ἐλευθερίας καὶ ° παραμείνας, οὐκ P s a b c
 ὁ ἀκρατῆς ° ἐπιλησμονῆς γενόμενος ἀλλὰ ° ποιητῆς ἔργου, d i g h j
 οὗτος μακάριος ἐν τῇ ° ποιήσει αὐτοῦ ἔσται. 26 εἰ τις k l m o
 13
 5, 11. 1 Pet. i. 12 only. Gen xxvi. 8. 1 ch ii 12. 5 Heb ix. 11 reff. t Rom. viii.
 21. 2 Cor. iii. 17. u 1 Cor xvi. 6. Phil i. 25. Heb. viii. 23 only. Gen xlv 33 y v 22,
 23 (reff.). w here only +. Sir. xi. 27. constr., Luke xvi. 8. xvi. 6. Rom. vi. 6. vii. 24. Col i 22. Isa.
 xxiii 6. x here only. Ps. xlviii. 1.

25. rec ins οὗτος bef ουκ ακρατης, with KL[P] rel syr [arm] Thl Œc: om ABCN
 13 latt Syr copt Aug Cassiod Bede.

26. aft ει ins δε C[P] m 13 latt copt Bede.

ing to all, not merely taking some possible man who may do this: see above) **he contemplated himself** (on the aorr. see above, ver. 11), and has departed (the perfect in the midst of aorr. is to be noted. We might have had all aorr.: but seeing that the *departing* begins a permanent state of absence from the mirror, that is chosen to be designated by a perfect. The *forgetting* is also a permanent state; but the Apostle rather chooses in this case to bring out the act itself, as one immediately (*εὐθύς*) and suddenly taking place. For similar conjunctions of perfects with aorr., cf. Luke iv. 18: Mark xv. 44: Heb. ii. 14 and note: 1 Cor. xv. 4: and Winer, § 40. 4), and immediately forgot of what appearance he was (viz. in the mirror. It is to be observed, that the *κατανοεῖν* answers to the hearing of the word: the *ἀπεληλυθῆναι* to the relaxing the attention after hearing—letting the mind go elsewhere, and the interest of the thing heard pass away: and then the forgetfulness in both cases follows. In the next verse we pass to one who looks and does not depart). 25.] But he who looked into (here we have the figure mingled with the reality, the comparison being dropped. The aor. participles are continued on from the former construction in ver. 24. Probably the verb *παρακύψαι* here, to stoop and look in, has reference to a mirror being placed on a table or on the ground, to contemplate which steadily, a man must put his face near to it. But we must not perhaps urge this too strictly: see ref. 1 Pet.: where it is used of looking closely into any thing. It is here the opposite of *κατενόησεν*, attention bestowed for a time only and then withdrawn. And this opposition is strengthened by *καὶ παραμείνας* the perfect law which is (the law) of our (Christian) liberty (τὸν νόμον τέλειον, not, the gospel as contrasted with the law, nor the covenant of faith as more perfect than that of legal obedience: but, the rule of life as revealed in the gospel, which is perfect and perfecting, but not in contrast with the former law as being not

perfect, and not able to make perfect: that distinction is not in view here: see below. The whole Epistle is founded on this perfect law of Christ, more especially on that declaration of it contained in the sermon on the mount: see Prolegg. And that this law here is meant, the *λόγος ἔμφυτος*, *λόγος ἀληθείας*, as it is a rule of conduct, is evident from what follows, where *deeds*, and they only, are spoken of. It is the law of our liberty, not as in contrast with a former law of bondage, but as viewed on the side of its being the law of the new life and birth, with all its spontaneous and free development of obedience. Huther remarks, "Ever in the O.T. the sweetness of the law was subject of praise (Ps. xix. 8—11), but the life-giving power belonged to the law only in an imperfect manner, because the covenant on which it rested, was as yet only one of promise, and not of fulfilment") and remains there (remains looking in, does not depart as the other. There is a paronomasia in the *παρα-* repeated. Schneckenburger tries to give it the sense of *ἐμμένειν* in Acts xiv. 22: but as Wiesinger remarks, the matter spoken of here is not so much observing the law in act, as observing it in attention—not letting it pass out of the thoughts. That leads to action, as below), being (not, *having become*: see above on *γινεσθε*, ver. 22: the former *οὗτος* being omitted, this part. carries with it a slightly inferential force: 'cum sit') not a forgetful hearer (the expression *ἀκρατῆς ἐπιλησμονῆς* is a Hebraism, the genitive indicating the quality: see below on ch. ii. 4, *κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν*) but a doer of work (*ἔργον*, not sing. for plur. as Grot., "effector eorum operum quæ evangelica lex exigit:?" but abstract, of *work*, something which brings a result with it), this man (see on *οὗτος* above, ver. 23) shall be blessed in his doing (cf. Sir. xix. 20, *ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ ποιήσις νόμου*). The words imply that even in the act there is blessing: *ἐν* not being instrumental, but taken in its proper meaning: the life of obedience

p = ch. i. 6.
Col. iii. 16 al.
q Rom. ii. 11.
Eph. vi. 9.
Col. iii. 25
only t. - (πτύν, ver. 9.
22. Rom. xiv. 22.

ΠΙ. 1 Ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ἐν ᾧ προσωπολημφίαις ἔχετε
τὴν πίστιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης.
s1 Cor. ii. 8. see Acts vii. 2. Eph. i. 17. Ps. xxviii. 3. double gen. 2 Pet. iii. 2. r vi. 14, 18. Matt. xxi. 21. Mark xi. 22.

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

ἀπάτης αὐτοῦ φθειρόμενον: but, as in ch. iv. 4, *the whole earthly creation*, separated from God and lying in sin, which, whether considered as consisting in the men who serve it, or the enticements which it holds out to evil lust (ἐπιθυμία), is to Christians a source of continual defilement. They, by their new birth unto God, are taken out of the world; but at the same time, by sin still dwelling in them, are ever liable to be enticed and polluted by it: and therefore must keep themselves (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 14), for fear of such pollution. This keeping is indeed in the higher sense God's work: cf. John xvii. 15: but it is also our work, 1 Tim. v. 22. The Commentators compare Isocr. ad Niccol. p. 36, ἡγοῦ τούτο εἶναι θύμα κάλλιστον καὶ θεραπείαν μεγίστην, ἐὰν βέλτιστον καὶ δικαιοτάτον σεαυτὸν παρέχῃς. Also Ps. l. 8—15: 1 Sam. xv. 22: Ps. xl. 7 f.: Sir. xxxv. 2).

CHAP. II. 1—13.] THE SIN OF RESPECT OF PERSONS: as the first of a series of reproofs for errors in practice which spring out of the mention of the νόμος τέλειος ὁ τῆς ἐλευθερίας: cf. ch. i. 25 and ver. 12. The Apostle begins, as is his wont, with strong blame of the sin: then illustrates it, vv. 2—4: then gives the ground of its sinfulness, vv. 5—11, and concludes, vv. 12, 13, with a reference again to the law of liberty.

1—4.] *The warning, and its practical ground.* 1.] *My brethren, do not*

(ἔχετε is not, as Schneckenburger, al., interrogative, but imperative, as ch. i. 16; iii. 1. The interrogative with μή may not always require a negative answer, but it always implies a doubt as to the fact questioned: 'Surely . . . not . . . ?' e.g. μήτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός; 'Surely this cannot be the Christ?' John iv. 29: μή πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει; 'Surely he will not do more signs?' John vii. 31: &c. See Winer, § 57. 3, b. And this clearly cannot be the case here) in respectings of persons (ἐν, 'in,' i. e. in the practice of, in the midst of: see on ἔχετε below. The subst. is plur., to point out the various kinds and occasions of the fault. The fault itself, as here intended, is easily explained by the context, where an example is taken of one kind of it. Theile says well that it is, "iniquitas singulos Christianos non virtute sua christiana, sed fortuna qualitativae externis metiendi atque secundum hanc normam alios aliis praefereendi." Notice, that ἐν προσωπολ. is put first, as

carrying the weight of the dehortation, ἔχειν τὴν πίστιν following, as matter of course and existing fact) hold (ἔχετε has been taken wrongly: e.g. by Grot., "detinere velut captivam et inefficacem," = κατέχειν in the saying of St. Paul in Rom. i. 18, τῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν ἀδικίᾳ κατεχόντων: by Pott, as ἔχειν τινὰ ἐν ὀργῇ, ἐν αἰτίαις, ἐν ἐπιγνώσει, as Rom. i. 28, explaining it "religiosis partibus nimium studere," which however this construction would hardly bear. ἔχειν is simply to have or to hold, as ever in St. James, cf. ch. i. 4; iii. 14: and see reff.) the faith (not merely 'faith in,' but *the faith of*, thus setting before them more forcibly the utter inconsistency of such respect of persons with the service of Christ) of our Lord Jesus Christ, (the Lord) of glory (such I believe, with most Commentators, to be the construction of τῆς δόξης, though it is somewhat harsh and unusual. Others have been proposed, but all of them are more objectionable still: e.g. by Erasm. ("Nolite facere discrimen personarum juxta rerum mundanarum aestimationem"), and Calvin ("ex opinione"), as if it were ἐν δόξῃ προσωπολημφίας or -ῶν: by Bengel ("Est appositio, ut ipse Christus dicatur ἡ δόξα, gloria, cf. Luc. ii. 32: Is. xl. 5: Eph. i. 17: 1 Pet. iv. 14;") none of which places justify the idea, seeing that in the two former a genitive follows δόξα, and the two latter rather support the common view): by Laurentius, who unites τῆς δόξης with χριστοῦ ("Christus gloriae = Christus gloriosus"): finally by Huther, who would join τῆς δόξης with τὴν πίστιν (differing however from Grot. who doing this had made τοῦ κυρίου dependent on it, τὴν πίστιν τῆς δόξης τοῦ κυρίου, and from Gataker and Hottinger, who also doing it, make it = τὴν πίστιν ἐνδόξου), making it a gen. of the object, and τοῦ κυρ. ἡμ. Ἰ. χρ. a gen. of the subject—the faith, resting on our Lord Jesus Christ, in the (future) glory, i. e. τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς; Rom. viii. 18. And, he adds, this belief in the glory which shall be revealed is the more naturally mentioned here, because of the contrast between it and the passing glory of this world's pomp. Exactly: but that contrast is just as vivid on the common hypothesis. This last, complicated and harsh as it is, seems to me the only admissible one of all these interpretations. But it is surely far better, either to govern τῆς δόξης

² εὖν γὰρ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς ὁ συναγωγὴν ὑμῶν ἀνὴρ ὁ χρυσο- ^{t = here only.}
 δακτύλιος ἐν ὁ ἐσθῆτι ὁ λαμπρᾶ, εἰσέλθῃ δὲ καὶ πτωχὸς ἐν ^(Rev. ii. 9.)
 ὁ ῥυπαρᾶ ὁ ἐσθῆτι, ὁ ἐπιβλέψῃτε δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν ὁ φοροῦντα ^{= ἐπισυν.,}
 τὴν ὁ ἐσθῆτα τὴν ὁ λαμπράν, καὶ εἶπητε Σὺ κάθου ὧδε ^{Heb. x. 25}
 ὁ καλῶς, καὶ τῷ πτωχῷ εἶπητε Σὺ στῆθι ἐκεῖ ἢ κάθου ^{u here only t.}
^(not elw.)
^{here 3cu.}
^{Luke xxii.}
^{11. xxiv. 4.}
^{Acts i. 10}
^{v. r.) x}
^{30. xii. 21 only t.}
^{2 Macc. viii. 35.}
^{w of clothing, here bis.}
^{Luke xxiii. 11.}
^{Acts x. 30.}
^{Rev.}
^{xv. 6 xix. 8. (xiii. 4 xxii. 1, 16) only t.}
^(Syr. xix. 22 al.)
^{x Rev. xxii. 11 only.}
^{Zech. iii.}
^{4, 5 only.}
^(-pros, 1 Pet. iii. 21.)
^{-παρία, ch. i. 21.)}
^{y Luke i. 48 ix. 38 only.}
^{Lev. xxi.}
^{9. 1 Kings i. 11.}
^{z Matt. xi. 8.}
^{John xix. 5.}
^{Rom. xiii. 4.}
^{1 Cor. xv. 49 (bis) only.}
^{Prov.}
^{xvi. 23, 27}
^{Syr. xi. 5. xl. 4 only.}
^{a see Luke vi. 28.}

CHAP. II. 2. rec ins την bef συναγωγην, with AKL[P]N³ rel Cyr[-p₁ Antch.] Thl Ec: om BCN¹ c.

3. rec (for επιβλεψ. δε) και επιβλεψ., with A[K]LN rel [vulg Syr sah æth] Ec Bede: txt BC[P] a c lat[-ff₁] syr Thl. rec aft ειπητε ins αυτα, with KL[P] rel vulg am [demid Syr coptt æth] Ec Bede: om ABCN a c j 13 fuld (and harl) lat[-ff₁] syr arm Hesych-int Thl. η [και C] καθου bef εκει B lat[-ff₁] rec aft 2nd καθου ins ωδε, with C²KL[P]N rel Syr coptt [æth] Thl Ec: om ABC¹ a c 13 latt syr arm Cyr[-p₁]

by κυρίου, as a second genitive, or to regard it as the epithetal genitive which so constantly follows the mention of the divine Name, as ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης and the like. Both these are abundantly justified: see reff. Huther's objection to the first, that the full name Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ entirely completes the idea, and forbids another genitive following, is not decisive: just for the same reason that the full Name is given, viz. to make the contrast more solemn and striking, is the additional title τῆς δόξης given, to increase still further that solemnity. It is to be again noticed, how expressly St. James grounds Christian practice on the faith of Christ, in all its fullness. The θρησκεία just spoken of is here taken up and enlarged on; but its root and ground is πίστις, and that, ἡ πίστις τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τῆς δόξης). 2—4.] *Hypothetical example*, to explain to them that to which he especially points. The hypothesis carries however in itself a foundation of fact, and appeals (γάρ) to the consciences of the readers whether it were not so. 2.] For (q. d. that which I mean, is) if there chance to have come (aor. because the entrance is accomplished when that which is alleged takes place. This is better than to account for the aor., with Huther, by its being St. James's manner to designate by aorists a fact habitually repeated; the examples which he gives, ch. i. 11, 24, resting on another ground: see there) into your assembly (some have too hastily inferred from the word συναγωγὴ that the Jewish synagogue is meant. This, in the face of the organization of the church implied in ch. v. 14, would be impossible. The word may well be understood of a Christian assembly, so in Test. XII. Patrum, p. 747, ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν, —or as merely an assembly in general, cf.

ref. Heb., μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν ἑαυτῶν. But it is most likely here, from the allusions to sitting and standing below, a place of Christian worship, the name being a natural one, considering by whom the Epistle was written and to whom it is addressed) a man with gold rings (this ἀπαξ λεγόμενος is expressed by χρυσόχειρ in Lucian, Timon, § 20. Wetst. has accumulated evidence of the practice of overloading the fingers with rings: e.g. Lucian, Somn. (Gall) 12, ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχων . . . δακτυλίου βαρεῖς ὅσον ἑκατάδεκα ἐξημμένους τῶν δακτύλων: Martial xi. 60, "Senos Charinus omnibus digitis gerit, Nec nocte ponit annulos, nec dum lavatur") in a splendid garment (glittering, either in colour, or with ornaments), and there have come in also a poor man in a vile garment (reff.),

3.] and (the δέ just expresses the change of subject, from the persons entering in, to the congregation) ye look upon (with respect, see reff.: so as to take into consideration) the man wearing a splendid garment (thus designated, because it is this which wins for him the respect— which attracts your notice) and say, Sit thou (κάθου for κάθησο, occurring Matt. xxii. 44: Luke xx. 42: Acts ii. 34: 1 Kings i. 23; xxii. 5: 4 Kings ii. 6 al., is not found in pure Greek. See Winer, § 14. 4) here (pointing out a spot to him: and that, as the contrast between ὧδε and ἐκεῖ shews, in the midst, near (for the words must be supposed to be spoken by those who would be the mouthpiece of the assembly) those in honour) in a good place (not, "honorifice," as Wahl, still less must καλῶς be supposed to mean "be so good as to" &c., as Storr), and ye say to the poor man, Stand thou there, or sit under (i. e. not literally underneath; but 'on the ground beside,' 'down by') my

b Matt. v. 35. Acts ii 35. vii 49. Heb. i. 13. x. 13 only. Ps. cix. 1. d Matt. xvi. 7, 8. 20. Ps. xciii. 11. gen., ch. i. 26 reff. c = Matt. xxi. 21 || Mk. Acts x. 20. (x. 12 v. r.). Rom. iv. 20. xiv. 23. ch. i. 6 (bis). e 2nd pers. ch. i. 22 reff. f ch. iv. 11. g = Rom. i. 21. 1 Cor. iii. 13

[Hesych-int] Aug. for υπο, επι B² (assigned by Tischd^f to his B³) [P] a c d 13 syr sah [arm]. aft υποποδιον ins των ποδων A 13 vulg syr [æth] Aug. Hesych-int.

4. rec ins και bef ου, with KL[P] rel Th^lexp^r Ec^eexp^r om ABCN a b² c h 13.36 vulg syrr coptt [æth] arm Cyr[.p.] Antch¹ [Hesych-int] Aug Bede.—om ου B¹ lat¹ ff.

footstool (Wiesinger calls *υποπόδιον* an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*: but see reff. Thus it is implied that the speaker is in a good place and furnished with a footstool. The question, argued at considerable length by Wiesinger and Huther, who these incomers are supposed to be, whether Christians, or Jews who have looked in as strangers, is perhaps hardly worth the trouble spent upon it. The illustration merely requires that they should be strangers, not having a regular place in the congregation. Certainly so far I agree with Huther, that there appears nothing in the text which compels us to assume them to be Christians. They are taken merely as samples of a class, the rich and the poor: and these two are dealt with again in vv. 5 ff., as classes of persons, out of one of which God hath chosen His people for the most part, and out of the other of which the oppressors of His people arise. So that it is better to leave the examples in their general reference), 4.] (Now comes the apodosis in the form of a question)—did ye not (in the case supposed) doubt (such is the constant sense of *διακρίνομαι* in the N. T. throughout (reff.), except in two passages, Acts xi. 2: Jude 9, where it means “disputing,” a sense which cannot enter here (on Jude 22, see there). And here, the sense seems very good: ‘Did ye not, in making such distinction between rich and poor, become of the number of those who doubt respecting their faith, ch. i. 6? Your faith abolishes such distinction: you set it up in practice. You are not then whole in that faith.’ Various other explanations have been given, which Huther enumerates thus: *διακρίνεσθαι* 1. = “separare:” thus Schulthess, Semler, Erasmus. Schmid, al., with the verb either passive, “Nonne inter vos ipsos estis discreti et separati?” or middle, “Nonne vos discernitis inter vos ipsos?” 2. = “discrimen facere:” a. the verb *active*, and that, a. *interrogative*: “Nonne discrimen fecistis apud vos ipsos?” so Laurentius, Grot., Wolf, Hottinger, Knapp: thus *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* = *ἐν ἀλλήλοις*: Schneckenburger however gives it “in animis vestris,” and makes “discrimen facere” to pass into an

act of individual judgment, “statuere:” *β. negative*: “Then ye have not made a sound distinction in yourselves:” so Grashof: b. the verb *passive*, “Inter vos ipsos non estis discriminati, N. E. cessat piorum et impiorum differentia,” Oeder. 3. = “judicare:” a. the verb *active*: and that, a. *interrogative*: “Nonne judicastis, deliberastis ipsi?” i. e. are ye not yourselves persuaded how wrong this is? Angusti: *β. negative*: “Non discrevistis justa deliberatione, considerantia et æstimatione, quid tribuendum esset pauperi potius vel certe non minus quam diviti,” Bengel (Luther combines this rendering with that under (2): und bedenket es nicht recht, sonderm ihr merket Richter, und macht bösen Unterschied). here also comes in the explanation of Ec.: τὸ διακριτικὸν ὑμῶν διεφθείρατε, μηδεμίαν συζήτησιν ποιήσαντες πότερον τιμητέον, . . . ἀλλ’ οὕτως ἀδιακρίτως κ. ἐν προσωποληψίᾳ τὸν μὲν ἐτιμήσατε . . . τὸν δὲ ἡτιμάσατε: b. the verb *passive*: and that, a. *interrogative*: “Nonne vos in conscientiis dijudicatis, h. e. convicti estis?” Paræus: *β. negative*: “Et dijudicati inter vos ipsos non estis ut judicatis secundum prava ratiocinia vestra,” Heisen. Cajetan, somewhat differently, “Hæc faciendo non estis judicati in vobis ipsis, sed estis judicati in vestibus et divitis et pauperis:” laying the chief stress on *ἐν ἑαυτοῖς*. 4. *διακρίνεσθαι* = ‘dubitare,’ to entertain doubts: a. *interrogative*: “Et non dubitastis apud vosmetipsos? et facti estis iniqui iudices?” “Should you not yourselves have entertained doubts? should you actually have passed evil-minded judgment?” Theile: *β. negative*: “Non dubitastis apud animum, ne scilicet quidem hæc cogitatio, id factum forte malum esse, sed certo apud vos statuistis id jure ac bene fieri.” The meaning above given is held by Keen, De Wette, Wiesinger, Huther) within yourselves (in your own minds, being at issue with your own faith), and become judges (in the case of the rich and poor; judges of the case before you), of evil thoughts (the gen. is one of quality, like *ὁ κριτὴς τῆς ἀδικίας*, Luke xviii. 6: *ἀκρατὴς ἐπιλησμονῆς*, ch. i. 25: not an objective

σατε, ¹ ἀδελφοί μου ¹ ἀγαπητοί, οὐχ ὁ θεὸς ^k ἐξελέξατο τοὺς ¹ πτωχοὺς ¹ τῷ κόσμῳ πλουσίους ^m ἐν πίστει, καὶ ⁿ κληρο-
νόμους τῆς ὁ βασιλείας ^p ἧς ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ^q ἀγαπῶσιν
αὐτόν; ⁶ ὑμεῖς δὲ ^r ἡτιμάσατε τὸν πτωχόν. οὐχ οἱ πλού-
σιοι ^s καταδυναστεύουσιν ὑμῶν καὶ αὐτοὶ ^t ἔλκουσιν ὑμᾶς
εἰς ^u κριτήρια; ⁷ οὐκ αὐτοὶ ^v βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν
4.) n Heb. i. 2 reff. o Gal. v. 21. Matt. xxv. 34 & passim.
1.) 10 reff. q ch. i. 12 reff. r Mark xii. 4. Luke xx. 11. John viii. 49. Acts v.
41. Rom. i. 24. ii. 23 only. Prov. xxii. 22, s Acts x. 38 only. Ezek. xlviii. 12, 16, t Acts
xxi. 30 only. Eccl. i. 5. (-κύνειν, Acts xvi. 19.) u 1 Cor. vi. 2, 4 only. Judg. v. 10 B. 3 Kings
vii. 7. v = Rom. iii. 8. Tit. iii. 2. 2 Pet. ii. 2. w Rom. ii. 24 (from Isa. lii.
5). Rev. xiii. 6, xvi. 9. p attr., Heb.
2 (Eph. ii.
31 4.)

5. rec (for τῶ κόσμῳ) του κοσμου τουτου, with æth: του κοσμου A²C²KL[P] rel lat: ff₁
Syr copt arm Thl Æc-comm: txt A¹BC¹N [syrr].—εν τῶ κοσμῷ 27. 43. 64: εν τ. κ.
τουτω 29 vulg. for βασ., επαγγελίας AN¹.

6. ουχι AC¹ a c. for υμων, υμας A[N¹] 19. 65 Hr.

7. for ουκ, και A c 13 syr æth.

gen., as Elsner, "Iniquas illas cogitationes approbabis:" and Bengel, "judices, approbatores, malarum cogitationum: i. e. divitum, foris splendidum, sed malis cogitationibus scatentium." The evil thoughts are in the judges themselves, and consist in the undue preference given by them to the rich. The same blame, of being a judge when a man ought to be an obeyer of the law, is found in ch. iv. 11. Notice also the parallel containing the same paronomasia, in Rom. xiv.: σὺ δὲ τί κρίνεις τὸν ἀδελφόν σου; (ver. 10:). . . . ὁ δὲ κατακρινόμενος ἐὰν πάγῃ κατακρίνεται (ver. 23)?

5.] Listen, my beloved brethren (bespeaking attention to that which follows, as shewing them in a marked manner the sin of their προσωποληψία), Did not God choose out (in His proceeding, namely, in the promulgation of the gospel by Christ, Matt. v. 3 ff.: Luke vi. 20. See also 1 Cor. i. 27) the poor (τούς, as a class, set against οἱ πλούσιοι as a class, below) as regards the world (reff.: or, those who in the world's estimation are accounted poor; but the dative of reference is most likely here, as in παιδία ταῖς φρεσίν, and the like) rich in faith (i. e. to be rich in faith, or so that they are rich in faith: the words are not in apposition with τοὺς πτωχοὺς, as Erasmus, al., but form a predicated specification of them. ἐν πίστει, as the element, the world, so to speak, in which they pass for rich, as in ref. 1 Tim.: not as the material of which their riches consist, as in ref. Eph. Wiesinger well says, "Not the measure of faith, in virtue of which one man is richer than another, is before the Writer's mind, but the substance of the faith, by virtue of which substance every believer is rich. The riches are the treasures of salvation, and especially, owing to the following κληρονόμους, the sonship in God's family." And

similarly Calvin, "Non qui fidei magnitudine abundant, sed quos Deus variis Spiritus sui donis locupletavit, quæ fide percipimus"), and heirs of the kingdom which He promised (Luke xii. 31, 32 al.) to them that love Him? 6.] Contrast to God's estimate of the poor. But ye dishonoured the poor man (in the case just now put: with reference also to which the aor. is used. "Indignum est deicere quos Deus extollit, et quos honore dignatur probrose tractare: atqui Deus pauperes honorat: ergo pervertit Dei ordinem quisquis eos rejicit." Calv. This is his first argument. Now, vv. 6, 7, he brings in another, deduced from the conduct of rich men towards Christians and towards Christ Himself). Do not the rich (opposed as a class, to τοὺς πτωχοὺς above. This serves to shew that ὁ πλούσιος, when generally spoken of in the Epistle, as e. g. ch. i. 10, is not the Christian rich man, but the rich man as such, in his worldliness and enmity to God) oppress you (see ref. So κατακυριεύειν, Matt. xx. 25: 1 Pet. v. 3: κατεξουσιάζειν, Matt. xx. 25: all signifying to use power, or lordship, or licence, against any to his hurt), and is it not they that (such is the force of the αὐτοί, again repeated below: not that they themselves ἔλκουσιν κ.τ.λ.) drag you (so "a lictoribus trahi," Livy ii. 27: see reff. The term implies violence) to courts of judgment (see ch. v. 6, κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον. The words may refer either to persecutions, or to oppressive law-suits; or perhaps to both, as Apollinarius in the Catena, τοῦτο μὲν οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἄρχοντες, ἐκ τῶν καρποφορίων πλουτοῦντες τοῦτο δὲ καὶ οἱ τὰ Ῥωμαίων διοικοῦντες πράγματα, εἰδωλολατρυόντες τότε. See on the matter, ref. 1 Cor.)? 7.] Is it not they that (on αὐτοί, see above) blaspheme

x Acts xv. 17, from Amos ix. 12.
 y John iv. 27, 28.
 z = Rom. i. 27. Gal. v. 16.
 b 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.
 38. Phil. iv. 14. ver 19
 2 Pet. i. 19. 3 Kings viii. 8.
 a Acts xii. 20, 21 (John iv. 46, 49) only.
 c Matt v. 43 al., from I. EVIT. xix. 15.
 d = Acts x. 33. 1 Cor. vii. 37, e here only τ. see ver. 1 reff.
 w ὄνομα τὸ x ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; 8 εἰ y μέντοι νόμον z τε-
 λείτε a βασιλικόν, b κατὰ τὴν b γραφήν, c Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν
 πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν, d καλῶς d ποιεῖτε. 9 εἰ δὲ e προς-
 ABCKL
 FN a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m o
 13

ἐπικληθὲν C¹.

8. βασιλικόν bef τελεῖτε C syr Antch₁, [ins τον bef βασ. P].

for σεαυτ., σαυτον

B: εαυτον b c d f j k m o² 36 [Antch₁]: εαυτους a.

(actually and literally, in words, it being, as we have maintained throughout, ungodly and heathens who are pointed at. Those who maintain them to be Christian rich men, would understand *βλασφημεῖν*, to disgrace by their lives: but apart from other objections, Huther has remarked well, that when the verb is thus used, it is ordinarily in the passive with *διά*,—see Rom. ii. 24: Titus ii. 5: 2 Pet. ii. 2: Isa. lii. 5,—not as a direct active governing a case, which is far more naturally taken in its literal sense) the *goodly name which was called on you* (i. e. which when you were admitted into Christ's Church by baptism was made yours, so that you are called *χριστοῦ*, 1 Cor. iii. 23 (not necessarily *χριστιανοί*: no particular form of the appropriation of the name is alluded to, but only the fact of the name being called over them. The appellation may or may not have been in use at this time, for aught that this shews). The name is of course that of *Christ*: not that of "God," as Storr and Schulthess, nor that of "brethren," as some. On the phrase *ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ'*, see, besides reff., Deut. xxviii. 10: 2 Chron. vii. 14: Isa. iv. 1: also Gen. xlviii. 16) ? So that if ye thus dishonour the poor in comparison with the rich, you are, 1. contravening the standard of honour which God sets up in His dealings: 2. opposing your own interest: 3. helping to blaspheme the name of Christ.

8—11.] *Proof that this behaviour is a transgression of God's law.* The connexion is somewhat recedite. The adversative *μέντοι* clearly takes exception at something expressed or understood. Calvin, Corn. a-Lap., Laurentius, al., and Theile, Wiesinger, and Huther, suppose the Apostle to be meeting an objection of his readers: "But thus, according to you, we should be breaking the injunction, Love thy neighbour &c., for we should view the rich with hatred and contempt." Then he replies, "Certainly, if ye &c. ye do well." understanding *καλῶς π.* as a very feeble approbation. But this seems to me very unnatural. It contains indeed the germ of the true view, which appears to be this: The Apostle is not replying to a fancied objection on the

part of others, but is guarding his own argument from misconstruction: q. d. 'All this is true of the rich. Still I do not say, hate them, drive them from your assemblies &c.: if you choose to observe faithfully the great command, Love others as yourselves, in your conduct to all, well and good (*καλῶς ποιεῖτε*): but respect of persons, instead of being a keeping, is a breach of this law; for I have proved it to be sin, and he who commits sin is a transgressor of the law, of the whole law, by the very terms of legal obedience.' Thus the context seems to run smoothly and naturally.

8.] Yet (for the connexion see above. Keen, Schneckenburger, al. try to make *μέντοι* mean "*igitur*," which it never can: see reff.) if ye fulfil (emphasis on *τελεῖτε*, as put before the epithet; if ye really choose to fulfil in its completeness that law) the royal law (the law which is the king of all laws, as the old saying makes law itself king of all: *νόμος πάντων βασιλεὺς*. Love fulfils the whole law, *πλήρωμα νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη*, Rom. xiii. 10. See similar expressions in Wetst. and Kypke from Plato, al.: the most remarkable being this: *ἐν τοῖς συγγράμμασι τοῖς περὶ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων, καὶ ὅλως περὶ πόλεως διακοσμήσεως τε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ὡς χρὴ πόλιν διοικεῖν, τὸ μὲν ὁρθὸν νόμος ἐστὶ βασιλικός, τὸ δὲ μὴ ὁρθὸν οὐ δοκεῖ νόμος εἶναι βασιλικός. . . . ἐστὶ γὰρ ὁνομα.* Plato, Minos, pp. 566 f. The explanations, Because it proceeds from God, the great King (Raphel, Wetst., Wolf, al.), from Christ (Grot.), because it applies to kings as well as other men (Michaelis), because "*reges facit*" (Thomus), Calvin's, "*Regia lex dicitur, ut via regia, plana scilicet, recte et æquabilis, qui sinuosis deverticulis, vel ambagibus tacite opponitur,*" &c., are all objectionable, as not bringing in any epithet contextually justified, or peculiarly belonging to this and not to other laws: whereas "that first of all laws" fits excellently the requirements of the context), according to the Scripture, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, ye do well (i. e. *well and good*: see above: if you choose to do this, '*do manus,*' I have nothing to object.

ωπολημπτεῖτε, ἁμαρτίαν ¹ ἐργάζεσθε, ἃ ἐλεγχόμενοι ὑπὸ ¹ τοῦ νόμου ὡς ^h παραβάται. ¹⁰ ὅστις γὰρ ὅλον τὸν ⁱ νόμον τηρήσῃ, ¹ πταίῃ δὲ ἐν ἐνί, γέγονεν πάντων ^m ἔνοχος. ^g ¹¹ ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν ⁿ Μὴ μοιχεύσης, εἶπεν καὶ ⁿ Μὴ φονεύσης· εἰ δὲ οὐ μοιχεύεις φονεύεις δέ, γέγονας ^h παραβάτης

11. 25, 27. Gal. ii. 18 only. Ps. xvi. 4 Symm. (-Basil, Heb. ii. 2.)
v. r.] only, see Wisd. xi. 18. k = Matt. xix. 17. Acts xxi. 25. 1 Tim. vi. 14. 1 John ii. 3 al.
1 (=) Rom. xi. 11. ch. iii. 2 (bis). 2 Pet. i. 10 only. 1 Kings iv. 2. m constr., Matt. xxvi. 66. Mark
ii. 29. xiv. 64. 1 Cor. xi. 27. Heb. ii. 15 only. (Matt. v. 21, &c.) 2 Macc. xiii. 6. n Exod. xx.
13, 14. Dlut. v. 17, 18. 1 Acus xi. 5 (24 here bis. Rom. i. 32)

10. for *ostis*, *os* C. τον νομον bef ολον C m. rec τηρησει, with KL[P] rel
coptt: πληρωσει A a c 63-9 [syr(appy)]: πληρωσας τηρησει 13: txt BCN Thl Œc,
servaverit latt Jer. rec πταισει, with KL[P] rel: txt ABCN Thl Œc Jer₂,
peccaverit lat-ff, offendat vulg.

11. ειπας A. μοιχευσεις N [13: -σεις L k]. transp μοιχευσης and φονευσης
(order of ref Deut and Exod-A) C a c 69. 106 syr arm Thl. rec (2nd time) μοι-
χευσεις φονευσεις, with K rel Thl [-σης LP], mœchaberis occideris latt(occides vulg):
txt ABCN 86. for γεγονας, εγενου A 13. for παραβ., αποστατης A (but not
13 as Tischdft [ed 7] from Scholz).

But then, this you can never do, as long as you respect persons): 9.] but if ye respect persons, it is sin that ye are

working (not obedience to this royal law), being (i. e. seeing that ye are) convicted by the law as transgressors (viz. by virtue of what I have already proved as wrong in your conduct. "Deus enim proximos jubet diligere, non eligere personas." Calv.). 10.] The fact of transgression of this law is proved by its solidarity, not admitting of being broken in one point and yet kept in the whole. "Hoc tantum sibi vult," says Calvin, "Deum nolle cum exceptione coli, neque ita partiri nobiscum, ut nobis liceat si quid minus allubescit, ex ejus lege rescare." For whoever shall have kept (reff.)

* the whole law, but shall have offended (stumbled) in (the matter of: as in ch. iii. 2: see there) one thing (one thing enjoined, one commandment, as by and by explained: not as Schulthess, ἐνὶ ἀνθρώπῳ; nor as Œc., al., τοῦτο περὶ ἀγάπης εἶρηκε (so the Schol.-Matthæi, ἐν ἐνὶ πταισειν ἐστὶ, τὸ μὴ τελείαν ἔχειν ἀγάπην): nor is it to be limited to commandments carrying capital punishment, as Grot., al. It is better to understand ἐντάλαται than νόμῳ (as De W., Wies., Huther, al.), seeing that νόμος here is evidently used collectively for the sum of the commandments, and so πάντων τῶν νόμων could not be said), has become guilty (brought into the condemning power of, involved in, see reff. The more usual construction is to put the punishment, in which a man is involved, in the genitive, as in reff. Matt. and Mark: sometimes in the dative, as in Matt. v. 21 f. The classical construction is to put both the crime and the punishment in the dative: so

ἔνοχος τῇ προδοσίᾳ, Demosth.: τῇ γραφῇ, δίκαις, δνέδει, &c., Plato, Xen. Sometimes however we have the gen.: as ἔνοχος λειπτοαξίου, Demosth. See Palm and Rost, sub voce) of all (things mentioned as objects of prohibition—for such is the reference here, see below—in the law).

11.] Reason for this assertion: the unity of the divine Author of the whole law, and of that law, as the exponent of His will: "Unus est, qui totam legem tulit: cujus voluntatem qui una in re violant, totam violant," Bengel. Cf. also Aug. Ep. ad Hieronym. on this passage. For He who said, Commit not adultery, said also, Commit not murder; now if thou committest no adultery (οὐ, and not μή, because the attention is fixed on the fact of no committal of adultery having taken place. It corresponds, in fact, to μὴ μοιχεύσης above in prohibition. See Winer, § 55. 2, c. d: and cf. ch. i. 23; iii. 2: 1 Cor. xvi. 22), but committest murder, thou hast become a transgressor of the law. (Various fanciful reasons have been given for the selection of these two commandments: "because these two were punished with death," Baumgarten: "because no one had laid a charge of adultery against the readers, but the other they violated by violating the law of love," Wiesinger. But it is far more likely that they are alleged as the two first which regard our duty to our neighbour generally: μὴ μοιχεύσης being put first, as in Mark x. 19: Luke xviii. 20: Rom. xiii. 9: Philo de Decalog. § 10, 12, 24, 32, vol. ii. pp. 186, 189, 201, 207, who lays a stress on this order as shewing that Adultery is μέγιστον ἀδικημάτων: see also De Spec. Leg. ad 6 et 7 Dec. Cap. § 2p. 300. So that this order must have been one preserved in

ο νόμου. 12 οὕτως λαλεῖτε καὶ οὕτως ποιεῖτε ὡς διὰ ἈΒCΚΛ
 1 Cor. iii. 15. P νόμου P ἐλευθερίας Q μέλλοντες Q κρῖνεσθαι. 13 ἡ γὰρ P N a b c
 x. 26. Eph. d f g h j
 v. 28. k l m o
 p ch. i. 25 reff. r κρίσις s ἀνέλεος τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος. u κατακαυ-
 q see Acts xvii. 31. 2 Tim. 14. 1 (1 Pet. 14. 5) [P is much mutilated in vv. 12—21.]
 r = Matt. xii. 41 || L. Luke x. 14 al. 14 v Τί τὸ ὄφελος, ἀδελφοί μου, ἐὰν πιστὴν λέγῃ τις
 s here only. t Luke i. 72. x. 37. Gen. xl. 14. u Rom. xi. 18 bis. ch. iii. 14 only. Jer xxvii. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 32 only. Job xv. 3 only.
 (1) 11, 38. Zech. x. 12 only. constr., 1 Tim. v. 11, v. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 32 only. Job xv. 3 only.
 w ver. 1 reff.

13. rec ανιλεως, with L a b² d [Ephr, Cæs.] Chr, Thl: ανιλεος b¹ 12: ανηλεος h 13: ανελεως f: txt ABCKN rel 36 Ec [(.) .) λeos P]. rec ins. και bef κατακαυχ., with æth Thl: add δε A N³ (but erased) [13(Tischdf)] 40. 73. 83. 101 vulg lat-ff, syr Ec: txt BCKLN¹ rel 36 Syr coptt. [P def.] κατακαυχασθω A 13. 27-9 copt: -χασθε C² Syr: txt B(-χαστε, sic: see table) KLN rel 36 latt Thl Ec Aug. [P def.] for 2nd ελεος, ελεον CKL rel 36 Ec: txt ABN a b¹ c g o Thl. [P def.]
 14. om το BC¹ [arn]. τις bef λεγῃ AC 56 [latt coptt].

ancient tradition: or perhaps found anciently in the LXX. The Rabbis have the same sentiment as this: Wolf quotes from the Talm. Sabbath, fol. lxx. 2, where R. Johanan says of the 39 precepts of Moses, "Quod si faciat omnia, unum vero omittat, omnium et singulorum reus est.")
 12, 13.] *Concluding and summary exhortations*, to speak and act as subject to the law of liberty and love. 12.] **So speak** (pres. as regarding a habit of life) and **so do** (οὕτως both times does not regard what has gone before, but what follows: οὕτως, *ws*. *Speaking* had been before hinted at in ch. i. 19: and will come again under consideration in ch. iii.), **as being about to be judged by** (by means of, as the measure by which your lives will be estimated) **the law of liberty** (the same as in ch. i. 25: that perfect expansion of God's will, resting on the free unrestrained principle of love, which is the moral code of the gospel. And the point of the exhortation is as Schol.-Matthæi, οὕτως τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐργάζεσθε ὡς μὴ ὑπὸ νόμου ἀναγκαζόμενοι, ἀλλ' αὐθαίρετοι). 13.] *Reason why we should be careful thus to speak and do*: viz. that if we do not, we cast ourselves out of that merciful judgment at God's hands which is promised to the merciful: Matt. v. 7, μακάριοι οἱ ἐλεήμονες· ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθήσονται, which is the key to our verse. **For the judgment** (which is coming) (**shall be**) **unmerciful** (Luther makes ἀνέλεος an epithet, es wird ein unbarmherziger Gericht ergeben, which would require the absence of the article) **to him who wrought not** (the aor. is proleptical, the Writer standing at the day of the judgment and looking back over life) **mercy**: **mercy boasteth over judgment** (without a copula, the sentence is introduced more emphatically and strikingly. The meaning is, the judgment which would condemn any and all of us, is, in the case of the

merciful, overpowered by the blessed effect of mercy, and mercy prevails over it. The saying is abstract: to turn it into a concrete, 'the merciful man,' or to appropriate the ἐλεος, 'the mercy of God,' is to limit that which is purposely and weightily left unlimited as an universal truth). 14—26.] In close connexion with what has gone before, the Apostle sets forth that *bare faith without works can never save a man*. The following remarks of De Wette on the passage are important, and well condensed. They have been impugned by many, among whom are Neander, Schneckenburger, Theile, Thiersch, Hofmann: but they seem to me best to represent the simple and honest view of the matter, without any finessing to make the two Apostles in exact accord in their meaning of terms and their positions respecting them (Hofmann, Schriftbeweis, i. pp. 556—563, is worth consulting for a good statement of the other view): "In order rightly to understand this polemical passage, it is necessary accurately to define St. James's ideas of *faith*, of *works*, and of *justification*, and to compare them with those of St. Paul. *Faith* is, according to St. James, the result of the reception of the Word (ch. i. 22), especially in a moral point of view: *moral conviction* (Rom. xiv. 23): and although he recognizes it also as belief in Christ (ch. ii. 1), *as trust* (i. 6; v. 15), and *truth* (i. 3), yet he makes these particulars here of so little moment, that he regards it as *theoretical* belief only, and ascribes it to the evil spirits (ii. 19). Widely different from this is St. Paul's idea of faith, which presupposes self-abasement, the feeling of unworthiness and incapability (Rom. iii. 9 ff., 23), and consists in trust on the grace of God revealed in the atoning death of Christ (Rom. iii. 25; v. 8; 2 Cor. v. 18 f.). Of this faith, moral faith is a branch (Rom. xiv. 23): but this

^w ἔχειν, ^x ἔργα δὲ μὴ ^x ἔχῃ; μὴ δύναται ἡ πίστις σῶσαι ^x αὐτόν; ^y 15 εἰάν δὲ ἀδελφὸς ἡ ἀδελφὴ γυμνοὶ ^y ὑπάρχωσιν

ch. i. 4.
 Luke vii. 25.
 Acts viii. 16.
 Gal. i. 14.
 2 Pet. i. 8.
 ii. 19. iii. 11.

15. om δε BN d m 13 lat-ff₁ (and spee) copt arm. [P def.]

latter, which is the adoption of the working principle of love (Gal. v. 6), can only spring from the purification of the inner man by faith in the atonement. So that it is impossible to say, as some have done, that the idea of faith in the two Apostles is the same. Works, according to St. James, are not the works of the law in the lower sense, the mere observance of carnal ordinances and usages,—but an active life of practical morality, the rule of which is indeed found in the Mosaic law, and especially in the command to love one another, but so found, as apprehended and appropriated by the spirit of liberty (see ch. i. 25; ii. 12). St. Paul also understands by ‘the works of the law’ not merely ceremonial observances, as plainly appears from Rom. vii. 14 ff.: but when he contends against the Jewish righteousness by works, and their pride, as in Rom. ix. 30 ff., he includes these observances in that to which he refers. As regards *justification*, St. James understands it in a *proper*, or moral sense (cf. Matt. xii. 37), which St. Paul also recognizes. But in the latter Apostle’s idea of justification, we must distinguish a threefold point of view: 1. the general moral, at which he stops, Rom. ii. 13 (cf. ib. ver. 5 ff.), taking no account, *how* the highest aim of morality, there indicated, is *to be* attained, and *is* attained: 2. in his polemical point of view, as combating Jewish righteousness by works, he denies that we can, by the fulfilment of the law (even of its moral part, seeing that no man fulfils it aright), attain justification or well-pleasingness to God (Rom. iii. 20: Gal. ii. 16): 3. in the third point of view also, in the Christian life itself, St. Paul recognizes the inadequacy of a good conscience to give peace and blessedness to men (1 Cor. iv. 4), and finds peace only in faith in God, who justifies him of His free grace, i. e. so looks on and accepts him, as if he were righteous. This higher kind of justification, St. James does not recognize.” A good résumé of the literature of the passage will be found in Wiesinger, p. 122, note. The whole question of fact, as to whether St. Paul’s teaching, or some misunderstanding of it, or neither the one nor the other, was in St. James’s view here, I have discussed in the Prolegomena, § iii. 5 ff. 14.]

What is the profit (arising from that to be mentioned: the resulting profit), my

brethren, if (so εἰάν after τί ὠφελήσεται, Matt. xvi. 26: 1 Cor. xiii. 3) **any man say** (there is no emphasis on λέγῃ, as many (Vorst, Piscator, Wolf, Baumgarten, Pott, Stier) have supposed: both its place in the sentence, after πιστῶν, forbids this, and more decisively still the context, in which the whole argument proceeds on the hypothesis of his *possessing* faith: and in ver. 19, faith is actually ascribed to the τίς. At the same time it is not to be wholly passed over, that the Apostle has written not ἔχῃ, but λέγῃ ἔχειν. While this does not imply any want of genuineness in the faith, it perhaps slightly distinguishes the possession of such faith from the absolute πιστῶν ἔχειν: or, as Huther, belongs to the dramatic form of the hypothesis, in which the man is introduced boasting of and appealing to his faith) **that he has faith** (no stress to be laid on the failure of the art. before πιστῶν, as is done by Schneckenburger, “Recte articulo caret, quum non habeat τὴν πίστιν.” This is sufficiently refuted by St. Paul’s similar anarthrous use of πίστις, where it is spoken of in the highest sense, and by our Lord’s command, ἔχετε πίστιν θεοῦ, Mark xi. 22) **but have not works** (i. e. those acts in his life which are proofs and fruits of faith: not mere ceremonial works: see De Wette’s remarks cited above) ? (a note of interrogation, not a comma, is to be placed here. The sentence contains two distinct but connected questions: ‘What is the profit, if’ &c. ? and, ‘Can’ &c. ? Otherwise we leave τί τὸ ὄφελος insulated, and make μὴ δύναται stand unnaturally in an interrogative apodosis) **Can (his) faith** (ἡ, merely because, by the hypothesis λέγῃ πιστῶν ἔχειν, the πίστις is now become definite, is appropriated, according to the general rule by which that which has been anarthrously introduced at the first mention, has the art. when next mentioned: not as Bede, “fides illa, quam vos habere dicitis:” nor as Theile, “quæ non habetur revera sed dicitur tantummodo et jactatur”) **save him** (see for σῶσαι, ch. i. 21. αὐτόν is noticeable, as confining the question within the limits of the hypothesis, by making this particular man, who has faith and not works, the object of the question, and not *τινα*, any, or every man. Here, and not in λέγῃ, nor in ἡ πίστις, lies the true key to the nullity of the faith in question) ? 15, 16.] *The quality, and un-*

z = ch 1. 4, 5 (reff.) only. a heie only t. εφ. 7p. Dion. Hal. viii 41 b see Mark 1. 34. Acts xvi 38 Luke vii. 50 c Mark xiv 54, 67 J. only. Job xxxi. 20. Hag 1. 6. d Matt 1. 6. xiv. 20 al. Ps xxxvi 19 e heie only 1 Chron. xxviii 2 only Wisd iv 5 al. h Acts xxviii. 16 only. 1 Chron. xliii 32. see Rom. xiv. 22. f ver. 14. g = Heb. vi 1. ix. 14. Rev. iii. 1. 1 Cor. xv. 35

καὶ ^aλειπομενοι τῆς ^aἐφημέρου τροφῆς, ¹⁶ εἶπη δέ τις ^{ABCKL} αὐτοῖς ^{PN} ἐξ ^{abc} ὑμῶν ^d Ὑπάγετε ἐν ^d εἰρήνῃ, ^d θερμαίνεσθε καὶ ^d χορτάζεσθε, μὴ δώτε δὲ αὐτοῖς τὰ ^d ἐπιτήδεια τοῦ σώ- ^dματος, τί τὸ ^d ὄφελος; ¹⁷ οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις, ἐὰν μὴ ^d ἔχῃ ^d ἔργα, νεκρά ἐστὶν ^d καθ' ἑαυτήν. ¹⁸ ἀλλ' ^d ἐρεῖ ^d τις Σὺ ^d πιστὶν ^d ἔχεις, καγὼ ^d ἔργα ^d ἔχω· δείξόν μοι τὴν ^d πίστιν σου χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων, καγὼ δείξω σοι ἐκ τῶν

rec aft λειπομενοι ins ωσι, with AL[P] rel Thl Cc: om BCKN syrr coptt [æth arm] Antch.

16. for εἶπη δε, καὶ εἶπη A d 13 Syr sah æth.—ειπει N¹. for τις, τι N¹. υπαγε C¹ (appy) 63. om το BC¹. [P def.]

17. rec εργα bef εχη, with L rel (copt) [æth] Thl Cc: txt ABCKN a b d m o 13. 36 latt sah, απεχη εργα c. [P def.]

18. rec (for χωρις) εκ, with KL rel Thl: om ABC[P]N a m 13 latt syrr coptt [æth] arm. rec aft 1st εργων ins σου, with CKL rel [æth] Thl: om AB[P]N a c 13 latt syrr coptt [arm] (om μου also (aft 2nd εργων) latt syr). σοι bef δείξω BN a c j m:

profitableness, of such faith shewn, as in vv. 2, 3, by a familiar example. 15.]

But (δέ takes up the argument against the person supposed, or against his fautors: and is not, as Wiesinger, merely transitional [it is best rendered in English by beginning the sentence abruptly, not giving any word for it]) if a brother or a sister (the case of a Christian brother or sister is supposed, to bring out more strongly the obligation to help, as a duty) be (found, on your access to them: see, on *πάροχω* and *εἰμὶ*, reff.: and note, Acts xvi. 20) *naked* (there is no need to interpret *γυμνοί* “*male vestiti*,” as so many Commentators: extreme destitution and nakedness in the literal, or almost literal sense, might well go together) and *destitute* (of reff.: Pind. Isthm. ii. 18, *κτεάνων λειφθεὶς ἅμα καὶ φιλῶν*: Soph. Trach. 932, *οὐτ’ ὀδυμάτων ἐλείπετ’ οὐδέν*. The usage is confined to St. James in the N. T.) daily food (the food for each day, τῆς καθ’ ἡμέραν ἀναγκαίας τροφῆς: not “*quod in unum diem sufficit*,” as Morus, nor “for the current day,” as Hottinger), 16.] and (δέ brings in the slight contrast between the want and the manner of its supply) *some one from among you* (not, as Grot., of you “*qui fidem creditis sufficere ad salutem*,” but generally; and put in this form to bring the inference nearer home to themselves) say (rather, ‘*shall have said*,’ not λέγει: but the force of the aor. cannot be given in English without overdoing it), *Go in peace* (see, besides reff., Judg. xviii. 6: 2 Kings xv. 9 LXX. The words would imply, that the wants were satisfied), *be warmed* (as being *γυμνοί*) and *filled* (both are in the present, as indicating the state

in which),—but ye (answering to the *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν*, and now applying the hypothesis to all) *give them not* (*have not given them*: but see above on εἶπη) the necessities of the body (so Herod. ii. 174, *ὅκως μιν ἐπιλείποι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια κ.τ.λ.*: Thuc. ii. 23, *ὅσον εἶχον τὰ ἐπιτήδεια*. See Kypke’s note here, and Wetstein), *what is the profit* (τό, see above, ver. 14)? 17.] *Application of the similitude*. So also *faith, if it have not* (be not accompanied by as its proper result. Here, again, the quasi-identification of the *πίστις* with the man, and ascription of the *ἔργα* to it as a possession, shew in what relative places the two stand in the Apostle’s estimate) *works, is dead* (so Plautus in a remarkably similar passage, Epidic. i. 2. 13, “*Nam quid te igitur retulit Beneficium esse oratione, si ad rem auxilium emortuum est?*”) *in itself* (not as E. V., “being alone,” καθ’ ἑαυτὴν οὐσα: nor, “against itself” = καθ’ ἑαυτῆς, as Möller, al.; nor is it to be joined to *πίστις*, “*fides sola*,” as Knapp and Baumgarten (“*in as far as it is alone*”): but the words belong to and qualify νεκρά, as De W., Huther, al.; it is dead, not merely “ad rem,” as Plant. above, but absolutely, καθ’ ἑαυτήν, in itself: has no living root whereby it energizes. Cf. Palm and Rost under *ἐαυτοῦ*, καθ’ ἑαυτὸν, an und für sich). 18.] But (in any case of faith without works, analogous to that supposed above, of one of you having dismissed the naked and hungry with mere words) *some one will say* (he will be liable to this reproach from any one who takes the more effectual and sensible method, of uniting faith with works), *Thou hast faith, and I have works: shew me* (not, ‘*prove*

ἐργων μου τὴν πίστιν. ¹⁹ σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἰς ὁ θεός ^{j ver. 8 reff.}
 ἐστιν. ^j καλῶς ^j ποιεῖς ^k καὶ τὰ ^k δαιμόνια ^l πιστεύουσιν, ^{k Gosp. pssm. Acts xii. 18.}
 καὶ ^m φρίσσουσιν. ²⁰ ⁿ θέλεις δὲ γνῶναι, ^o ἄνθρωπε ^{1 Cor. x. 20 bis. 1 Tim. iv. 1. Rev. i. 1. Winer Ps. cxlv. 10. 1 Pet. iii. 10 reff.}

ix. 20 Deut. xxxii 17.
 § 58. 3, a.

l plur., Matt. vi. 28. 1 Cor. x. 11. Rev. i. 19 al
 m here only. Job iv. 15. Jer ii. 12.

n John v. 40 1 Pet. iii. 10 reff.

om δ. σ. lat-ff₁ æth. [P def.] rec aft 3rd πιστιν ins μου, with AKL [P(.ou)] rel Thl
 Ec: om BCN a c 13 lat-ff₁ [arm].

19. rec o θεος bef εἰς, with L rel Did, Ec: εἰς ἐστ. o θ. AN 68 vulg Syr coptt æth-pl
 arm Cyr₁[-p]: o θ. ἐστ., addg εἰς in marg bef ἐστ., K: txt (B)C(a c) lat-ff₁ syr æth
 [-rom] Thl.—om o B a c l m [Thl].—om ἐστιν lat-ff₁ æth-rom Cyr₁. [P def.]

to me,' but 'exhibit to me,' ostenta mihi') thy faith without the works (which ought to accompany it), and I will shew thee my faith by (from the evidence of, out of, as the ground of the manifestation) my works. The whole difficulty found in this verse by Commentators has arisen from overlooking the fact that it continues the argument from the previous verses, and does not begin a new portion of the subject. And the reason why this has been overlooked, is, the occurrence between the two of the general clause in ver. 17. The same mistaken person is in the Apostle's view throughout, down to ver. 22: and it is as addressed to him, on the part of a chance objector to his inconsistency, that the ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τις is introduced: the ἀλλά conveying the opposition of an objection not to the Apostle himself, but to him whom the Apostle is opposing. For the various and curious difficulties and confusions which have been raised on the verse, see Huther's note.

19.] Still addressed to the same soli-fidian, but now directly, and not in the person of the ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ τις. This is better than to suppose the τις still speaking; on account of the length of argumentation before the second person singular is dropped, and the analogy of the two arguments drawn from Abraham and Rahab, both of which most naturally come, as the latter on any view does, from the Apostle himself. Thou believest (better without an interrogation: see John xvi. 31, note) that God is one (or with the reading εἰς θεός, 'that there is one God.' The Apostle selects, from all points of dogmatic belief, that one which stands at the head of the creed of Jews and Christians alike. Cf. especially Deut. vi. 4: Neh. ix. 6: Mark xii. 29, 32: Rom. vii. 30: 1 Cor. viii. 4, 6: ch. iv. 12: and the Shepherd of Hermas, ii. 1, p. 914, πρῶτον πάντων πιστεύουσιν ὅτι εἰς ἐστιν ὁ θεός. De Wette and Wiesinger have noticed that the construction with ὅτι after πιστεύεις instead of εἰς or ἐν, implies that merely a theoretical faith is spoken of. But against this view there are two objec-

tions: 1. that εἰς or ἐν could hardly have been used in this case, where the existence (εἰς θεός) or the unity (εἰς ὁ θεός) of God is spoken of as the object of belief: 2. that ὅτι after πιστεύω does undoubtedly elsewhere express the highest kind of realizing faith: e. g. Mark xi. 23, 24: John vi. 69; xi. 27, 42; xiv. 10, 11; xvii. 8, 21; xx. 31 al.): thou doest well (i. e. either understood simply, 'so far is well:' 'it is a good faith, as far as it goes:' or understood ironically, as Calv. al., "ac si dixisset, Hoc magnum est, infra diabolos subsidere:" only that "infra diab." is further than the text assumes: rather, 'diabolis, quod ad fidem, æquari.' The former seems preferable; it is hardly likely that the Apostle would speak slightly even 'argumenti causa,' of so fundamental an article of the faith): the dæmons also (not, the dæmoniæ, as Wetst., though his explanation is specious, "qui per exorcismos et pronuntiationem nominum Dei Hebræorum sanari dicuntur:" nor as Schneckenburger, al., the dæmons in the possessed, who trembled at the sacred Name: but simply, as usually, the evil spirits) believe (the verb is purposely used absolutely: not merely, 'believe this truth,' but, 'thus far, are believers in common with thyself'), and (not to be diluted into ἀλλὰ καί, as Pott, or "atqui," as Theile: the keenness of the sarcasm lies in the simple copula) shudder (φρίσσω, properly of the hair standing on end with terror. Their belief does nothing for them but certify to them their own misery. "Hoc, præter expectationem lectoris additum, magnam vim habet." Bengel).

20—23.] Proof of the uselessness of faith without works, from the example of Abraham: introduced by a severe and triumphant appeal to the objector. 20.] But (passing on to another example which is to prove it even more certainly) wilt thou know (the use of θέλεις serves to shew that the knowledge itself is plain and palpable, and the resisting, it can only arise from perversity), O (this interjection is generally found, in the N. T., in conjurations or vituperations: e. g. Rom. ii. 1, 3;

ο = here only. (see Acts vi. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 10, &c.)
 p = 2 Pet. i. 8 (reiff) Wisd. xiv. 5.
 q Luke i. 73. John viii. 53. Rom. iv. [1.] 12.
 r vi. 24, 25. 20. iv. 2. Gal. ii. 16 (3ce). Rom. iii. 20. 27 reiff. Gen. xxii. 2.
 s = Luke xviii. 14. Rom. ii. 13 al. fr. (chiefly Paul.) Ps. cxlii. 2.
 t = Heb. vi. 27 reiff. Gen. xxii. 2. u = 2 Cor. vii. 8. Heb. iii. 19 v Mark xvi. 20. Rom. vii. 28. 1 Cor. xvi. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 1 only +. Esdr. vii. 2. 1 Macc. xii. 1 only, dat., as 2 Tim. i. 8. w see Heb. ii. 10 reiff. 1 John ii. 5 al. x = Matt. i. 22 al. fr. in Gossp. 2 Chron. xxxi. 21, 23.

20. rec (for ἀργη) νεκρά, with AC³KL[P]N rel vulg copt [syrr arm-use (Orig, Cyr, ?)]
 Thl Ec: txt BC¹ am² (with demid fuld) lat-ff¹ sah arm-zoh (1805) Bede¹.

22. συνέργει AN¹, cooperatur vind.

ix. 20: 1 Tim. vi. 20: Gal. iii. 1: see also Luke xxiv. 25: Acts xiii. 10) empty (void of knowledge and seriousness: content with a dead and bootless notion: κενὸν ἐκάλειπεν ἄνθρωπον τὸν ψιλῇ τῇ πίστει αὐχοῦντα, μηδὲν τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων ὑποστάσεως κεκτημένον εἰς πληρώσιν, Ec.) man (so in Rom. ix. 20), that faith (here abstract: all faith, faith αὐτὸ καθ' αὐτό: not merely πίστις, faith, in any supposed case) separate from works (here again, τὰ ἔργα, abstract; and therefore, in subordination to the former abstract noun, the works which belong to it, which might be expected from it) is idle (bootless, without result: see reiff. So Demosth. p. 815, ἀργὰ χρήματα: Isocr. Panegyr. p. 49, § 48, μήτε τοῖς ἰδιώταις μήτε . . . ἀργὸν εἶναι τὴν διατριβήν. The idea is much the same if we read νεκρά; but seeing that none read ἀργή in vv. 17, 26, and it was hardly likely that the easy νεκρά here would be changed into the difficult ἀργή, this latter is beyond reasonable doubt the genuine reading) ? 21.] The example of Abraham. Was not Abraham our father (the Apostle and his readers being all Jews) justified (accounted righteous before God. No other meaning will satisfy the connexion, inevitable to any intelligent reader, between this ἐδικαιώθη and the σῶσαι of ver. 14: which again is connected with the μέλλοντες κρίνεσθαι of ver. 12. Commentators have endeavoured to evade this full meaning, in various ways. Thus e. g. Calvin, "Notanda est hæc amphibologia; justificandi verbum Paulo esse gratuitam justitiæ imputationem apud Dei tribunal: Jacobo autem esse demonstrationem justitiæ ab effectis, idque apud homines, quemadmodum ex superioribus verbis colligere licet: ostende mihi fidem tuam" &c. It is manifest, that by such "amphibology," any difficulties whatever may be explained away. On the difficulty itself, see in the Prolegomena) by (out of, as the ground of the justification: precisely as St. Paul so constantly uses the phrase δικαιούσθαι ἐκ

πίστεως) works (the category to which the ground of his justification belonged. It was one especial work, in matter of fact: and that work, itself springing out of pre-eminent faith) when he offered (not, as E. V., al., "had offered:" the aor. part., as so often, is synchronous with the aor. itself in the same sentence. ἀναφέρω in this reference with ἐπὶ is not 'to offer up in sacrifice,' but simply to offer, to bring as a sacrifice to the altar: whether the entire 'offering up' takes place or not. Where it did take place, the general meaning may be given: where it did not, as here, the particular one must be kept. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 24) Isaac his son at the altar ? 22.] Thou seest (better not a question: in which case the καὶ of ver. 23 does not follow so naturally as when we couple the direct verb βλέπεις with the direct verb ἐπληρώθη) that (not, "how," as E. V.: it is not the manner in which, nor even "how" in the sense of 'how that,' which is meant. The assertion is, that the inference is indubitable, that the fact was as stated) faith (the art. is abstract here, not possessive, as αὐτοῦ being expressed below shews) wrought (at the time, 'was working,' imperf.) with his works (τοῖς ἔργοις again categorical, the work in the example being but one), and by (out of, as the ground and source) works (again categorical; the general proposition proved by the particular case. Doubtless this second time it might be 'by his works, his faith,' &c.: but the other is more like St. James, who is singularly given to introduce abstract propositions as applicable to particular cases) faith (see above) was made complete (in one act, once for all: not imperf. as συνήργει, but aor.: not, as again many Commentators, even Bengel and De Wette, and so Calvin, "quod vera esse inde comprobetur;" an impossible meaning, and very far from the context of the Apostle's argument; which is, that faith is developed and brought to perfection by obedience: see below on ver. 26. And

ρώθη ἡ γραφή ἡ λέγουσα ὃ Ἐπίστευσεν δὲ Ἀβραὰμ τῷ ^{John v. 24, 38. Acts v. 14. Rom. iv. 3, & Gal. iii. 6, from GEN. xv. 6.} θεῷ, καὶ ^z ἐλογίσθη αὐτῷ εἰς δικαιοσύνην καὶ ^a φίλος ^z θεοῦ ἐκλήθη. ²⁴ ὁρᾶτε ^b ὅτι ^r ἐξ ἔργων ^{rs} δικαιοῦται ^z ἄνθρωπος, καὶ οὐκ ^r ἐκ πίστεως ^c μόνον. ²⁵ ὁμοίως ^c δὲ ^z

^{xix. 27. Rom. ii. 26 al. Ps. cv. 31. only. Exod. iii. 2 al. see Heb. ii. 8. vii. 3, 4 only.} ^{a (GEN. xviii. 17.) see note. c Matt. xxvii. 41 (1 Mk. v. r.) Luke v. 10. x. 32. 1 Cor.}

24. rec aft *ορατε* ins *ταινων*, with KL rel Ec: om ABC[P]N c d 13: 36 latt syrr copt æth [arm] Thl.

25. for *ομοιως, ουτως* C Syr copt [(æth) arm]. om δε C 5. 6. 76 [vulg-clem]

hence also is it evident, how faith *συνήρ-γαι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ*. By the Apostle's own comparison, ver. 26, faith is the body, obedience the spirit: faith without obedience is dead, until obedience, the spirit, sets faith in motion: then faith, like the limbs of the body, moves with and works with the acts of obedience. Which is prior in time, which the ground of the other, is a point not touched by St. James at all. Pool collects well in his Synops. ad loc., the opinions of others: "Opera autem fidem perficiunt ratione operationis et consummationis, quum per opera fides ad maturitatem pervenit, quomodo arbor perfecta sit quum ita excrevit ut fructum ferat, Num. xvii. 8; et peccatum perficitur, Jac. i. 15, quum in habitum evasit . . . Fides tum demum consummata redditur, postquam bonos fructus protulit." But when he goes on to say, "Fides est causa: opera, effectus. Causa autem non perficitur a suo effectu, sed perfecta declaratur: ut fructus boni arborem bonum non efficiunt, sed indicant," he is travelling out of the record, and giving meanings unknown to this passage:] 23.] and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, But (*καὶ*, LXX)

Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness (i. e. that saying of Scripture, which long preceded the offering of Isaac, received its realization, not, it may be, its only realization, but certainly its chief one, in this act of obedience. It was not, until this, fulfilled, in the sense of being entirely exemplified and filled up. Wiesinger combats this sense as an unworthy one, and follows Wolf and Knapp in understanding *πληρωθῆναι* and *τελεσθῆναι* not only "cum illud ipsum quod prædictum erat evenit, sed etiam ubi tale quid accidit quo ejusmodi dicta . . . quoquo modo vel confirmantur et illustrentur." But this is not satisfactory, unless the case in point be such a prominent illustration as to constitute the main fulfilment; and then we come to much the same point. No such objection as that which Wiesinger brings (viz. that we make thus the truth of God's saying depend on Abraham's subsequent conduct)

lies against our view, that the saying received on and not till this occasion its entire and full realization. It was true, when uttered: but it became more and more gloriously true of Abraham's life and acts till it reached this its culminating point, in his chief act of self-denying obedience): and he was called (couple with *ἐπίστευσεν* not with *ἐλογίσθη*) God's friend ('amatus a Deo,' not 'amans Deum.' This appellation of Abraham is not found in the LXX. In ref. Gen., where they have *Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ παιδὸς μου*, Philo, *De Resip. Noë*, § 11, vol. i. p. 401, cites it *Ἀβρ. τοῦ φίλου μου*. And in Isa. xli. 8 the words *σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ ὃν ἠγάπησα* are rendered by the vulg. "semen Abraham amici mei," and by the E. V. "the seed of Abraham my friend." So also in 2 Chron. xx. 7).

24.] *General inference from the example of Abraham.* Ye see (not imperative, nor interrogative) that by (from, out of, as a source) works a man is justified (accounted righteous before God, as above: not, as Calvin, "Fructibus cognoscitur approbatur ejus justitia"), and not by (from) faith only (notice *μόνον*: St. James never says that a man is not justified by faith, provided that faith include in it the condition of obedience: but by faith *μόνον*, *χωρὶς ἔργων*, is no man justified. *μόνον* must be joined with *πίστεως*, not with *οὐκ*, as Theile, "Appositionis lege explenda est oratio: non solum fide, sed etiam operibus . . . nempe cum fide conjungendis:"); see similar instances of adverbs joined to substantives in 1 Cor. xii. 31: 2 Cor. xi. 23: Gal. i. 23: Phil. i. 26: and cf. Winer, § 54. 2, b).

25.] *The example of Rahab.* Various reasons have been assigned for this example being added. Bede says, "Ne se causarentur opera tanti patris Abraham imitari non valere, præsertim cum nullus eos modo cogeret Deo filios offerre perimendos, . . . addit et mulieris exemplum, mulieris criminosa, mulieris alienigenæ, quæ tamen per opera misericordiæ, per officium hospitalitatis, etiam cum periculo vitæ suæ Dei famulis exhibitum, justificari a peccatis meruit" &c. Grotius, "Abrahami exemplum Hebræis ad Chris-

d Heb. xi. 31. ^c καὶ ῥαὰβ ἡ ^d πόρνη οὐκ ^r ἐξ ἔργων ^{rs} ἐδικαιώθη, ^e ὑπο- ABCKL
 reff. Josh. PN a b c
 ii. 1. δεξαμένη τοὺς ἀγγέλους, καὶ ἑτέρα ὁδῶ ^f ἐκβαλοῦσα; d f g h j
 e Luke x. 38. ²⁶ ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα χωρὶς ^g πνεύματος νεκρόν ἐστιν, k l m o
 xix. 6 Acts 13
 xxi. 7 only τ. οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ^h νεκρά ἐστιν.
 Tobit vii. 8. III. ¹ Μὴ πολλοὶ ⁱ διδάσκαλοι γίνεσθε, ἀδελφοί μου,
 1 Macc. xvi. εἰδότες ὅτι μεῖζον ^k κρίμα ^k λημφόμεθα. ² ⁱ πολλὰ γὰρ
 15 only. f = Matt. ix. 25. Mark. 1. 43. Acts
 19. 40 al. h = ver. 17 Heb. vi. 1 ix. 14. i = Acts
 2 Chron. k Mark xii. 40 || L Rom. xiii. 2. 1 = Matt. ix.
 xlii. 14. g = Matt. xxvi. 41. xxvii. 50 al. h = ver. 17 Heb. vi. 1 ix. 14. i = Acts
 xiii. 1. 1 Cor. xii. 25, 29. 1 Ph. ii. 11 k Mark xii. 40 || L Rom. xiii. 2. 1 = Matt. ix.
 14. 1 Cor. xvi. 12 Job xxxv. 5.

Syr copt arm (but not 13 as Scholz [and Tischdf]).

for ἀγγέλους, κατασκοπούς C

K-marg L d g lat-ff₁ Syr syr-mg[(addg ιησου) arm æth].

26. for γαρ, δε lat-ff₁ Orig₁: om B Syr æth arm.

om των B^N a 69 Orig₁.

tum conversis sufficere debebat, sed quia etiam alienigenis scribebat, adjunxit exemplum fœminæ extraneæ:" and similarly Hofmann, Schriftb. i. 557. Schneckenburger, "Novum additur exemplum e sexu muliebri sumptum:" and so Bengel, "Post virum ponitur mulier: nam viros et mulieres appellat," ch. iv. 4 (see note there). When Delitzsch, on Heb. xi. 31, assigns as a reason that der Psalmsmus had already used this example to prove justification *sola ex fide*, he does not necessarily assume the later date for our Epistle. See the whole matter discussed in the Prolegomena. And (the δέ brings out the contrast of the example, again affirming the Apostle's proposition, to the ἐκ πίστεως μόνον, which has been just denied. Huther understands the δέ as bringing out the dissimilarity between the examples implied in πόρνη) in like manner (with Abraham) was not Rahab the harlot (not "caupona" or "hospita," as Grot., not "idololatra," as Rosenmüller, but to be taken literally: see on Heb. xi. 31) justified by works, when she received (not necessarily "clam exceptit," as Theile, see reff. It may be so, but the word does not express it. The word in Heb. is δεξαμένη) the messengers (κατασκοπούς, Heb. xi. 31), and thrust them forth (in haste and fear, Josh. ii. 15, 16: ἐκβαλλειν is not simply 'emittere': see reff.) by another way (viz. διὰ τῆς θυρίδος, Josh. ii. 15 LXX. For the local dative, see Rom. iv. 12: Rev. xvii. 14: and Winer, § 31. 9)?

26.] General conclusion to the argument, but in the form of a comparison, as in ver. 17. For (γάρ binds the verse on to the foregoing, and makes it rather depend on this axiom, than this axiom a conclusion from it: 'it must be so, Rahab must have been thus justified, seeing that' &c.) just as the body without (separate from) spirit (or, the spirit) is dead, so also faith without works (or without its works, the works belonging to it: as in ver. 20) is dead. This comparison has been found matter of

surprise to some Commentators, inasmuch as the things compared do not seem relatively to correspond. Faith is unquestionably a thing spiritual: works are external and material: so that it would seem as if the members of the comparison should have been inverted, and works made the body, faith the spirit. But the Apostle's view seems rather to be this: Faith is the body, the sum and substance, of the Christian life: works (= obedience), the moving and quickening of that body; just as the spirit is the moving and quickening principle of the natural body. So that as the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is also dead.

CHAP. III. a. 1—12.] *The danger*, as connected with the upholding of faith without works, *of eagerness to teach*: and, by occasion, *the manifold and irrepressible sins of the tongue*. Then follows, b. 13—18.] *An exhortation, to prove a man's wisdom by mildness, not by a contentious spirit*.

1.] The more the idea prevailed, that faith, without corresponding obedience, was all that is needful, the more men would eagerly press forward to teach: as indeed the Church has found in all ages when such an opinion has become prevalent: for then teachers and preachers of their own appointing have rapidly multiplied. Be not ('become not': let not that state of things prevail among you in which you become) many teachers (πολλοί belongs not to the predicate, as Schneckenb. al., so that πολλοὶ γίνεσθαι should = *multiplicari*: nor does it mean "nimii in docendo," as Baumgarten: nor = πάντες, as Grotius: but is to be taken with διδάσκαλοι, and in its proper meaning. And διδάσκαλοι is not, as E.V., "masters," which conveys a wrong idea: but *teachers*, persons imparting knowledge in the congregation. This in the primitive times might be done by all in turn, as we know from 1 Cor. xiv. 26—33: and St. James exhorts against the too eager and too general assumption of this privilege), my

^m πταίμεν ἅπαντες. εἴ τις ἐν λόγῳ οὐ ^m πταίει, οὗτος ^m ch. ii. 10
^{no} τέλειος ὁ ἄνθρωπος, δυνατὸς ^p χαλιναγωγῆσαι καὶ ὄλον τὸ ⁿ ch. i. 4 reff.
 σῶμα. ³ εἰ δὲ τῶν ἵππων τοὺς ^q χαλινούς εἰς τὰ στό- ^o Eph iv. 13.
 ματα ^r βάλλομεν ^s εἰς τὸ πείθεσθαι ἡμῖν αὐτούς, καὶ ² Kings xxii.
 26.
 xiv. 20. r = Mark vii. 33. John xviii. 11. xx. 25 bis, 27 al. s = ch. ii. 17 reff.
 p ch. i. 26
 only t (ref).
 q Gen. xiv. 20
 only. Zech.

CHAP. III. 2. [for απ., παντες P.—om 1st clause K.] δυναμενος N a c h [Cyr,
 Damasc, Thl]. aft δυν. ins τε C(appy) vulg.
 3. rec (for ει δε) ιδου, with f: ιδε C[P] rel [arm] Thl: ειδε γαρ N¹(N³) disapproving
 γαρ): om o: ecce syr sah, ecce enim Syr, et ecce æth-pl: txt ABKL l m 13. 36(sic)
 Damasc Cc, si autem vulg lat-ff, quare ergo spec, et insuper æth-rom. rec (for
 εις) προς, with AKL[P] rel [Thl Cc]: txt BCN Damasc. rec αυτους bef ημιν,
 with BKL[P]N rel Damasc, Thl Cc: txt AC 13.

brethren, knowing (as ye do: or, as ye ought to do: it is a good remark of Huther's, that εἰδότες, being closely joined to the imperative, is itself hortatory: 'knowing, as ye might know') that we (i.e. as many of us as are teachers) * shall receive greater condemnation (than others who are not teachers: κρίμα, in the phrase κρίμα λαμβάνειν, according to N. T. usage, is not a 'vox media,' but signifies condemnation only: see besides reff. 1 Tim. v. 12. This being so, it has surprised some Commentators, that the Apostle includes himself with those whom he is dissuading: and Grot., al. would understand κρίμα as meaning "responsibility:" but the solution is easy,—viz. that he includes himself out of humility, and obviously on the assumption that the office of teacher is not faithfully performed. The sense might be thus filled up, as, indeed, it is virtually filled up in ver. 2: 'be not many teachers, for in such office there is great danger of failing, and if we teachers fail, our condemnation will be greater'). 2.] For (see above: this supplies the ellipsis) often-

times (adverbial: see reff. and Winer, § 54. 1) we all (without exception: ἅπαντες is a stronger form than πάντες, being originally contracted from ἅμα πάντες) offend (πταίω, cognate with πλῖπω, πέ-πωκα, πτώσις, see Buttmann, Lexil. i. p. 295, to stumble, fall: cf. the proverb, μή τις πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λίθον πταίειν: hence figuratively, to err or offend morally. The present assertion is to be taken in the widest moral sense, as an axiom applying to our whole conduct. It is in the next clause limited to the subject in hand, viz. the tongue): if any man (see ch. i. 5, 23, 26) offendeth not (is void of offence: οὐ, because the negative belongs, not subjectively to the hypothesis, but objectively to the fact included within the hypothesis) in word (in speaking: and therefore the hypothesis is applicable to these many

who set up for teachers, seeing that thus their chances of offence would be multiplied many fold), he (is) a perfect man (explained by what follows), able to bridle the whole body also (I cannot see the force of De Wette's objections against the general sense of the πολλὰ πταίμεν ἅπαντες. The sense surely runs well thus: We all oftentimes offend: and of those frequent offences, sins of the tongue are so weighty a part and so constant a cause, that he who is free from them may be said to be perfect, inasmuch as he is able to rule every other minor cause of offence: 'the whole body' standing for all those other members by which, as by the tongue, sin may be committed: which may be ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ or ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ, Rom. vi. 13). 3—6.] The importance and depravity of the tongue, so small a member, is illustrated by comparisons: 1. with the small instrument, the horse-bit, ver. 3: 2. with the small instrument, the ship-rudder, ver. 4: 3. with a small fire burning a great forest, vv. 5, 6. 3.] This mention of χαλιναγωγῆσαι, and the situation of the tongue where the χαλινός also is placed, introduce this similitude: which circumstances will also account for τῶν ἵππων standing first and emphatic, χαλινός and στόμα being ideas already given by the context. But (transitional) if (as we do: = in our vernacular, 'when,' 'as often as') of horses (this would not be English, but indicates the emphatic place of τῶν ἵππων. The gen. depends on τὰ στόματα, not on τοὺς χαλινούς) we put (so χαλινὸν ἵππῳ ἐμβάλλειν, Ælian V. H. ix. 16) bits (τοὺς, which are in common use: the bits, of which every one knows) into the mouths, in order to their obeying us (thus shewing, by the expression of this purpose, that we recognize the principle of turning the whole body by the tongue),—(now comes the apodosis after the εἰ: see below) we turn about also (in turning the bit one

† here bis only. ² Chron. xxxvi. 3 al. u ² Cor. i. 10. Heb. ii. 3. Rev. xvi. 18 only. ² Macc. xii. 6. = here (Matt. xxi. 24. John vi. 60. Acts xxvi. 14. Jude 15) only. Prov. xxviii. 16. w = Luke viii. 29. 2 Pet. ii. 17 (Mark vi. 48. John vi. 19) only. Sir. xxxviii. 25. 2 Macc. ix. 4. x Acts xxvii. 40 only. ² Acts xiv. 5 only. Prov. iii. 25. z = here (John i. 23) only. Num. xxi. 23. a here bis. ch. iv. 1. Matt. v. 29, 30. Paul. Rom. vi. 13 bis alt. Lev. i. 6. b here only. ² see Ps. ix. 18 (39). Ezek. xvi. 50. Zeph. iii. 11. Isoc., Lysias, Plato, in Wetst. c here bis. Col. ii. 1 only. d here only. = Isa. x. 17. Sir. xxviii. 10. e Luke xii. 49 (Acts xxviii. 2 v. r) only. 2 Chron. xiii. 11.

μετάγομεν bef αυτων A 13. 36: om αυτων 2. 30 spec Ec.

4. ins τα bef τηλικαυτα B. rec σκληρων bef ανεμων, with AL rel æth Thl: txt BCK[P]N a b c h m o 36 latt Damasci. om αν BN sah. βουλεται B[L]N Damasci: βουληθη 13: βουλοιοτο a.

5. for ουτως, ωσαυτως A d 5. 64-5. 71. 133. rec (for μεγαλα αυχει) μεγαλαυχει, with KLN rel, magna exaltat vulg Bede, magna gloriatur latt-ff, magna exultat fuld: magne exultat harl: magniloqua spec: txt A B (see table) C²[P] Ephr¹]. rec (for ηλικον) ολιγον, with A¹ (as origly written) C²KL rel latt-ff (with spec) [syrr copt æth arm] Damasci Thl: txt A (as corrd by origl scribe) BC¹[P]N vulg Antch¹ Ec.

6. om 1st και N¹.

way or the other) their whole body (cf. Soph. Antig. 473, σμικρῶ χαλινῷ δ' οἶδα τοὺς θυμολέοντος "Ἴππους καταρτυθέντας).

4.] The second comparison takes up, not the protasis with its εἰ δέ, but only the apodosis foregoing. Behold, even (or also) the ships, though so great (the participle carries a slightly ratiocinative force, illative or exceptive according to the circumstances), and driven by fierce (see reff.: and cf. Ælian de Animal. v. 13, σκληρὸν πνεῦμα: and Hist. Var. ix. 14, ὥτα μὴ ἀνατρέπεται ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνέμων, εἴποτε σκληροὶ κατέπνεον. See other citations in Wetst.) winds (Bede interprets this as having a meaning respecting ourselves: "Naves magnæ in mari, mentes sunt hominum in hac vita, sive bonorum sive malorum. Venti validi, a quibus minantur (?), ipsi appetitus sunt mentium, quibus naturaliter coguntur aliquid agere" &c. But it is not likely that the Apostle had any such meaning), are turned about by a very small rudder, whithersoever (οπου for οποι, which is not used in N. T. So also in the classics: e. g. Soph. Trach. 40, κείνος οπου βέβηκεν) the desire (not, as many Commentators, the external impulse given by the hand. Cf. Plato, Phileb. p. 35 D, ξύμπασαν τήν τε δρμήν καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ τήν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ζώου παντός) of the steersman (him who actually handles the tiller) may wish. The same thought occurs in Aristot. Quæst. Mechan. 5, τὸ πηδάλιον, μικρὸν ὄν, καὶ ἐπ' ἐσχάτῳ τῶ πλοῖοι, τοσαύτην δύναμιν ἔχει, ὥστε ὑπὸ μικροῦ οἰακος, καὶ ἐνδὸς ἀνθρώπου δυνάμεως, καὶ ταύτης ἡμετέρας, μεγάλου κινεῖσθαι μεγέθῃ πλοίων. Philo,

In Flacc. 5, vol. ii. p. 521, joins the two ideas together, ἐμπειροτάτους κυβερνήτας, οἱ καθάπερ ἀθλητὰς ἵππους ἡνιοχοῦσιν, ἀπλανῆ παρέχοντας τὸν ἐπ' εὐθείας δρόμον. Cf. also Lucret. iv. 899, and other examples in Wetst.

5.] Application of the comparison. Thus also the tongue is a little member, and boasteth great things (μεγάλα αὐχεῖ (or μεγαλαυχεῖ) is interpreted by Ec., μέγδα ἐργάζεται, and so Thl., Calv., De Wette, al., in the Homeric sense of εὐχεται εἶναι. But Hutherwell observes that there is no need for thus forcing the word out of its ordinary meaning, for the deeds of the tongue follow. This μέγδα αὐχεῖ is the method which it uses to accomplish its deed; it vaunts great words which bring about great acts of mischief). Behold, how small (ἡλίκος is 'quantulus' as well as 'quantus,' e. g. in Lucian, Hermot. 5, παπῶ, ὦ Ἑρμότιμ, ἡλίκους ἡμᾶς ἀποφαίνεις, οὐδὲ κατὰ τοὺς πυγμαίους ἐκείνους, ἀλλὰ χαμαιπετεῖς παντάσῃ ἐν χροῖ τῆς γῆς. De Wette however understands it here "how great," and thinks that not the smallness of the first spark, but the greatness of the fire in its ultimate extent, is intended. Against this, as Wiesinger and Huther observe, is ἀνάπτει, which can hardly mean 'consumes,' but must be said of the first lighting up. Seneca has the very similar words, "quam lenibus inititis quanta incendia oriantur," Contr. v. 5) a fire kindleth how great a forest (ἔλη is taken by some Commentators to mean "materia, lignorum congeries," as in ref. Sir. So Jerome on Isa. lxxvi. 15, 16, vol. iv. p. 813, "Parvus ignis quàm grandem succendit

πῦρ, ὁ ^f κόσμος τῆς ^g ἀδικίας. ἡ γλῶσσα ^h καθίσταται ^f = Prov. xvii. 6 (4). see John xxi. 25. ^g γεν., ch. i. 25 reff. ^h = ch. iv. 4. Rom. v. 19. 2 Pet. i. 8. 3 Mac. iii. 5. i Jude 23 only+. Wisd. xv. 4 only. (-λως, 1 Pet. ii. 13. -λὰς, Jude 12.) j here his only. Exod. ix. 24. k here only (see note). Ps. lxxvi. 18. Isa. xxviii. 27 al. 1 = here (ch. i. 23 reff.) only (see note).

rec ins ουτως bef 2nd η γλωσσα, with [P] rel syr-w-ast Thl Ec: ουτως και L 106: om ABCKN c latt Syr coptt arm Antch, Damasc., [καθίσταται B¹.] for 3rd η, και N¹. aft γενεσεως ins ημων N [7. 25. 33-marg. 68. 83. 96² vulg Syr æth].

materiam." Erasm., Grot., al. But the ordinary meaning gives a far livelier and more graphic sense here. Cf. also Hom. II. β. 455, ἦντε πῦρ ἀίδηλον ἐπιφλέγει ἄσπετον ὕλην, and λ. 155, ὥς δ' ὅτε πῦρ ἀίδηλον ἐν ἀξύλῳ ἐμπέσῃ ὕλῃ. The comparison is beautifully used in a good sense by Philo, De Migr. Abr. § 21, vol. i. p. 455, σπινθήρ γὰρ καὶ ὁ βραχύτατος ἐντυφόμενος ὅταν καταπνευσθεὶς ζωπυρηθῇ, μεγάλην ἐξάπτει πυρὰν καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον οὖν ἀρετῆς, ὅταν ἐλπίσι χρησταῖς υποβαλόμενον ἀναλάμψῃ, καὶ τὰ τέως μεμικτά καὶ τυφλὰ ἐξωμμάτωσε, καὶ τὰ ἀφανανθέντα ἀναβλαστῇ ἐποίησε, καὶ ὅσα ὑπὸ ἀγωνίας ἐστείρωτο εἰς εὐφορίαν εὐτοκίας περιήγαγεν [Tischdf. in his 8th edn., omitting with N¹ the καὶ in ver. 6, carries on the sentence to ἡ γλῶσσα, construing ἡλικὸν πῦρ as an accusative, and ἡλικὴν ὕλην as in apposition with it].

6.] Likewise the tongue is a fire, that world of iniquity (these latter words are still in apposition with ἡ γλῶσσα (and belong appositionally to the *subiect*, not to πῦρ the predicate: as e.g. in Æsch. Choeph. 529 f., ἐν σπαργάνοισι παῖδες ὀρμησάι δικήν, τινὸς Βορᾶς χρῆζοντα, νεογενὲς δάκος); not, as many Commentators, an elliptical clause requiring ὕλη to complete it—"igni respondet lingua, materis seu silvæ respondet mundus improbus," Morus, in Huther. But, when taken as a designation of ἡ γλῶσσα, the interpretations are various. 1. (Ec. mentions as an alternative the signification "adornment" for κόσμος. After giving the ordinary interpretation, he says, ἡ κόσμος ἐστίν, ἥτοι κοσμοῦσα τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν κ.τ.λ., and before, κοσμεῖ τὴν ἀδικίαν διὰ τῆς τῶν ῥητόρων εὐγλωττου δεινότητος. And so it is taken by Wetst., Elsner, Wahl, and others. But it is rightly objected by Huther, that κόσμος never signifies that which (actively) adorns, but that wherewith a thing or person is adorned, as in 1 Pet. iii. 3: so that it would be here that *wherewith*, not that *whereby*, iniquity is adorned. 2. Estius makes the words mean, a world of iniquity, "quia (lingua) peccata omnigena parit." 3. Le Clerc, Hammond, Kuinoel, al. hold the words to be spurious, and a gloss: but

most absurdly. We have the similar use of ὁ κόσμος in ref. Prov., τοῦ πιστοῦ ὅλος ὁ κόσμος τῶν χρημάτων, τοῦ δὲ ἀπίστου οὐδὲ ὕβρις: and the Latins often use 'abyssus,' 'mare,' 'oceanus,' in the same sense [a complete repertory of all wickedness, as the world is of all things]. The use of the art. in titular appositional clauses of this kind is natural as designating the thing pointed at—'mundus ille iniquitatis': the tongue (we must not, although we omit οὕτως, follow Lachmann, and Tischdf. [edn. 7], in destroying the stop at ἀδικίας and carrying the sense on to this clause: for thus we make a very lame sentence, with the subject, ἡ γλῶσσα, twice repeated. The new sentence begins here) is (perhaps we cannot find in English a better word for καθίσταται, though it does not give the exact meaning, which is as in vulg., "constituitur." Any rendering of this in English would be too forcible; as if some divine arrangement were spoken of: "collocata est" (Beza, Piscator, Schneckenburger, al.) is not exact. See reff.) among our members that one which (De Wette compares for the construction, Phil. ii. 13, ὁ θεός . . . ἐστὶν ὁ ἐνεργῶν) defileth (ref.) the whole body (thus justifying the title given to it of ὁ κόσμος τῆς ἀδικίας) and setteth on fire (the other clause, καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα πῦρ, is now taken up. By the construction, strictly considered, these two participles, φλογίζουσα and φλογιζομένη, are (as Wiesinger) subordinated to ἡ σπιλοῦσα, there being no articles before them. But forasmuch as thus we should find a difficulty in the sense, in that the action indicated by the first of these participles can hardly take place within our members, it is better, with Huther, to regard the participles as new particulars, and the construction as not a strictly exact one. Something of the same inaccuracy is found in ch. iv. 11, but not in iv. 14, as Huther also alleges) the orb of the creation (in interpreting the difficult words τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως, one thing must especially be borne in mind: that like ὅλον τὸ σῶμα, they designate some material thing which agreeably to the figure used may be set on

ζομένη ὑπὸ τῆς ^m γενένης· ἡ ⁿ πᾶσα γὰρ ⁿ φύσις ^o θηρίων ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

^m Gospp., ⁿ Matt. v. 22, ^o al. fr. Epp., here only +. ⁿ = (see note) here only +. ^o Wisd. vii. 20 only. Jos. B. J. iii. 5, ζώων τε ^o πολλὰ φύσεις παρήγοντο. so Soph. Antig. 356, εἰναλίαν φύσιν. ^o Acts xi. 6.

fire. This would at once set aside all figurative explanations, such as "rotam originis nostræ, quæ, simul atque nati sumus, cursum suum auspicatur," Gebser, al.,—τὸν χρόνον, τὸν τροχοῖδῃ δηλονότι, τῆς ζωῆς, Isidor. pelus.,—founded on the parallel in Anacreon (iv. 7), τροχὸς ἄρματος γὰρ οἷα βίOTOS τρέχει κυλισθεῖς. So likewise Ec., τροχὸς, ὁ βίος εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἀνελιττόμενος, illustrating it by the Psalmist speaking of ὁ στέφανος τοῦ ἐναντιοῦ: such again as that of Wolf, "indesinens successio hominum aliorum post alios nascentium," after the Syr., "It turneth the course of our generations which run as a wheel." In seeking then for some material interpretation, we come first to that of Wiesinger,—the whole body—the circumference of our corporeal being, the τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως, as the πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως in ch. i. 23: the circumference (of the body) which is congenital with us. But, as Huther has observed, it would be in the highest degree unnatural, when the Writer has just expressed βλῶν τὸ σῶμα without a figure, that he should again express it in a figure, and that without the least indication of the identity of meaning. The same objection is fatal to Bengel's view, who also understands it of the body, but gets this meaning by an allegorical method, "Rotasive sphaera superior est ipsa natura humana rationalis: gehenna vero est pars profundior, cor: lingua in medio ex inferioribus inflammatur et superiora inflammatur." More ingenious is the idea of Beza (ed. 1598), "Jacobus mihi videtur alludere ad rapiditatem circumactæ rotæ, suo motu flammam concipientis:" and this is followed by Benson, who says, "The present life of man is here compared to a wheel, which is put in motion at our birth, and runs swiftly till death puts a stop to it. By the rapidity of its (?) motion the tongue sets this wheel in a flame, which sometimes destroys the whole machine." Cf. Hor. Od. i. 1. 3, "metagæ fervidis evitata rotis:" but it seems to lie too far from the words for us to suppose that the Apostle can have thus intended to express it. And besides, the propriety of the comparison is not satisfied: for in the case of a wheel, it is set on fire by its own rapid motion, not by any thing without it. It appears then to me that we are driven to the rendering given above, on which Beza says (ed. 1565), "Mihi videtur minus dura explicatio, si τὸν τροχόν accipiamus ἀντὶ τοῦ κύκλου, ἐκ τῆς γενέσεως pro τῆς κτίσεως, ut significetur linguam posse vel totum

orbem conditum accendere." In favour of this, we have, that τροχὸς is used for "orbis" in Aristoph. Thesmoph. 17: for circular enclosures, Plato, Critias, p. 113 ff.; Soph. frag. 222 d; Schol. on Plato, Legg. iii. p. 451: see also Odys. μ. 173; φ. 178, 183: and that γένεσις is used in the concrete sense of "creation" by Plato, Tim. p. 29 D, E (λέγωμεν δὲ δι' ἡντινα αἰτίαν γένεσιν καὶ τὸ πᾶν τὸδε ὁ ξυνιστὰς ξυνέστησεν), and by other writers. And it is remarkable also (De W.), that just below, when St. James would speak of men as created after God's image, he uses not κτισθέντας but γεγονότας. Cf. also his use of τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γενέσεως, before cited, in ch. i. 23, "the face wherewith he was created." This sense, the whole orb or cycle of creation, is not, as Wiesinger affirms, "at least not favoured" by ver. 7, but on the contrary agrees exceedingly well with it. After the mention of the τροχὸς τῆς γενέσεως, it is natural that the Apostle should take up with the γὰρ the details of creation, and assert that they might all be tamed by man, but that the tongue is untamable. Again, such sense is most agreeable to the similitude just used, of a small spark kindling a vast forest. This sense is found in Syr., æth., Crusius, Cocceius, and De Wette [the expression in E. V., the course of nature, is sufficiently near the meaning, and expresses it in better English, perhaps, than any other]], and itself set on fire (notice the present, indicating that it is habitually, continually, so set on fire: see below) by hell (which is itself γέννα τοῦ πυρός, ref. and al. These words are not to be explained away, as Theile, "igne fœdissimo ac funestissimo:" such is not St. James's teaching, cf. ch. iv. 7, where the devil, as a tempter to evil, is personally contrasted with God: but are to be literally taken. It is the devil, for whom hell is prepared, that is the tempter and instigator of the habitual sins of the tongue. It is out of the question (see above) to regard φλογιζομένη as alluding to the original temptations of the fall: equally so, to suppose it to have a future reference, and to imply that the tongue shall be tormented in (ὑπο?) hell: as some in Ec., ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ φησι φλογίζεσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς γενένης, ὡς δῆλον ἀπὸ τοῦ τὴν γλώσσην ἀποτηγανίζομενον πλουσίον: so also Grot., Benson, Semler, Storr, Rosenmüller. I need hardly add, that the foolish conjectural emendation γέννης, "a (ὑπο?) nativitate," insisted on with much confidence in a note to an

τε και ^{op}α πετεινῶν ^{op}α ἐρπετῶν τε καὶ ^sἐναλίων ^tδαμάζεται ^pas above (o).
καὶ ^tδεδάμασται τῇ ⁿφύσει τῇ ^uἀνθρωπίνῃ, ⁸τὴν δὲ ^qas above (o,p).
γλώσσαν οὐδεὶς ^tδαμάσαι δύναται ἀνθρώπων· ^vἀκατά-
στατον κακόν, ^wμεστὴ ^xιοῦ ^yθανατηφόρον. ⁹z ἐν αὐτῇ ^ras above (o,p)

24. s here only t. Soph. as above (n) t here See. Mark v. 4 only. Dan. ii. 40 (bis Theod. only.
u 1 Pet. ii. 13 ref. v ch. i. 8 only. Isa. liv. 11 only. w Matt. xxiii. 28. John xix. 29. xxi
11. Rom. i. 29, xv. 14. ver. 17. 2 Pet. ii. 14 only. Ezek. xxxiii. 1, x = Rom. iii. 13 (ch. v.
3) only. Ps. cxxxix. 3. y here only Num. xviii. 22. Job xxxiii. 23. z = Matt. v. 13 al. fr.

7. om 2nd τε A a 11. 47 [arm: και ερπ. c]. transp δαμάζεται and δεδάμασται
C b o [arm(Tischdf)]: om κ. δεδ. Syr.

8. [om δε P.] rec δυνатаи ανθρωπων bef δαμασαι, with L rel [arm] Cyr[-p₁]
Damasc₁ Thl Œc: δυνатаи bef δαμασαι AK[P]N a c m: δαμασαι bef ουδεις 13: txt BC
syr. rec ακατασχετον, with CKL rel spec syrr [æth arm(Treg) Cyr-p₁] Epiph₁
Damasc_{allic} Thl Œc: txt AB[P]N vulg lat. ff₁ copt arm[(Griesb) Damasc-ms₁] Jer.
(13 def.)

anonymous version of St. James and St. Peter (Hatchard, 1842), is quite out of the realm of, as the construing proposed on its adoption is beneath, legitimate criticism [though it can claim the support of spec 'a genitura']. Wiesinger says, "This passage reminds us, in its general sense, of the O. T. sayings, Prov. xvi. 27: Ps. cxx. 2—4: Sir. xxviii. 11 ff." The last clause, καὶ φλογ. ὑπὸ τ. γ., is strikingly paralleled by the Targum on Ps. cxx. 2, where the deceitful tongue is compared "cum carbonibus juniperi, qui incensi sunt in gehenna inferne." But none of these passages treats of the destruction which the tongue brings on its own body (cf. Wiesinger's interp. above). 7, 8.] *The untameableness of the tongue.* The thought in ver. 3, though not directly leading on to this, yet is a hint tending towards it.

7.] For (a fresh fact is adduced, substantiating the strong terms used of the mischief of the tongue) **every nature** (natural generic disposition and character; and so below, when joined to ἀνθρώπινος: not, "kind," "genus," as E. V. and many Commentators) of **beasts** (quadrupeds, see below) and **winged things, of creeping things and things in the sea** (creation is divided into four classes: θηρία, πετεινά, ἐρπετά, and ἐνάλια. The first then is not to be taken in its wide sense, as Acts xxviii. 4, 5, but as distinguished from the other three, i. e. as = quadrupeds, beasts of the earth, proper. The classification in Peter's vision, ref. Acts, is different: τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία κ. τὰ ἐρπετά κ. τὰ πετεινά τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, θηρία there at least including the fishes) is (habitually, pres.) **tamed and hath been tamed** (has long ago been reduced into subjection: such taming has become (perf.) an enduring fact in the world's history, exemplified (pres.) every day) by (not, 'to,' as a 'dativus commodi': it is the dat. of the agent, after a passive verb, = the construction with

ἵπδ and a gen., as is shewn by the following active construction with οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων) the **nature** (not, "ingenii solertia," as Schneckenb., al.; but φύσις as before, natural generic character) of **man**:

8.] but (exception) **the tongue no one of men can tame** (the assertion is absolute, not to be weakened by εὐκόλως κ. ἐνευ πόνου, as the Schol. in Matthæi. And it is plain that to read it, as Œc., interrogatively (εἰ τὰ ἀτίθασσα θηρία ὁ ἄνθρωπος τιθασσεύει καὶ χειροσθή ποιεῖ, ἄρα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γλῶσσαν οὐ δαμάσει;), is quite out of the question. Observe δαμάσαι, aor., 'even to tame once,' not habitually, pres. Now we see fully the meaning of ver. 2): it is a **restless mischief** (ἀκατάστατον expresses both fickleness and restlessness, see above on ch. i. 8 and Dio Chrys. there, who calls a democracy ἄστατον κακόν. The figure here seems to correspond nearly to what is related of Proteus, that he eluded the grasp of Menelaus under many various shapes. Cf. Hermas, Pastor ii. 2, p. 916, ὃ πόσον πονηρὰ ἐστὶν ἡ καταλαλὴ, καὶ ἀκατάστατον δαιμόνιον), (it is) (the supply of a copula is necessary on account of the change of gender, referring back again to γλῶσσα. Or, the two clauses may be rendered without any copulæ, as quasi-exclamations) **full of death-bringing poison** (cf. ref. Ps., ἡκόνησαν γλῶσσαν αὐτῶν ὥστε ὀφεις, ἰδὲ ἀσπίδων ὑπὸ τὰ χεῖλη αὐτῶν). I cannot forbear referring the reader to Erasmus's very elegant paraphrase of these two verses, 7, 8; and thanking Wiesinger for directing attention to it. 9, 10.] *Exemplification of ἀκατάστατον κακόν, by the inconsistent use of the tongue.*

9.] Therewith (there could not be a word more accurately expressing the instrumental sense, as it is called, of ἐν: it is as *clad in*, and working in the realm and sphere of, that this use is found, as we say 'a man in armour,' 'in a helmet:' ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς)

13 Τίς ^v σοφὸς καὶ ^{vw} ἐπιστήμων ἐν ὑμῖν; ^x δεῖξάτω ^x ἐκ ^v τῆς καλῆς ^y ἀναστροφῆς τὰ ^z ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἐν ^a πραύτητι ^b σοφίας. 14 εἰ δὲ ^{cd} ζῆλον ^p πικρὸν ἔχετε καὶ ^e ἐριθείαν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν, μὴ ^f κατακαυχᾶσθε καὶ ^g ψεύδεσθε ^h ἐκ κατὰ τῆς ⁱ ἀληθείας. 15 οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῇ ^j ἡ ^b σοφία ⁱ ἀνωθεν

Rom. x. 2 al. Sir. xxx. 24. d here bis. 2 Cor. xii. 20. Gal. v. 20. e as above (d). Rom. ii. 18. Phil. i. 17. ii. 3 only. f ch. ii. 13 reff. g see Matt. v. 11. h James, ch. i. 18. Heb. xiii. 7 reff. i = John iii. 19, 20, 21. a ch. i. 21 reff. b = ch. i. 5. c = Acts v. 17. xlii. 45.

14. aft εἰ δε ins ara A[P] 13. 56. 106(sic). ταις καρδίαις N [b j o 4. 16. 27-9. 66². 106 latt syrr copt arm Antch.]. καυχασθε A a m 141-6-9. 22-3-6. 37. 46. 69. 78. 123-77. (κατὰ) τῆς ἀληθείας bef και ψεύδεσθε N [Syr].—om κατὰ N¹. 15. η σοφία bef αὐτῇ C a c Did₁ [Ephr₁]. Thl: om αὐτῇ lat-ff₁.

crisy and mere seeming). 13—18.] *Wisdom must be shewn by meekness and peaceableness, not by contentiousness.* This paragraph is closely connected with the subject of the chapter as enounced in ver. 1. Where that ambition, and rivalry to be teachers, existed, there was sure to be contentiousness and every evil thing. 13.] Who is (cf. the similar question in Ps. xxxiii. 12, τίς ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζῶν κ.τ.λ.; παύσον τὴν γλώσσαν σου ἀπὸ κακοῦ κ.τ.λ.) **wise and a man of knowledge** (the same adjectives are joined in reff. It is not easy to mark the difference, if any is here intended. Wiesinger says, “σοφός is a general term for the normal habit as regards intelligence, cf. ch. i. 5: while ἐπιστήμων denotes the practical insight which in any given case judges rightly and teaches the right way to put σοφία in practice.” Rather would it follow the general analogy of the words to regard σοφία as denoting general ability backed by knowledge, ἐπιστήμη as acquaintance with particular facts and departments of knowledge. The σοφός is an able man, the ἐπιστήμων a well-informed man. But the distinction must be very uncertain: for while Plato says, Rep. v. p. 477 B, ἐπιστήμη ἐπὶ τῷ ὄντι πέφυκε γνῶναι ὡς ἐστὶ τὸ ὄν, in the Phædrus, p. 96 B, he says again, οἱ σοφοὶ ἐπιστήμη σοφοὶ εἰσιν . . . ἐπιστήμη ἥρα σοφία ἐστίν among you? Let him shew (aor. because referring to each individual ἔργον when performed, rather than to his general habit) out of (ref.: to which passage and its reasoning the Apostle seems again to be referring. The σοφία and ἐπιστήμη would be dead without this exhibition, as faith without works) **his good conduct** (in life: see reff.) **his works** (the good conduct is the general manifestation: the works, the particular results of that general manifestation. The sum of both makes up the ἔργα in the former case, ch. ii.) **in meekness of wisdom** (an adverbial clause belonging to δεῖξάτω: not to be tamed down into πραεῖα σοφία as Beza, Grot., al., nor

into πραύτης σοφία as Laurentius: meekness is the attribute, σοφία the character to which it belongs: ‘in that meekness which is the proper attribute of wisdom’). 14—16.] *Consequences of the opposite course.* 14.] But if ye have (as is the fact: this is implied by the indic.: cf. Col. iii. 1, εἰ ὁν συνηγέρθητε τῷ χριστῷ κ.τ.λ.) **bitter emulation** (πικρὸν seems to refer back to the example in vv. 11, 12. “Non damnatur,” says Bengel, “zelus dulcis et ira dulcis, ex fide et amore”) and rivalry (see on ἐριθός and ἐριθεία in note, Rom. ii. 8. Beware of confounding ἐριθεία with ἐρις, as is very generally done) **in your heart** (out of which come thoughts and words and acts, see Matt. xv. 18, 19), **do not** (in giving yourselves out for wise, which (cf. ver. 15) you cannot really be) **boast against** (ref.) and **lie against the truth** (q. d. κατακαυχᾶσθε κ. καταψεύδεσθε, but the latter compound is resolved to bring out more forcibly the ψεύδος in their conduct. Some, as De W. and Wiesinger, suppose κατακαυχ. κατὰ to belong together, and καὶ ψεύδεσθε to be an insertion of the Apostle further to define the κατακαυχᾶσθε. Others again have taken pains to excuse the imagined tautology in ψεύδεσθε κατὰ τῆς ἀληθείας, which however is no tautology at all. ἡ ἀλήθεια, from its following κατακαυχᾶσθε, is necessarily not subjective, ‘truth’ merely, as a quality absent from the conduct of those thus acting, but objective, ‘the truth,’ of which their whole lives would be thus a negation and an opposition;—which would be in their persons vaunted against and lied against).

15.] *Designation of such pretended wisdom.* This wisdom is not one descending from above (the verb is purposely resolved, to throw out the negation οὐκ ἔστιν, and to put the categorical κατερχομένη into prominence as a class to which this σοφία does not belong. So that we must not miss this purpose by making ἐστὶν κατερχομένη = κατέρχεται, as does E. V., Schneckenb., al.: still less must we with Luth., al.,

^k = here only. ^k κατερχομένη, ἀλλ' ^l ἐπίγειος, ^m ψυχική, ⁿ δαιμονιώδης. ^{ABCKL}
 16 ° ὅπου γὰρ ^{cd} ζήλος καὶ ^{de} ἐριθεία, ἐκεῖ ^p ἀκαταστασία καὶ ^{PNabc}
 πᾶν ^q φαῦλον ^r πρᾶγμα. 17 ἡ δὲ ⁱ ἄνωθεν ^b σοφία πρῶτον ^{d f g h j}
 μὲν ^q ἀγνή ἐστίν, ἔπειτα ^t εἰρηνική, ^u ἐπικηκής, ^v εὐπειθής,
 only t. ^w μεστὴ ^x ἐλέους καὶ ^y καρπῶν ^z ἀδιάκριτος, ^{k l m o}
 m 1 Cor. ii. 14. ¹³
 xv. 44 bis. ¹³
 46. Jude 19 only t. ⁿ here only t. ^{Ps} xc. 6 Symm. ^o Heb. ix. 16 reff. ^p Luke xxi.
 9. 1 Cor. xiv. 33. 2 Cor. vi. 5. xii. 20 only. ^{Prov} xvi. 28. ^{Tobit} iv. 13 (not in N) only. (-^{ταρος}, ch. i. 8.)
 q John iii. 20. v. 29. ^{Rom} ix. 11. ^{Tit} ii. 8 only. ^{Prov} xii. 8. ^r = Heb. vi. 18 x. i. xi. 1 al.
 s 2 Cor. vii. 11. xi. 2. 1 John iii. 3 al. ^{Ps} xxi. 9. (-^{νότης}, 2 Cor. vi. 6.) ^t Heb. xii. 11 only. ^{Deut} xxiii. 6 al.
 u 1 Pet. ii. 18 reff. ^v here only t. ^{εὐπειθεστέρω} πρὸς τὸ παρακαλοῦμενον, ^{Polyb} i. 68. 3. ^w ver. 8.
 x ch. ii. 18. ^y here only. ^{elaw} κ. καλός, as Matt. iii. 10. ^{vi} 16 &c. ^z here only t. ^{Prov} xxv. 1 only.

αλλα B[N].

16. for ἐριθεία [-^{ρειθ}-B¹], ερεις C [ε^{ρις} P Antech¹] aft ἐκει ins και AN 4. 13. 73.
 101 vulg-mss Syr.

17. aft καρπων ins εργων C(erased by C²?) 27-9. 66². 106 Did¹. rec ins και

render ungrammatically, "this is not the wisdom which cometh down" (ἡ ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη), but earthly (as the sharp-contrast to ἄνωθεν κατερχομένη: belonging to this earth, and its life of sin and strife), sensual (it is almost impossible to express satisfactorily in English the idea given by ψυχικός. Our "soul" is so identified with man's spiritual part in common parlance, that we have lost the distinction between ψυχή and πνεῦμα, except when we can give a periphrastic explanation. The idea here is, belonging to the unspiritual mind of man. See the whole treated in the note on Jude 19, ψυχικοὶ πνεῦμα οὐκ ἔχοντες), devilish (like, or partaking of the nature of, the devils. This word must be figuratively taken, as by Hottinger (in Huther), "impuro genio magis quam homine digna:" it betokens both the origin of this hypocritical wisdom (cf. φλογισμένη ὑπὸ τῆς γέεννης above, ver. 6), and its character: it is from, — not God, the giver of all true wisdom, ch. i. 5, but — the devil, — and bears the character of its author). 16.] *Justification of the foregoing assertion.* For where is emulation (in a bad sense) and rivalry (see above), there is confusion (ref. 1 Cor.: anarchy, restless disturbance. Cf. ref. Prov., στόμα ὁστεγον ποιεῖ ἀκαταστασίας), and every evil (reff.) thing (or, deed).

17, 18.] *Character and praise of heavenly wisdom.* 17.] But (contrast) the wisdom from above is first of all pure ("Ad duplex genus qualitas revocatur: altero interna vis uno vocabulo exprimitur, quippe una ipsa cæterarumque effectrix, altero externæ rationes sex notationibus describuntur, quæ ad primum scriptoris consilium invidiæ rixisque occurrendi omnes redeunt." Theile. ἀγνή, καθαρὰ καὶ ἀρύτατος, μηδενὸς τῶν σαρκικῶν ἀντερχομένη, &c. It is hardly necessary to guard any scholar against the abuse of this text often found, when it is made to signify that the

heavenly-wise must be pure, i. e. free from all contact with any thing that offends, before he can be peaceable: and thus it is used to further, instead of to discourage, an uncharitable spirit, then (= in the second place: its external qualities are now enumerated) peaceable, forbearing (μὴ ἀκριβοδίκαιος ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον, Aristot. Eth. Nic. x. 6. See note on Phil. iv. 5), easily persuaded ("suadibilis," vulg. The word occurs in the active sense of "easily persuading," in Æschyl. Agam. 274, πότρεα δ' ὀνείρων φάσματ' εὐπειθὴ σέβεις: and Choece. 259, πέμπειν ἔχοις ἂν σήματ' εὐπειθὴ βροτοῖς: but not, that I am aware, in this passive sense), full of compassion (the great triumph of the Christian practical life is won by ἔλεος: see ch. ii. 13) and good fruits (contrast to πᾶν φαῦλον πρᾶγμα above), without doubting (as might be expected, from the various meanings of διακρίνεσθαι, this word has been variously interpreted. Luther, E. V., and most Commentators render it "without partiality," unparteiſch, thus giving to a passive adjective an active meaning: and in the same spirit, &c., μὴ διακρίνουσα παρατηρήσεις βρωμάτων κ. διαφόρων βαπτισμάτων: Beza, "absque disceptatione;" vulg., "non judicans;" Calvin, "Nimis anxiam et scrupulosam inquisitionem notat, qualem fere in hypocritis cernere licet, qui dum nimis exacte inquirunt in fratrum dicta et facta, nihil nou in sinistram partem rapiunt:" Bengel, "Non facit discrimen ubi non opus est, v. gr., inter potentes et tennes." The passive sense is kept by Gebser, who understands "undivided:" the heavenly-wise keeping banded together in love: Wetst., "non duplex." Two considerations contribute to substantiate the rendering given above, which is that of De Wette, Wiesinger, and Huther. 1. The word would seem, from its close junction with ἀνυπόκριτος, rather to betoken an inner

^a ἀνυπόκριτος. ¹⁸ ^b καρπὸς δὲ ^b δικαιοσύνης ἐν εἰρήνῃ ^a σπείρεται τοῖς ^d ποιοῦσιν ^d εἰρήνην. a Rom. xii. 9.
2 Cor. vi. 6.
1 Tim. i. 5.
2 Tim. i. 5.
1 Pet. i. 22
only + Wsd.
v. 18. xviii.
16 only.
b Phil. i. 11.
Heb. xii.

IV. ¹ ^e Πόθεν πόλεμοι καὶ ^e πόθεν ^f μάχαι ἐν ὑμῖν ;
οὐκ ^g ἐντεῦθεν, ἐκ τῶν ^h ἡδονῶν ὑμῶν τῶν ⁱ στρατευο- c = Gal. vi. 8 al. Prov. xxii. 8.
d Eph. ii. 15 only. Isa. xlv. 7. see
e Rom. vii. 5. Luke i. 43 al.
f 2 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Tim. ii. 23. Tit.
g = (& Epp.) here only. (John xviii. 36 al.)
h = here bis
i 1 Pet. ii. 11 ref.

11. Prov. xi. 30. c = Gal. vi. 8 al. Prov. xxii. 8. d Eph. ii. 15 only. Isa. xlv. 7. see
Matt. v. 9. e Rom. vii. 5. Luke i. 43 al. f 2 Cor. vii. 5. 2 Tim. ii. 23. Tit.
11. 9 only. Gen. xiii. 7. g = (& Epp.) here only. (John xviii. 36 al.) h = here bis
(Luke viii. 14. Tit. iii. 3. 2 Pet. ii. 13) only. i 1 Pet. ii. 11 ref.

bef ἀνυποκριτος, with KL rel Syr [æth] Thl Æc: om ABC[P]N a 13 latt syr copt arm
Did. [Ephr, Antch.] Damasc₁.

18. rec ins της bef δικαιοσύνης, with K rel Æc: o(but erased) N: om ABCL[P]
a c d h k [arm Ephr, Antch, Damasc₂] Thl.

CHAP. IV. 1. rec om 2nd ποθεν, with KL rel vulg vind Syr [æth] Æc: ins ABC[P]N
a c m 13 lat-ff₁ (and spec) syr copt arm Antch₁ Thl. εν υμ. bef κ. ποθ. μαχ.
A [arm-mss]; bef μαχαι 13 [Syr].

quality than (as Gebser above) an outward circumstance: 2. when thus used of an inner quality, cf. ch. i. 6 and ii. 4, our Apostle, in common with other N.T. writers, signifies by it 'to doubt.' So that I would understand by it "expers omnis cujuscunque ambiguitatis et simulationis," as Huther), without feigning ("These two characteristics are also added with especial reference to the state of things among the readers: on ἀδίακριτος, cf. ch. i. 6—8; ii. 4: on ἀνυπόκριτος, ch. i. 22, 26; ii. 1." Huther). 18.] Before, in ver. 16, after the characterization came the *statement of the result*: and so now here. That result was designated as a present one, ἀκαταστασία κ. πᾶν φαῦλον πᾶγμα: this is a future one, but beautifully anticipated by the pregnant expression καρπὸς σπείρεται: see below. But (δέ passes from the subjective character to the objective result) fruit (or, *the fruit*, καρπὸς being in the emphatic place and therefore losing its article) of righteousness (genitive of apposition: that fruit which is righteousness: see ref. Heb. and cf. Isa. xxxii. 17: righteousness in its wider sense: in themselves and in others; in practice and in reward; in time and in eternity) is sown (in saying καρπὸς σπείρεται the Apostle uses a prolepsis, as if a husbandman should this autumn be said to sow next year's bread) in peace (not as De W., for εἰς εἰρήνην, but betokening the spirit and mode in which the sowing takes place, as opposed to θῆλος κ. ἐριθεία) by them who work (better than "make," which seems to confine the meaning to the reconciling persons at variance. So also in ref. Matt. The dative participle is not a 'dativus commodi,' but the dat. of the agent: the former view would leave out of the proposition that which is in fact its necessary and most important feature, viz. that the peace-workers themselves are the

sowers of the fruit) peace.

CHAP. IV. 1—10.] *Exhortations and pleadings, as connected with what preceded, first against wars and fightings, then against the lusts and worldly desires out of which these spring.* And herein, 1—3.] *against wars and fightings, the origin of which is detailed and exposed.*

1.] *Whence are wars, and whence fightings among you* ("By what follows, it is not contentions between teachers that are meant, as Schneckenb., al., or sects, as Semler, al.,—but concerning 'meum' and 'tuum.' Grot. refers them to the tumults which preceded the destruction of Jerusalem. πῶλ. and μάχ. are strong expressions, as in Arrian, Epict. iii. 21 in Raphael, and Wetst. πρὸς τὸ παιδάριον πόλεμος, πρὸς τοὺς γείτονας κ.τ.λ." De Wette. The above assertion, that these are strifes about mine and thine, confines them perhaps to too narrow a space; they seem rather, as Huther, to represent all those quarrels which spring up about common worldly interests from selfish considerations of pride, envy, covetousness, and the like)? *Are they not from hence* (this second question contains in fact the answer to the former, in an appeal to the consciences of the readers), *from your lusts* (an unusual sense of ἡδοναί, hardly distinguishable from ἐπιθυμίαι: in fact taken up by ἐπιθυμεῖτε) *which militate* (campaign, have their camp, and, as it were, forage about. There seems no need, with De W., Calov., al., to supply κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς or κατὰ τοῦ νοός, as in ref.: Huther observes well, that, had this been intended, it would have been more plainly expressed. Schneckenb., Theile, al. understand it of militating *one against another*, but this again is not consistent with the context, in which αἱ ἡδοναὶ ὑμῶν are treated as a class, united for one purpose, cf. ver. 3 fin. Wiesinger thinks that the adversaries are to be found in

k h iii. 5, 6 μένων ἐν τοῖς ^k μέλεσιν ὑμῶν ; ² ἐπιθυμεῖτε, καὶ οὐκ
 ref. ἔχετε· φονεύετε καὶ ⁿ ζηλοῦτε, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ^o ἐπι-
 1 absol., Gal v. 17. 2 Kings xxi. 15. ...πολε-
 m Matt xix. 16. τυχεῖν· ^p μάχεσθε καὶ ^q πολεμεῖτε. οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ ...μετε C.
 n Acts vi. 9. xvi. 5. 1 Cor. i αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς· ³ αἰτεῖτε, καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι ABKLP
 xii. 4. Gen. f g h i k
 xxxvii. 11. ^s κακὸς ^r αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ^h ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν ^t δαπανήσχητε. f g h j k
 o Rom. xi. 7. 15. xi. 33 only. Gen. xxxix. 2. Prov. vi. 27 only. p John vi. 52 Acts vii. 25. 2 Tim. ii. 24 only. Gen. 1m o l 3
 bis. Heb. vi. q here only, exc Rev. ii. 16 al^s. Ps. xxxiv. 1 al fr. r of prayer, ch. i 5 ref. Matt. xvi. 20. s = John xviii. 23. Acts xxi. 5 (from Exod. xxi. 28) only. 1 Macc. vii. 42. t Mark v. 7. Luke xv. 14. Acts xxi. 24. 2 Cor. xii. 15 only r. Judith xii. 4 al.

2. rec aft 2nd ουκ εχετε ins δε: pref και [P]N a b^a c f g k l² 36 latt syrr copt [(æth) arm] Thl Ec: om ABKL rel fuld(with tol).

3. [aft αιτειτε add δε P d m.] καταδαπανησητε N¹: δαπανησετε B.

the fact of the ἐπιθυμῆν having set over against it an οὐκ ἔχειν, an οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν. But this again would not, except by implication (this οὐ δύνασθε implying a neighbour who is the obstacle, touch the point of wars and fightings. It is far better therefore to see as the adversaries, our fellow-men, against whom, to put down whom and set ourselves up, our lusts are as it were an army of soldiers ever encamped within us and waging war) in your members (see a remarkable parallel in Plato, Phædo, p. 66 c: καὶ γὰρ πολέμους καὶ στάσεις καὶ μάχας οὐδὲν ἄλλο παρέχει ἢ τὸ σῶμα καὶ αἱ τοῦτον ἐπιθυμίαι) ? Ver. 2 carries on the assertion in detail. Ye desire (generally: it is not said what: but evidently worldly possessions and honours are intended by the context, vv. 4 ff.), and possess not (lust of possession does not ensure possession itself, then comes a further step, out of this lust): ye murder (but how comes φόνος to be introduced at this early stage of the development of ἐπιθυμία, before ζηλος, which itself leads on to μάχαι κ. πόλεμοι? Three solutions of this difficulty may at once be set aside, as out of the question: 1. that which makes the words mean "ye envy even unto death," giving the so-called adverbial meaning to φονεύετε καί. So Carpzov, Pott, Schneckenburger, al. Against this, besides its exceeding lameness and clumsiness, is, that in this case the subordinate verb φονεύετε must come last, not first. 2. That which gives to φονεύετε the unexampled sense, "ye murder in thought," have the intent to murder. So Estius, Calov., Bengel, De Wette, Luther, Wiesinger. But even if such a meaning might be justified, which I doubt, by the strong figurative cast of the passage, yet the matter of fact character of the following clause, καὶ οὐ δύνασθε ἐπιτυχεῖν, makes it more probable that a matter of fact is here also pointed at, and that φονεύετε is rather qualified by καὶ ζηλοῦτε than strictly parallel with it. 3. That of

Ecum., which as far as I know stands alone: ἐπιστατέον δὲ ὡς φόνον ἐνταῦθα καὶ πόλεμον οὐ τὸν σαρκικόν φησι. τοῦτο γὰρ βαρὺ καὶ κατὰ ληστῶν ἐννοεῖν, μὴ ὅτι κατὰ πόσως πιστῶν καὶ τῷ κυρίῳ προσερχομένων. ἀλλ' ὡς γέ μοι δοκεῖ, φονεὺν φησὶ τοὺς τὴν ἑαυτῶν ψυχὴν ἀποκτίνοντας ταῖς τολμηραῖς ταύταις ἐπιχειρήσεσι, δι' ὧς καὶ ὁ πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν αὐτοῖς πόλεμος. Another inadmissible expedient is, to suppose φθονεῖτε to be the true reading; there being no authority whatever for it in manuscripts. Thus Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Benson, and many others. It only remains then to take the word literally, and understand it to allude to such cases, e. g. as those in the O. T. of David and Ahab, who, in their desire to possess, committed murder. And if it be said, as Ec. above, that this is a hard saying of those who feared the Lord, be it remembered that the Apostle is speaking of πόλεμοι καὶ μάχαι, and though he may include under these terms the lesser forms of variance, the greater and more atrocious ones are clearly not excluded. In the state of Jewish society during the apostolic age, it is to be feared that examples of them were but too plentiful, and there is no saying how far the Christian portion of Jewish communities may have suffered themselves to become entangled in such quarrels and their murderous consequences) and envy, and are not able to obtain: ye fight and make war (these words form the final answer to the πόθεν κ.τ.λ. with which the section begins: and are therefore not to be joined with the following as by δέ in the rec.).

Reason why ye have not. Ye have not, because ye ask not (in prayer to God: in the following verse he explains, and as it were corrects this): 3.] ye ask (notice the unaccountable interchange of active and middle, αἰτεῖσθαι . . . αἰτεῖτε . . . αἰτεῖσθε, all referring to the same act) and do not receive, because ye ask amiss (with evil intent, see below), that ye may spend

4 ^u μοιχαλίδες, οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ἡ ^v φιλία τοῦ κόσμου ^u Matt. xii. 39. xvi. 4 Mk. ^w ἔχθρα τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν; ὃς ἂν οὖν ^x βουληθῇ φίλος εἶναι ^u Rom. vii. 3. bis. 2 Pet. ^u τοῦ κόσμου, ἐχθρὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ^y καθίσταται. ⁵ ^z ἢ ^z δοκεῖτε ^u Mal iii. 5 al. ^z ὅτι ^a κενῶς ἢ ^b γραφῇ ^b λέγει ^c Πρὸς ^{cd} φθόνον ^e ἐπιποθεῖ ^u v here only. ^u Prov. x. 12. ^w Rom. viii. 7. Luke xxiii. 12. ^x = 1 Tim. vi. 9. ^y = ch. iii. 6 reff. ^z Matt. xxvi. 53. ^a here only (see 2 Cor. vi. 1 al.). ^b Isa. xlix. 4 only. ^c ἀσώμους καὶ κενῶς, Arrian, Epict. ii. 17. Wetst. ^b Rom. iv. 3. 1 Tim. v. 18 al. ^c = here only. ^d 1 Pet. ii. 1 reff. ^e w. πρὸς, here only. ^f Ps. xli. 1. — 2 Cor. ix. 14. Phil. i. 8. (1 Pet. ii. 2 reff.) ^w ἐπί, Deut. xiii. 8. Ps. xli. 1.

4. rec ins μοιχοι καὶ bef μοιχαλίδες, with KL[P]N⁸ rel syr Thl Æc: om ABN¹ 13 Syr copt æth arm, *adulteri* vulg, *fornicatores* lat-ff.—B joins μοιχαλίδες with the precedg. aft 1st κοσμον *ιστουτου* N [68 vulg Syr æth arm Orig-int₁]. *ἐστιν* bef τω θεω N. om os N¹. for αν, εαν B[P]N¹ a c 5. 22. 69 [Cyr-P₁ Damasac]. βουληθῆς (but s erased) N³. ἐχθρα N¹.

5. λεγει is joined to πρ. φθον. follg in A h j [4. 10-1-4-5-6. 21. 38] 40. 66. 73-8. 97. 104

(it) (that which ye ask for) in ('in the exercise of,' 'under the dominion of:' *ἐν* does not belong to the verb *δαπανᾶν ἐν*, 'to spend on,' 'that ye may consume it upon' as E. V., which would be *δαπανᾶν εἰς*), but to the state in which the spenders are, q. d. in the course of satisfying) *your* lusts. The general sense is: if you really prayed aright, this feeling of continual craving after more worldly things would not exist: all your proper wants would be supplied: and these improper ones which beget wars and fightings among you would not exist. Ye would ask, and ask aright, and consequently would obtain.

4.] Ye adulteresses (the occurrence of the fem. only is rightly explained by Theile: "A fem. nec vero a masc. facta denominatio suppeditari poterat ipsa imagine. Ea quum Deum sistat *maritum*, homines *fœminam*, non minus recte singuli homines *scorta* dicentur, quam totum genus atque universa aliqua gens *scortum*." Nor is De Wette's protest needed that only das Volf im Ganzen, only the entire people, is thus called: nor Huther's consequent modification of Theile, that St. James is addressing Churches here. For God is the Lord and husband of every soul that is His, as much as of every church; and the indignant μοιχαλίδες of the Apostle is just as applicable to every one who forsakes his or her God, as to an apostate church. This is one of those cases where the testimony of our ancient Mss. is so valuable, in restoring to us the nervous and pregnant rebuke of the original), know ye not that the friendship of the world (ὁ κόσμος here, precisely as in ch. i. 27, men, and men's interests and ambitions and employments, in so far as they are without God. So that we must not understand merely worldly goods, as Schneckenburger, Theile, al., nor merely worldly desires (Didymus, Laurentius), nor both of these together

(De Wette), to neither of which will *φιλία* properly fit) is enmity ('the state of being an enemy:' not ἐχθρά, "inimica," as vulg., which destroys the parallelism and force) of God (the man who is taken out of the world by Christ, cannot again become a friend and companion of worldly men and their schemes for self, without passing into enmity with God, of whose family he was a reconciled member. God and the world stand opposed to one another: so that a man cannot join the one without deserting the other. This is further stated in what follows)? whoever therefore (particular consequence on the general axiom just stated, carried however further, into all approach to, and not merely the completion of, the outward state) shall be minded (no stress on βουληθῇ: it is a mere statement of fact as to the man who becomes a friend of the world, and therefore, in so doing, sets his mind and thought and wish that way. So that we need not say with Laurentius, "Non is tantum est inimicus Dei, qui est ipso opere amicus mundi, sed etiam ille qui cum non possit, vult tamen." But he is so far right, that the Apostle certainly means to say, He that *would be* a friend of the world, must make up his mind to be God's enemy) to be a friend of the world, is (thereby, by the proceeding in the direction indicated by that βουλή) constituted (as above, ref.; not merely "is," or 'becomes:' 'becomes ipso facto,' 'then and there,' is rather the meaning of καθίσταται) an enemy of God.

5, 6.] Testimony from Scripture to convince further those who might question what has just been stated. 5.] Or (ref. the formula puts a hypothetical alternative, the assumption of which negatives itself) do ye think that the Scripture saith in vain, The Spirit that He (God) placed in us (viz. when the Spirit descended on the church. We have κατοικίω somewhat

f here only,
Gen. iii. 24
al. fr.

τὸ πνεῦμα δ' ἰκατόκισεν ἐν ἡμῖν; ὁ μείζονα δὲ ἐδίδωσιν

ABKLP
N a b c d
f g h j k
l m o 13

g see below (m)

arm Ec.

rec κατωκήσεν (*itacism*), with KL[P] rel Thl Ec, *habitat* latt syrr copt : κατωκήσεν A : txt BN.

similarly used Aesch. Prom. 250, τυφλὰς ἐν τοῖς θνητοῖς ἐλπίδας κατώκισα) **jealously** (πρὸς φθόνον, as πρὸς βίαν and the like : see below) **desireth** (us for his own)? These words connect naturally with the foregoing. We are married to one, even God, who has implanted in us His Spirit : and He is a jealous God, who will not suffer us to be friends of His enemy and His friends at the same time. The only difficulty seems to be, to trace this latter saying in any part of Scripture. For that this is the quotation, and no other, must be maintained against very many Commentators (see below) on account of λέγει, which can hardly be otherwise used than at introducing the thing said. I will state the solution which seems to me the most probable, and then give an account of other methods of solving it. The emphasis of this clause lies on the πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ : and, interpreting those words as above, we are naturally led to ask, is there any chapter or passage especially, where such a mind towards His people is ascribed to God? And this directs our thoughts at once to Deut. xxxii., where the love of Jehovah for Israel, and His jealousy over them is described. In that song of Moses we have this very word used of God, ver. 10 f., ἐκύκλωσεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν αὐτόν, καὶ διεφύλαξεν αὐτόν ὡς κόρην ὀφθαλμοῦ ὡς ἀετὸς σκεπάζει νοσσοῖαν αὐτόν καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς νοσσοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπεπόθησεν : and ver. 19, καὶ εἶδεν κύριος καὶ ἐζήλωσεν, καὶ παρωζύνηθ' δι' ὀργὴν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρων καὶ εἶπεν, Ἀποστρέψω τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτῶν κ.τ.λ. So that here we have the elements of the sense of that which is cited, viz. the jealous desire of the Lord over His people. And for the rest, τὸ πνεῦμα δ' κατωκήσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, the only solution seems to be, that the Apostle translates into the language of the Gospel the former declarations of the God of Israel, e.g. such as that Num. xxxv. 34, ἐγὼ γὰρ εἰμι κύριος κατασκοπῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, combining them with such prophecies as Ezek. xxxvi. 27, καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά μου δώσω ἐν ὑμῖν. I own that such a solution does not seem to me wholly satisfactory : still there is nothing improbable in the idea that St. James may have combined the general sense of Scripture on the point of God's jealousy over His people, and instead of the God who dwelt in Israel, may have placed the

Holy Spirit who dwelleth in us. At all events it is better to understand it thus, than to make λέγει mean 'speaks,' or to force the words of the citation from their simple meaning. I now proceed to state other interpretations. And 1. of those who have recognized the fact that the words πρὸς φθόνον κ.τ.λ. are a citation. Of these, understanding the words variously (see below), Grotius believes them to refer to Gen. vi. 3, 5 : Beza, Erasm. Schmid, to Gen. viii. 21 : Witsius, to Num. xi. 29 : Schneckenb. to Deut. v. 9 ff. : Le Clerc, to Ps. cxix. 20 ff. : Michaelis, to Prov. xxi. 10 : Cocceius, to Cant. viii. 6 : Wetstein, to Wisd. vi. 12. Others have supposed the N. T. to be intended by ἡ γραφή. Thus Benson believes the reference to be to Matt. vi. 24 : Storr, al., to Gal. v. 17 : Bengel, to 1 Pet. ii. 1 ff. : and Semler again, to a passage in the apocryphal book called the Testament of the XII Patriarchs. Bewildered by these differences, many Commentators, among whom are Ec., Bede, Calv., Est., Wolf, al., either deny the fact of a citation altogether, or refer the λέγει either on to the citation following in ver. 6, or back to what went before,—or, as I have done above, believe that the general sense of Scripture on the subject, and not any particular text, is adduced. Before passing from this part of my note, I may remark that Luther's objection, that against the view here given, the formula citandi, ἡ γραφή λέγει, is decisive, is not valid : see Wolf's Curæ, vol. v. p. 66 : and cf. John vii. 38, 42, where though the formula εἶπεν ἡ γραφή is used, the general sense, and not the exact words, is given. 2. The sense of the words themselves, πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα δ' κατωκήσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, is very variously given. a. πρὸς φθόνον is by some referred back to λέγει,—ἡ. λέγει πρὸς φθόνον : "An putatis, quod scriptura in vanum loquatur adversus invidiam? Spiritus desideria excitat, sed meliora desideris carnis : " so Du Mont, in Luther. But this "*desideria excitare*" is an unexampled sense of ἐπιποθεῖ. Gebser takes this connexion, and renders, "Think ye, that the Scripture speaks in vain, and enviously?" And nearly so Ecumenius, ἡ δοκεῖτε ὅτι κενῶς ἡ γραφή λέγει, ἡ πρὸς φθόνον : οὐδὲν τούτων ἀλλ' ἐπιποθεῖ κ.τ.λ. But, as Luther remarks, this necessity for ἡ sufficiently condemns this view : and

ε¹ χάριν¹⁴ ἡ διὸ ἡ λέγει, ἰ¹ Ὁ θεὸς ἰ¹ ὑπερῆφάνους¹⁴ κ¹ ἀντιτάσ-¹⁴
 σεται, ἰ¹ ταπεινοῖς δὲ¹⁴ μ¹ δίδωσιν¹⁴ μ¹ χάριν. ἡ¹ ὑποτάγητε¹⁴
 οὖν τῷ θεῷ. ὁ¹ ἀντίστητε δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ¹⁴ ρ¹ καὶ¹ α¹ φεύζεται¹⁴

only. Ps. cxviii. 21. k 1 Pet. v. 5 reff. l = Matt. xi. 29. 1 Pet. v. 5 al. Ps. xxxiii. 18.
 m = Eph. iv. 29. 1 Pet. v. 5 from l. c. (1 Cor. i. 4 al.) see Exod. iii. 21. n Rom. viii. 7. = Heb. xii.
 9 reff. o Matt. v. 39. Eph. vi. 13. 1 Pet. v. 9. Job xli. 2. p = John ii. 19. Eph. v.
 14. Rev. ii. 10. q mid, John x. 5 only. Lev. xxvi. 17 al. fr.

7. rec om δε, with KL[P] f h k 36 Thl Cc: ins *et* bef *αντιστ.* spec Syr æth [arm]:
 txt ABN rel [latt] syr copt.

thus ἐπιποθεῖ would be left here without any qualifying adverb to fill out its sense. β. Taking then πρὸς φθόνον with ἐπιποθεῖ, we have the following various views taken: I. πνεῦμα as the *subject*. And herein A. τὸ πν. = the human spirit, in its natural condition. So Hottinger, "Animus hominis natura fertur ad invidendum aliis:" so also Beza, Laurentius, Grot., al., and E. V. B. τὸ πν. = the Spirit of God, whom God hath caused to take up His dwelling in us: and then a. πρὸς φθ. = "*ad invidiam*:" in which case the clause is interrogative: "Num ad invidiam proclivis est Spiritus, qui nobis inest? minime:" similarly Bede ("Numquid spiritus gratiæ, quo significati estis in die redemptionis, hoc concupiscit ut invidetis alterutrum"), Witsius, Calv., Wolf, al. b. πρὸς φθ. = "*contra invidiam*:" so Luther, der Geist . . . gelüftet wider den Häß,—Pareus, Bengel, al. c. πρὸς φθ. = "*invidiose*:" so De Wette, much as the interp. given above, νείδισθ̄ lieht (unß) der Geist: so Schneckenburger, and in substance many old Commentators (see Pol. Synops. v. p. 1459, col. 1), rendering it "*usque ad invidiam*:" e. g. Tirinus, Menochius, Cajetan, al. II. πνεῦμα as the *object*, supplying δ θεός as the subject, understanding πν. the human spirit, and taking πρὸς φθόν. adverbially. So Wiesinger, "The Love of God jealously desires as an object your love:" so Theile, supplying however ἡ γραφή as the subject, as also does Eucumenius, continuing from the words cited above, οὐδὲν τούτων ἀλλ' ἐπιποθεῖ ἡτοι ἐπιζητεῖ τὴν διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως αὐτῆς ἐγκατοικισθεῖσαν ἡμῖν χάριν: and below, πνεῦμα τὴν ἀγαθὴν φησι προαίρειν. In judging of the above interpretations (the classification of which I have mainly taken from Huther), we may notice, that to interpret πρὸς φθόνον ἐπιποθεῖ, as if it were κατὰ φθόνον ἐπιθυμεῖ, see Gal. v. 17, is to do violence to the construction and meaning of the words: besides which, there is no mention here of envy, as a human passion, the discourse being of the enmity to God incurred by those who would be friends to the world; of God's

enmity to the proud and upholding of the humble. So that God must be the subject of this clause, as expressed by τὸ πνεῦμα ὃ κατέκτισεν ἐν ἡμῖν. This being so, our only rendering of πρὸς φθόνον will be as above, adverbially, as so very frequently, e. g. πρὸς δίκην, πρὸς ἡδονήν, πρὸς χάριν, πρὸς λύπην, πρὸς ὀργήν, πρὸς βίαν, πρὸς ὕβριν, &c. &c. See Palm and Rost's Lex. under πρὸς, vol. ii. p. 1138, col. 2, where many examples are given, e. g. πρὸς χάριν ἢ πρὸς ἀπέχθειαν δικάζειν, Lucian: πρὸς ὀργὴν ἀκούειν, &c. With regard to the sense above given, as fitting into the context, Theile well says, ἐπιποθεῖν with an accusative, "desiderio alicujus teneri," to love eagerly, as reff. 2 Cor., Phil., introduces us into the same figurative realm of thought in which μοιχαλίδες placed us before. The Apostle is speaking of the eager and jealous love of God towards those whom He has united as it were in the bond of marriage with Himself.

6.] But He (God, by His Holy Spirit dwelling in us, the same subject as in the previous sentence) gives the more grace (the more and greater, for this longing and jealous desire): wherefore he saith (the Spirit, again: for it is the same Spirit who is implanted in us that speaks in Scripture. This is better than to supply 'the Scripture,' far better than to take λέγει impersonally, "it is written," as Kern), God (κύριος, LXX: and the same variation is found where the words are again cited in 1 Pet. v. 5) is set against the proud (reff.), but giveth grace to the lowly (see Rom. xii. 16. This is a proof that the ambitious and restless after worldly honours and riches, are God's enemies, whereas the humble and lowly are the objects of His gifts of ever-increasing grace. The inference follows in the shape of solemn exhortation (vv. 7—10)). 7.] Submit yourselves therefore to God (addressed mainly to the proud—the μοιχαλίδες above; but also to all): but resist the devil (the ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου) and he shall flee (better than E. V., "will flee," which is merely an assurance as from man to man: this is a divine promise. Huther refers to Hermas, Pastor ii. 12. 5, p. 949,

^r = Heb. vii. 19 reff. ^s = Acts xv. 9. 2 Cor. vii. 1. Eph. v. 25. Tit. ii. 14. Sir. xxxviii 10. ^t John xi. 55. Acts xxi. 24, 26, xxiv 18. 1 Pet. i. 22. 1 John iii. 3 only. Num. xxxi. 23. ^u ch. i. 8 only. ^v here only. = Ps. xxxvii. 6. (-*ρία*, ch. v. 1) ^w Mark xvi. 10. Luke vi. 25. Rev. xviii. 11, 15, 19. 2 Kings xix. 1. ^x as above (w). Matt. v. 4, ix. 15. 1 Cor. xii. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 21 only. ^y ch. v. 1 al. fr. ^z here only. Eccl. ii. 2 (-*λάν*, Luke vi. 21, 25.) ^a Rev. xviii. 7 bis, 8, xxi. 24 only. Gen. i. 4. ^b Acts ii. 20 (from Joel ii. 31). Gal. i. 7 only. Amos iii. 10. 1 Macc. ix. 41. ^c here only. (-*φής*, Wisd. xvii. 4.) ^d Matt. xxiii. 12 bis. Luke xiv. 11 bis. xviii. 14 bis. 2 Cor. xi. 7. 1 Pet. v. 6. Job xxii. 23. Sir. ii. 17. ^e as above (d). Matt. xxvii. 4. Luke ii. 5 (from Isa. xl 4). 2 Cor. xii. 21. Phil. ii. 8. iv. 12 only. ^f James, here only. al. freq. ^g here 3cc. 1 Pet. ii. 12. iii. 16 only. Job xix. 3. (-*λος*, Rom. i. 30. -*λία*, 2 Cor. xii. 20.)

8. εγγισει B.

9. om και (bef κλαυσετε) AN: om κ. κλαυσ. 15-8. 36 Syr Aug. for μεταστραφ., μεταπρατητω B[P] a c 69 Thl.

10. rec ins του bef κυριου, with L rel Thl Ec: om ABK[P]N a c 13 Orig, Hesych.

11. αδελφ. μου αλληλων A 13(sic).

δύναται ὁ διάβολος παλαίσαι, καταπαλαίσαι δὲ οὐ δύναται. ἐάν οὖν ἀντίστης αὐτόν, νικηθεὶς φεύγεται ἀπὸ σοῦ κατασχυμένος) from you: 8.] draw near to God,

and He will draw near (here better 'will': in speaking of the divine dealings, positive declarations are better softened: cf. John xvi. 23, E. V. Not that this is always observed: cf. Rev. vii. 17, E. V.) to you. But it is only the pure in heart and hand that can approach God: therefore—Purify your hands (the hands being the external organs of action, and becoming polluted by the act, as e. g. by blood in the act of murder: cf. Isa. i. 15, αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν αἷματος πλήρεις: lix. 3: 1 Tim. ii. 8. And, for both the particulars here mentioned, Ps. cxliii. 4, ἀθῶος χερσὶ καὶ καθαρός τῇ καρδίᾳ), ye sinners: and make chaste your hearts (in allusion to μοιχαλίδες above), ye double-minded (ye whose affections are divided between God and the world. The Apostle is addressing not two classes of persons, but one and the same: "Eodem vocat peccatores et duplices animo," Calv.). 9.] This cannot be done without true and deep repentance, leading them through deep sorrow. Be wretched (in your minds, from a sense of your sinfulness. That such feeling will have its outward demonstrations is evident: but this word itself does not allude to them, as Grot., "Affligite vosmetipsos jejuniis et aliis corporis σκληραγωγίαις:" so likewise Est., al. Beza also misses the point of the exhortation, when he says, "ἀναλογισίας primum reprehendit in adversis, deinde immoderatam in rebus prosperis exultationem." "Vestram pernitescite miseriam," of Theile, is nearest the mark) and mourn and weep (here again Grot. refers the exhortation to out-

ward things—"Lugubren habitum induite, saccum et cilicia." These may follow on that which is here commanded, but are not the thing itself): let your laughter ("lautæ vitæ," Theile) be turned into mourning (these more of the outward manifestations) and your joy into humiliation (κατήφεια, lit. casting down of the eyes: hence shame or humiliation, which produces such downcast looks: cf. II. γ. 51, where Hector, addressing Paris, calls Helen πατρί τε σὺ μέγα πῆμα, πόλῃ τε παντὶ τε δήμῳ, Δυσμενέσιν μὲν χάρμα, κατηφείην δέ σοι αὐτῷ. These latter, more of the inner states of mind). 10.] Conclusion of the exhortation: the true way to exaltation, through humility. Calvin quotes from Augustine, "Sicuti arborem, ut sursum crescat, profundas subtus radices agere oportet, ita quisquis in humilitatis radice fixum animum non habet, in ruinam suam extollitur." Be humbled before the Lord (ref. Matt. and 1 Pet. v. 6: but ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ there is not = ἐνώπιον κυρίου here. This latter gives more the realization in the soul of the presence of God, as drawing near to Him in humility: that, the subjection to Him in recognition of His providence and His judgments. κυρίον, not Christ, but the Father: see on ch. i. 7), and He shall exalt you (both here and hereafter: by His grace and counsel here (not exactly as Grot., who is too external throughout this passage, "Sublimes facie donis suis") to the hidden glory of His waiting children, and by His fruition and presence hereafter (ἐν καιρῷ as 1 Pet. v. 6) to the ineffable glory of His manifested children. Cf. besides reff. Luke i. 52: Job v. 11: Ezek. xxi. 26). 11, 12.] Exhortation against evil speaking and

ABKLP
Nab cd
f g h j k
l m o 13

φοι· ὁ ^ε καταλαλῶν ἀδελφοῦ ἡ ^h κρίνων τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ^h = Matt. vii.
^ε καταλαλεῖ νόμου καὶ ^h κρίνει νόμον· εἰ δὲ νόμον ^h κρίνεις, 1. John vii.
οὐκ εἰ ^{ik} ποιητῆς ⁱ νόμου ἀλλὰ ⁱκριτῆς. 12 εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ⁱ Rom. i. 13
^m νομοθέτης καὶ ^mκριτῆς, ὁ δυνάμενος σῶσαι καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσαι· only, 1 Mac.
σὺ δὲ ^p τὸς εἰ ὁ ^p κρίνων τὸν πλησίον; k = as above
xv. 3. Col. ii. 16. only, 1 Mac.
xv. 67 only.
k = as above
(1). ch. i. 22.
v. 6 (Acts xviii. 28)

only. 1 ch. ii. 4. m here only. Ps. ix. 20 only. (·τεῖν, Heb. vii. 11.) n = Acts
x 42. 2 Tim. iv. 8. Heb. xii. 23. ch. v. 9. Isa. xxxiii. 22. o = Rom. xv. 15. 1 Cor. viii.
11. xv. 18. 2 Pet. iii. 9. Matt. x. 28. p Rom. xiv. 4.

rec (for η) και, with KL rel flor lat-ffⁱ (and spec) [æth(Tischdf) Antch.] Æc: txt
AB[P]N c j o 13 vulg syrr coptt arm [Damasc.] Thl.

12. [om 1st o BP.] rec om και κριτης, with KL c d f k l Thl-comm Æc: ins AB
[P]N rel 36 latt Syr syr-w-ast coptt [æth arm Cyr-p₁] Did₃ Antch, Thl[-txt] Cassiod.
[om 2nd o A.] rec om δε, with a b c g h sah [arm] Æc: ins ABKL[P]N rel 36
latt Syr syr[-w-ast] coptt Antch, Thl. rec (for o κρίνων) os κρίνεις, with KL rel
Æc: txt AB[P]N a c m 13 coptt Thl. rec (for πλησιον) ετερον, with KL rel [æth] Æc:
txt AB[P]N a c 13 latt syr coptt [Antch.] Thl. add οτι ουκ εν ανθρωπω αλλ' εν
θεω τα διαβηματα ανθρωπου κατευθυνεται (see Ps xxxvi. 23) K Euthal₁.

uncharitable judgment. Some have thought that there is no close connexion with the preceding: and Huther urges this from the milder word *ἀδελφοί* being here used, whereas before it was *μοιχαλίδες, ἁμαρτωλοί, δίσυχοι*. But it may be observed, that St. James frequently begins his exhortations mildly, and moves onward into severity: in this very paragraph we have an example of it, where unquestionably the *σὺ τίς εἰ ὁ κρίνων τὸν πλησίον*; is more severe than the *ἀδελφοί* with which it began. The connexion is with the whole spirit of this part of the Epistle, as dissuading mutual quarrels, undue self-exaltation, and neighbour-depreciation. Chap. iii. dealt with the sins of the tongue: and now, after speaking against pride and strife, the Apostle naturally returns to them, as springing out of a proud, uncharitable spirit. 11.]

Do not speak against one another (it is evident what sort of *καταλαλεῖν* he means, by the junction of *κρίνειν* with it below: it is that kind which follows upon unfavourable judgment: depreciation of character and motive), **brethren** (*ἀδελφοί* prepares the way for the frequent mention of *ἀδελφός* below): **he that speaketh against a brother** (but not necessarily indefinite: the relations of life, *πατήρ, μήτηρ, ἀδελφός* &c. frequently lose their articles even when put definitely), **and judgeth his brother** (the expression of *αὐτοῦ* in this second case brings out more strongly the community under the *νόμος*, which such an one violates), **speaketh against the law** (of Christian life: the old moral law glorified and amplified by Christ: the *νόμος βασιλικός*, ch. ii. 8; *νόμος τῆς ἐλευθερίας*, i. 25), **and judgeth the law** (viz. by setting himself up over that law, as pronouncing upon its observance or non-

observance by another. This is far better, than with Grot., al., “*Doctrinam evangelicam homo talis spernit et damnat ut imperfectam: Christus enim tales non damnat*.” or than Laurentius, cited with approbation by Huther, “*Is qui detrahit proximo, detrahit legi, quia lex prohibet omnem detractionem: sed et judicat idem legem, quia hoc ipso quod contra prohibitionem legis detrahit, judicat quasi legem non recte prohibuisse.*” This is condemned by the word *quasi*: for such an argument might be used of every transgressor. See below): but if (as thou dost) thou judgest the law, thou art not a doer of the law, but a judge (seeing that he who judges, judges not only the man before him, but the law also: for he pronounces not only on the fact, but on that fact being, or not being, a breach of the law. So that thus to bring men’s actions under the cognizance of the law, is the office of a judge. There is no need to supply *νόμον* after *κριτής*: indeed it destroys the sense by removing the point of the assertion. That the evil speaker *judges the law*, was before asserted; now, he is stated to be thereby removed from the Christian brotherhood of doers of the law, and become categorically a *judge*. And then in the next verse, the inconsistency and absurdity of his placing himself in that category is shewn). 12.] **One** (God)

is the lawgiver and judge (unites these two offices in His own person: the latter of them depending on the former), **He who is able to save and destroy** (this second clause, *ὁ δυνάμ.* κ.τ.λ., is an epexegetis of *εἰς*, and belongs closely to the subject, not to the predicative part of the sentence, as De Wette gives it, *Einem ist der Befehlgeber und Richter, der da vermag zu retten und zu verderben.* ὁ δυνάμενος, because

q ch. v. 1 only.
Judg. xix. 6
B.
r = 1 John ii.
28.
s Luke xiii. 32,
33 Exod.
xii. 10
xiii. 23.
3 Symm.

13 α^q Ἀγε ἰ νῦν οἱ λέγοντες ὁ Σήμερον καὶ ὁ αὔριον πορευ-
σόμεθα εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ποιήσομεν ἐκεῖ ἐνιαυτὸν
ἓνα καὶ ἔμπορευσόμεθα καὶ κερδήσομεν, οἷτινες
t = (see note.) u = Acts xv. 33. xviii. 23. xx. 3. 2 Cor. xi. 25. Rev. xiii. 5 (?). Prov.
v = here (2 Pet. ii. 3) only. Gen. xxxix. 10, 21. w Matt. xvi. 26 al. fr.† Job xxii.
x Heb. viii. 5 reff

ABCKLP
N a b c d
f g h j k
l m o 13

13. elz (for 1st καὶ η, with BN 13 latt Syr coptt [æth] Jer₁: txt AKL[P] rel 36
syr [arm] Cyr[-p.] Thl Ecē. Steph πορευσόμεθα and ποιήσομεν, with AKL rel 36
Ecē: -σόμεθα and -σομεν Thl: -σόμεθα and -σωμεν N b¹ g: txt B[P] b² (c?) d l latt
Cyr[-p.] om ἐκεῖ A 13 Cyr₁. om ἓνα B[P]N 36 latt coptt Jer₁. Steph.
εμπορευσόμεθα κ. κερδήσομεν, with KL rel 36 Thl: -σόμεθα and -σωμεν b¹ 13: txt
AB[P]N b² (c?) d l &c.

He alone has the power to carry out His judgment when pronounced: "Nostrum non est iudicare, præsertim cum exequi non possimus," Bengel. On *σῶσαι*, see on ch. i. 21 and ii. 14, as relating to ultimate salvation: and on κ. ἀπολέσαι, ref. Matt., to which this is the key text, fixing the reference there to God, and not to God's Enemy): but thou, who art thou (thou, feeble man, who hast no such power, and who art not the lawgiver) that judgest thy neighbour (see ref. Rom., the influence of which on our readings here it is, as usual in such cases, very difficult to estimate)?

13—17.] *Against ungodly and presumptuous confidence in our worldly plans for the future.* This again falls into the previous context, where we are warned against hearts divided between God and the world. But, as has been rightly remarked as early as Bede, and by many since, e. g. Ecē, Semler, al., St. James, though carrying on the same subject, is no longer, from this place to ch. v. 6, addressing members of Christ's church, but those without: the ungodly and the rich in this world. This however must be taken with just this reservation,—that he addresses Christians in so far as they allow themselves to be identified with those others. This first paragraph, for example, might well serve as a warning for Christians who are in the habit of leaving God out of their thoughts and plans. That it is still *Jews* who are addressed, appears from ver. 15, and ch. v. 4.

13.] *Go to now* ("interjectio ad excitandam attentionem," Beng. This seems to be the true view of it: 'come on,' q. d. let us reason together: cf. δεῦτε, διελεγχώμεν, Isa. i. 18. The νῦν serves to mark the time, as noted by the point to which the argument of the Epistle has arrived. It is hardly purely temporal, but as so often, slightly ratiocinative, = 'rebus sic stantibus,' 'quæ cum ita sint': see on 1 Cor. xiii. 13), ye that say (no stress on λέγοντες: not as Theile, 'qui non solum cogitare solent, sed etiam dicere audetis.')

The fault is even oftener perhaps committed in word than in thought. We speak more presumptuously before men than we think in our own hearts; though there also we are too liable to forget God), *To-day and to-morrow* (the ἡ of the rec. would suppose an alternative, "to-day, it may be, or to-morrow:" with καί, the two days are assigned for the journey, without any alternative. Bengel and Wiesinger take καί, as in δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν, 2 Cor. xiii. 1, as combining two possible cases: "Nunc dicit hodie, idem aliusve cras, ut commodum est," Beng. This is possible: but I prefer the other) *we will go* (the indic. fut. (see var. readd.) gives the fixed certainty of the assumption) into this (most Commentators render, "this or that," = "such a," as E. V.: and Winer, Gramm. § 23. 5, refers to Plutarch, Sympos. i. 6. 1, for this usage of ὅδε. But his reference does not quite bear him out. Plutarch is proving the vinity of Alexander from the βασιλικὰ ἐφημερίδες, in which is found very often written ὅτι τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκ τοῦ πότου ἐκάθευθεν, ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ τὴν ἐφεξῆς: where τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν is clearly a quotation from the diary, not 'this or that day,' but "this day:" and then τὴν ἐφεξῆς is an improper elliptical way of recording, that against the next day a similar entry was made. So that I should much doubt this usage of ὅδε, there being no mention of it in the best Lexx., and apparently no other example: and should consider τήνδε τὴν πόλιν as a sort of 'oratio mixta,' to express in general terms the city then present to the mind of the speaker) city, and will spend (reff. for this temporal sense of ποιέω) there one year (ἐνιαυτὸν ἓνα is the accus. not of duration, but of the object, after ποιήσομεν. So that the E. V. "continue there a year," is not accurate. It should have been 'spend a year there,' which savours of presumption much more strongly and vividly. ἐνιαυτ. ἓνα: "Sic loquuntur, quasi mox etiam de insequentibus annis deliberaturi." Beng.), and (Bengel remarks well: "καὶ frequens:

n dat., Rom. xiv. 14.
 1 Cor. iv. 3.
 o ch. iv. 13
 only Judg.
 xix. 6 B.
 p here only.
 Isa xiv. 31.
 xv. 3 al.
 q = Acts xx.
 38 al.
 r Rom. iii. 16
 (from Isa. lix.
 7) only. Isa.
 xlvii. 11 al.
 only. Ps. xxxvii. 5 al.
 only. Sir. xii. 11 only.

δοτί οὖν καλὸν ποιεῖν καὶ μὴ ποιοῦντι, ἁμαρτία ^a αὐτῷ ἔστιν. ABCKLP
 N a b c d
 f g h j k
 l m o 13

V. 1 οἱ ἄγε νῦν οἱ πλούσιοι, κλαύσατε ^p ὀλοοῦντες
^q ἐπὶ ταῖς ^r τάλαιπωράις ὑμῶν ταῖς ^s ἐπερχομέναις. ² ὁ
 πλούσιος ὑμῶν ^t ἐσέσπεν καὶ τὰ ἱμάτια ὑμῶν ^u σητόβρωτα
 γέγονεν. ³ ὁ χρυσὸς ὑμῶν καὶ ὁ ἄργυρος ^v κατίωται,

s = Luke xxi. 26, 35. Acts viii. 24. xiii. 40. Judg. ix. 57. absol., Eph. ii. 7. t here
 u here only. Job xiii. 28 only. (ΜΑΤΤ. vi. 19, 20.) v here

CHAP. V. 1. at end ins *υμιν* K 5. 8. 25 vulg Syr copt æth arm: *divitiis vestris*, omg
 πλουτος υμων, spec.

3. κατιωται bef και ο αργυρος A 13.

nota sunt:" in which case this would hardly be the place for it, considering that more exhortations follow, ch. v. Grotius takes it to mean, "Moniti estis a me, ignorantiam non potestis obtendere, si quid tale posthac dixeritis, gravior erit culpa:" and so Theile, Wiesinger, De Wette, al. But in this case, why should such a conclusion follow this, rather than any other exhortation? So that (οὖν here does not prove what follows, but refers the particular case to the general principle; q. d. therefore we see 'hoc exemplo' the truth of the general axiom, &c.) to him who knoweth to do good (not τὸ καλόν: καλόν is not any positive good, as beneficence; but merely the opposite of *πονηρόν*). So Wiesinger, rightly: and ποιεῖν is the object after *εἰδότες*, not the epexegetic inf. as De Wette, "knows the good, that he must do it") and doeth it not (not merely, *omits to do it*, as might be the case if it were some one definite deed that was spoken of. It is not sins of *omission* that men are here convicted of, as so often mistakenly supposed: but the doing *πονηρόν*, as in the case of the speech above supposed, where καλόν is easy and obvious), it is sin to him (i. e. reckoned to him as sin. Schneckenburger well remarks, "Videre licet, Jacobum omnia . . . ad thema suum primum revocare, recti scientiam requirere recti exercitationem").

CHAP. V. 1-6.] *Denunciation of woe on the rich in this world.* These verses need not necessarily be addressed (as Huther) to the same persons as ch. iv. 13 ff. Indeed the *ἄγε νῦν* repeated seems to indicate a fresh beginning. Commentators have differed as to whether this denunciation has for its object, or not, exhortation to repentance. I believe the right answer to be, much as De Wette, that in the outward form indeed the words contain no such exhortation: but that we are bound to believe all such triumphant denunciation to have but one ultimate view, that of grace and mercy to those addressed.

That such does not here appear, is owing chiefly to the close proximity of judgment, which the writer has before him. Calvin then is in the main right,—when he says, "Falluntur qui Jacobum hic exhortari ad penitentiam divites putant: mihi simplex magis denuntiatio iudicii Dei videtur, qua eos terrere voluit *absque spe veniæ*,"—except in those three last rather characteristic words. 1.] Go to now (see above, ch. iv. 13), ye rich, go weep (the imper. aor. gives the command a concentrated force, as that which ought to be done at once and without delay), howling (the part. is not merely a rhetorical reduplication of *κλαύσατε*, but describes the mode of the *κλαῦσαι* by a stronger and more graphic word, in the present, as thus habitual during the *κλαῦσαι*. ὀλοοῦν (reff.) is a word in the O. T. confined to the prophets, and used, as here, with reference to the near approach of God's judgments. Thus in Isa. xiii. 6, ὀλοοῦτε, ἐγγὺς γὰρ ἡμέρα κυρίου) over your miseries which are coming on (no supply of *ὑμῶν* (see digest) is required after *ἐπερχ.* These miseries are not to be thought of as the natural and determined end of all worldly riches, but are the judgments connected with the coming of the Lord: cf ver. 8, ἡ παρουσία τοῦ κυρίου ἤγγικεν. It may be that this prospect was as yet intimately bound up with the approaching destruction of the Jewish city and polity: for it must be remembered that they are Jews who are here addressed). 2.] The effect of the coming judgment is depicted as already present, and its material as already stored up against them. What is meant by the figure used, we learn in ver. 4. Your riches are corrupted (see besides reff., Job xxxiii. 21; xl. 7. σήπω is transitive—σήπων δὲ ἄσεβεις παραχρήμα, Job xl. 7 (12),—but σέσηπα the perf. middle. The expression is figurative, and πλοῦτος to be understood of all riches: 'your possessions') and your garments (the general term πλοῦτος is now split into its component parts.

καὶ ὁ ^w ἰδὸς αὐτῶν ^x εἰς ^x μαρτύριον ὑμῶν ἔσται, καὶ ^y φάγεται ^w — here (ch. iii. 8. Rom. iii. 13) only. Ep. Jer. 12, 24. see Ezek. xxiv. 6, 11, 12. x Heb. iii. 5 ref. y (plur.) Rev. xvii. 16. xix. Luke xii. 21. Rom. a Acts ii. 17. 2 Tim. iii. c here only. f = (see note) Exod. ii. 18, 21 only. Lev. xxvi. 29. 4 Kings ix. 36. Mic. iii. 2, 3. z Matt. vi. 19, 20. 2 Luke xii. 21. 1 Cor. xvi. 2. 2 Cor. xii. 21. 2 Pet. iii. 7 only. Mic. vi. 10. 1. (Heb. i. 1.) b Luke x. 8. Luke x. 7 al. y Wied. xvii. 17 al. d = Luke xii. 16. John iv. 35. Acts vii. 1. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 13. (Mark x. 19. 1 Cor. vi. 38. vii. 5. 1 Tim. vi. 5) only. Mal. iii. 5. f = (see note) Exod. ii. 23. (see Gen. iv. 10. Hab. ii. 11.)

for φαγεται, φαινετε N¹. aft σαρκ. υμ. ins o ιος A[P]N⁸ 13 syr [Damasc₁].

AL k o have a stop bef ως πυρ. ημεραις bef εσχάταις A 13.

4. αφυστερημενος B¹N: αποστερημενος [K]L [Damasc₁-ms].

clothing and treasure) are become moth-eaten (ref.: see also Isa. li. 8: Acts xii. 23. The reference to Matt. vi. 19, 20 is obvious):

3.] **your gold and your silver is rusted through** ("Loquitur populariter, nam aurum propriæ æruginem non contrahit." Horneius, in Huther. In ref. Ep. Jer., we have of golden and silver images of idols, οὐ διασώζονται ἀπὸ τοῦ. Rust, happening generally to metals, is predicated of gold and silver without care for exact precision. So that there is no need to seek for some interpretation which may make the καίωται true of gold, as that (Bretschn.) copper vessels plated with gold are intended. The stern and vivid depiction of prophetic denunciation does not take such trifles into account. In καίωται, the prep. gives the sense of entireness; 'thoroughly rusted'), and the rust of them shall be for a testimony to you (not, as Ec., καταμαρτυρήσει ὑμῶν, ἐλέγχων τὸ ἀμετάδοτον ὑμῶν,—the rust which you have allowed to accumulate on them by want of use, shall testify against you in judgment,—but, as Wiesinger and Huther rightly, seeing that the rust is the effect of judgment begun, not of want of use,—the rust of them is a token what shall happen to yourselves: in the consuming of your wealth, you see depicted your own), and shall eat (φάγεται is a well-known future, contracted from φαγήσεται: cf. John ii. 17, and the prophecy ref. 4 (2) Kings, καταφάγονται οἱ κύνες τὰς σάρκας Ἰεζαβέλ) **your flesh** (plur. in ref. Huther remarks that in almost all the places cited, the same verb is used with the noun) **as fire** (i. e. as fire devours the flesh; which will account for the use of τὰς σάρκας, without giving it any emphatic meaning ("your bloated bodies," "your flesh of which alone you consist," and the like: see De Wette), seeing that fire consumes the flesh first).

The Syr., Ec., Grot., Knapp, Wiesinger, al. place the period at ὑμῶν, and connect ως πῦρ with ἐθσαυρίσατε, explaining it, ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις εὐρήσετε τὸν πλοῦτον ὑμῶν ως πῦρ ταμευθέντα ὑμῶν εἰς δλεθρον

(Ec.),—"quasi ignem in vestro malo aservastis" Grot.). But the reasons given for this are not satisfactory. There is in reality no confusion of metaphor in φάγεται τ. σάρ. ὑμ. ως πῦρ, and no want of an expressed object in ἐθσαυρίσατε ἐν ἐσχ. ἡμ., the verb ἐθσαυρίζω containing its object in itself. Ye laid up treasure in the last days (i. e. in these, the last days before the coming of the Lord, ye, instead of repenting and saving your souls, laid up treasure to no profit; employed yourselves in the vain accumulation of this world's wealth. The aor., as so often when the course of life and action is spoken of, is used as if from the standing-point of the day of judgment, looking back over this life.

ἐν is not for εἰς, here or any where: nor is the meaning 'for' or 'against' the last days. Estius, Calvin, al., with this idea, follow the vulg. in supplying 'iram' after 'thesauravistis,' as in Rom. ii. 5. Wolf and Morus understand by the last days, the last days of life: "Accumulavistis divitias extremæ vitæ parti provisuri:" but this is clearly wrong in N. T. diction: cf. ref.).

4—6.] *Specification of the sins, the incipient judgments for which hitherto have been hinted at under the figures of rust and moth.* And 4.] *the unjust frauds of the rich*, in non-payment of just debts. Behold (belongs to the fervid graphic style), the hire of the workmen (the sentence would be complete without the words τῶν ἐργατῶν: but probably there is tacit reference to the well-known saying (see on 1 Tim. v. 18) used by our Lord, ref. Luke (Matt. x. 10), ἄξιος ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ) who mowed (ἀμάω, from ἄμα, properly to gather together; but commonly used as here of reaping or mowing corn for harvest. So Il. σ. 551, ἔρθα δ' ἐριθοι ἡμῶν, ὀξείας δρεπάνας ἐν χερσὶν ἐχοντες. See Soph. Antig. 598, and Hermann's note) your fields (reff.), which has been held back (for the sense cf. Levit. xix. 13: Jer. xxii. 13, and esp. ref. Mal. In Sir. xxxi. (xxxiv.)

g = here only. s κράζει, καὶ αἱ ἡ βοαὶ τῶν ἱ θερισαντων εἰς τὰ ἡ ὄτα ABKLP
 (see Gen. iv. 10. Deut. xxiv. 17 [15].) ἱ κυρίου ἱ Σαβαὼθ ἡ εἰσεληλύθαν. 5 ἡ ἐτρυφήσατε ὁ ἐπὶ N a b c d
 h here only. Exod. ii. 23. 1 Kings iv. 14. τῆς γῆς καὶ ἡ ἐσπαταλήσατε, ἐθρέψατε τὰς ἡ καρδίας ὑμῶν f g h j k
 i Matt. vi. 26 ἡ L. Lev. xiii. 10, 22. ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ἡ σφαγῆς. 6 ἡ κατεδικάσατε, ἐφονεύσατε ἡ τὸν l m o 13
 k 1 Pet. iii. 12. Isaa. v. 9. 1 Isaa. as above (k) and generally (elw. usually, = παντοκράτωρ ὁ τῶν δυνάμεων.) m Ps
 xvii. 6. n here only. Neh. ix. 26. Isaa. lxvi. 11. Sir. xiv. 1 only. (-φή, 2 Pet. ii. 13.) o Matt.
 vi. 10 al. p 1 Tim. v. 6 only. Ezek. xvi. 49. Sir. xxi. 15 only. (-λη, Sir xxviii. 13. κατασπατάλω, q = Luke xxi. 34. Ps. ciii. 15. r Acts viii.
 Prov. xxix. 21. Amos vi. 4. see Wetst. q = Luke xxi. 34. Ps. ciii. 15. r Acts viii.
 32 (from Isa. lvi. 7). Rom. viii. 36 (from Ps. xlii. 22) only. Jer. xii. 3 al. s Matt. xii. 7, 37. Luke vi.
 37 (bis) only. Ps. xxxvii. 33. t so 2 Pet. ii. 8. u 1 Pet. v. 5.

rec εἰσεληλυθασιν, with KLN rel [Thl ŒC]: txt B[P], -θεν A [Damasc.].

5. om και A 73 copt [-p₁]. rec ins ωs bef εν ημερα, with KLN³ rel syrr [arm Ephr¹ Antch¹], Cyr¹ Thl ŒC: om AB[P]N¹ 13 latt copt.

22, we have ἐκχεῶν αἷμα ὁ ἀποστερῶν μισθὸν μισθίου), crieth out ("Vindictam quasi alto clamore exposcit," Calvin. Cf. Gen. iv. 10) from you (this, which was suggested by Luther, is better than to take refuge in the idea that ἀπό = ἐπὶ, and to render, "which has been held back by you:" or than Wiesinger's interpretation, which, recognizing the difference between the two prepositions, makes ἀπό designate, not the direct origin of the act, but the proceeding of the act of robbery from them: and so Winer, § 47, ἀπό, note [2, p. 464, Moulton's Edn.]: but none of the examples which he gives at all come near this one. The most plausible, Luke ix. 22 and xvii. 25, ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων κ.τ.λ., differs in this, that a *Person* is spoken of, whose ἀποδοκιμασία will come from the πρεσβύτεροι: whereas here, where a *thing* is in question, with which the ἀποστεροῦντες deal, we can hardly say that *its* ἀποστέρησις proceeds from them. The other construction is amply justified by ref. The μισθός, which was kept back, and rests with you, cries out *from you*, your coffers, where it lies): and the cries of them who reaped have entered into the ears of the Lord of hosts (not only does the abstracted hire cry out from its place, but the defrauded victims themselves join, and the cry is heard of God. For the expressions see ref. This is the only place in the N. T. where κύριος Σαβαὼθ is used by any writer: Rom. ix. 29 is a citation. The Jewish character of the whole will sufficiently account for it. Bede gives another reason, which also doubtless was in the Apostle's mind: "Dominum exercituum appellat, ad terrorem eorum, qui pauperes putant nullum habere tutorem").

5.] *Second class of sins: luxury and self-indulgence.* Ye luxuriated on the earth (the last words of ver. 4 placed the thought in heaven, where the judgment is laid up) and wantoned (ἐτρυφή, ἐσπατάλ., "luxuriare, lascivire: alterum deliciarum, alterum

prodigientia," Theile. See on ref. 1 Tim.), ye nourished (satiated, fattened) your hearts (καρδίας as in ref., and in Acts xiv. 17, ἐμπιπλῶν τροφῆς. . τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν. Although the body is really that which is filled, the heart is that in which the satisfaction of repletion is felt) in the (the omission of the art. as so common before ἡμέρα, ἔρα, καιρός: cf. Matt. viii. 29: Winer, § 19. 1) day of slaughter (i. e. as Theile, "Similes sunt pectudibus quae ipso adeo inactionis die se pascent saginant-que lætæ et securæ." Cf. ref. Jer. ἐν is again not for εἰς. This seems the simplest and most obvious interpretation. It need not be dependent on the insertion of the ὥς; the sudden and direct application of the image to the persons addressed requires no particle of comparison. And it is no reason against it, which Luther somewhat petulantly alleges against De Wette, that beasts do not eat more greedily on the day of their slaughter than on any other day; for this is not implied. Even if we grant Luther's own view, that ἡμέρα σφαγῆς is an expression for the day of judgment, this expression derives its force from the above comparison, and will not let us forget it. Many Commentators, as Calvin, Beza, Grot., Laurentius, Bengel, al., understand ἡμ. σφαγῆς to mean a day of banqueting, when oxen and fatlings are slain. Calvin says, "Solebant in sacrificiis solemnibus liberalius vesci quam pro quotidiano more. Dicit ergo divites tota vita continuare festum." This might be allowable, were it not that the analogy of ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις above seems to demand the other. It is no objection to it (Huther), that thus all allusion to the judgment is lost; this comes in with the other interpretation, and appositely: but is not absolutely required by the sentiment of the verse, which regards the self-indulgence, &c., of the rich while on earth.) 6.]

Third class of sins: condemning the innocent. Ye condemned, ye murdered the

7 ὁ Μακροθυμήσατε οὖν, ἀδελφοί, ἕως τῆς παρουσίας τοῦ κυρίου. ἰδοὺ ὁ γεωργὸς ἐκδέχεται τὸν τιμίον καρπὸν τῆς γῆς, μακροθυμῶν ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἕως λάβῃ τὸν ὄψιμον καὶ ὑμεῖς, μακροθυμήσατε καὶ ὑμεῖς, v Heb. vi. 15
ref.
w Matt. xxiv.
3, 27, 37, 39
only in
Gosp. Epp.,
1 Cor. xv. 23.
1 Thess. ii.
19, iii. 13

al fr.+ 2 Macc. viii. 12, xi. 21 only.
i. 11.
a Matt. xviii. 26, 29. Luke xviii 7. Sir. xviii 11. xxxii. (xxxv.) 18
24. Joel ii. 23. x Matt. xxi. 33 &c. || John xv. 1. 2 Tim. ii 6 only. Joel
z = Acts xx. 24. 1 Pet. i. 19 al. Prov. iii 15 al.
c here only. Hos. vi. 4. d here only. Prov. xvi. 16.

7. for αὐτω, αὐτον KL c f g h k l Thl. rec aft 2nd εως ins αν, with [P]N rel
syr-mg [Antch.] Ec-c-comm: om ABKL d j k l 36 sah Thl. rec ins υετον bef
πρωιμου, with AKL[P] 13 syrr Thl Ec; καρπον N(N¹ has καρποντον, N³ disapproving τον)
9 lat-ff. syr-mg copt Antch, Cassiod.: om B m vulg sah arm. πρωιμου AB¹[P]N.
8. aft μακροθυμ. ins ουν LN [vulg-ed] (with fuld tol, not am demid) aeth [Antch.].

just man (these words are probably spoken generally, the singular being collective. τὸν δίκαιον, not merely τὸν ἄββον; it is his justice itself which provokes the enmity and cruelty of the πλούσιοι. It has been usual to refer these words to the condemnation and execution of Christ. So Ec., ἀναντιρρήτως τό, ἐφρονεύσατε τὸν δίκαιον, ἐπὶ τὸν χριστὸν ἀναφέρεται. τῇ μέντοι ἐπιφορᾷ, τῇ, οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται ὑμῖν, ἐκοί-νωσε τὸν λόγον καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς τὰ ὅμοια παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παρόντας. ὥσως δὲ καὶ προφητικῶς τό περὶ αὐτὸν ὑπεμφαίνει πάθος. So Bede, at some length; Grot., al. But there is surely nothing in the context to indicate this, further than that such a particular case may be included in the general charge, as its most notorious example. I cannot see, with Huther, how the present ἀντι-τάσσεται makes against this: for any- how we must suppose a change of sense before the present can be introduced: and then it may as well be a description of Christ's patient endurance, or of His present long-suffering, as of the present meekness of the (generic) δίκαιος. But I prefer the latter, and with it the other reference throughout): he (the δίκαιος; Bentley more ingeniously than happily conjectured δ κύριος, as an emendation for οὐκ) doth not resist you (the behaviour of the just under your persecutions is ever that of meekness and submission. "οὐκ ἀντιτάσσεται sine copula et pronomine ponderose additur." Schneckenb.). This last clause serves as a note of transition to what follows. So Herder remarks, as cited by Wiesinger: "And thus we have as it were standing before us the slain and unresisting righteous man, when lo the curtain falls: Be patient, brethren, wait!" See, on the whole sense, Amos ii. 6, 7; v. 12; and the description in Wisd. ii. 6—20.

7—11.] Exhortation to suffering Christians to endure unto the coming of the Lord. On the connexion, see above. 7.] Be patient (reff.) therefore (the οὖν ἐδν,

'matters being so') is a general reference to the prophetic strain of the previous passage: judgment on your oppressors being so near, and your own part, as the Lord's δίκαιος, being that of unresisting-ness), brethren (contrast to οὐ πλούσιοι, last addressed), until (ἕως as a preposition, see Winer, § 54. 6. "Non tempus tantum sed rem quoque indicat, qua ἡ θλίψις μακρο-θύμως toleranda tollatur." Schneckenb.) the coming of the Lord (i. e. here, beyond all reasonable question, of Christ. δ κύριος, it is true, usually in this Epistle is to be taken in the O. T. sense, as denoting the Father: but we have in ch. i. 1 and ii. 1 examples of St. James using it of our Saviour, and it is therefore better to keep so well known a phrase to its ordinary meaning, than with Theile and De W. (but only μαθητῶν ἐν τῇ) to understand it, "Dei, qui Messia adventante invisibili modo præsens est"). Encouragement by the example of the husbandman. Behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, being patient over it (with reference to it: quasi sitting over it and watching it: this local superposition is the root of all derived meanings of ἐπί with a dative), till it (better than "he," as Luth. and E. V.) shall have received the early and latter (rain) (see reff., and Winer, Realw. under Bitterung. From the latter it appears that the πρώτος fell in Oct., Nov., and Dec., extending, with occasional snow, into Jan. (see reff. Deut., Jer.): and after fine spring weather in Feb., the δεύτερος in March to the end of April (reff. and Jer. iii. 3 Heb. and E. V.). Ec. gives a curious interpretation of the early and latter rain: πρώτος υετός, ἡ ἐν νεότητι μετὰ δακρύων μετάνοια· δεύτερος, ἡ ἐν τῷ γήρᾳ. As to the reading, it is much more probable that υετόν has been supplied than that it has been erased): 8.] be ye also patient (as well as, after the example of, the husbandman): establish (confirm, strengthen, both which are required for patience) your

e = Luke xxii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi. 25 al. f = 1 Pet. v. 10. Ezek. vi. 2 al. g = 1 Pet. iv. 7 ref. h = here only. (Heb. xiii. 17 ref.) i = Matt. v. 1. 1 ch. iv. 12 ref. k Acts v. 23. xii 6. see Matt. xxiv. 23. Rev. iii. 20. n Heb. vi. 12 ref. xx. 13. r = ch. i. 3, 4 ref. x. 6. Gal. ii. 14.

ε = Luke xxii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi. 25 al. f = 1 Pet. v. 10. Ezek. vi. 2 al. g = 1 Pet. iv. 7 ref. h = here only. (Heb. xiii. 17 ref.) i = Matt. v. 1. 1 ch. iv. 12 ref. k Acts v. 23. xii 6. see Matt. xxiv. 23. Rev. iii. 20. n Heb. vi. 12 ref. xx. 13. r = ch. i. 3, 4 ref. x. 6. Gal. ii. 14.

ε = Luke xxii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi. 25 al. f = 1 Pet. v. 10. Ezek. vi. 2 al. g = 1 Pet. iv. 7 ref. h = here only. (Heb. xiii. 17 ref.) i = Matt. v. 1. 1 ch. iv. 12 ref. k Acts v. 23. xii 6. see Matt. xxiv. 23. Rev. iii. 20. n Heb. vi. 12 ref. xx. 13. r = ch. i. 3, 4 ref. x. 6. Gal. ii. 14.

9. aft αδελφοι ins μου A d 13. 36 Syr coptt [Antch]. rec κατ' αλληλων bef αδελφοι, with LN rel syrr coptt [arm] Thl Ec: om αδελφοι K 23. 36. 64. 100-2: txt AB[P] a c d m 13 latt aeth.—κατα Ν. rec κατακριθητε, with Ec: txt ABKL[P]N rel [Antch.] Thl. rec om δ: ins ABKL[P]N rel Thl Ec.

10. om λαβετε A 13 [aeth]. rec aft αδελφοι ins μου, with KLN rel Syr coptt Thl Ec: om AB[P] a c h 13 latt syr arm Chr, Bede, rec τ. κακοπ. bef αδελφοι, with Ec: txt ABKL[P]N rel latt syrr coptt Chr, Thl. καλοκαγαθιας Ν. ins εχετε bef τ. προφ. AN³: δεχετε 13 [sunt aeth]. ins εν bef τω ονοματι B[P] a h l² m, in nomine latt [arm].—εν ονοματι Ν [Chr].

11. rec υπομενοντας, with KL rel: txt AB[P]N a latt (qui sustinuerunt) syrr. rec ειδετε, with B¹KN: txt AB²L[P] j k m 13 Thl.

hearts, because the coming of the Lord is nigh (perf.: 'hath (already) drawn near, and is therefore at hand,' as the perfects εστηκα, εγνωκα, &c. Calvin says, "Colligendum robur ad durandum: colligi autem melius non potest, quam ex spe et quasi intuitu propinqui adventus Domini").

9.] *Exhortation to mutual forbearance.* "Quos ad manifestas et gravissimas improborum injurias fortiter ferendas incitat, eos nunc hortatur, ut etiam in minoribus illis offensis quæ inter ipsos sæpe subnascuntur, vel condonandis vel dissimulandis prompti sint. Contingit enim ut qui hostium et improborum maximas sæpe contumelias et injurias æquo animo tolerant, fratrum tamen offensas multo leniores non facile ferant." Horneius (in Huther). *Murmur not, brethren, against one another* (there is not any imprecation of Divine vengeance to be thought of, as Calvin, Theile, al.), *that ye be not judged* (seeing that murmuring against one another involves the violation of our Lord's μη κρινετε (ref. Matt.)), he finishes with the following clause there, *Ινα μη κριθητε*: the passive verb here, as there, being to be taken in a condemnatory sense, or at all events as assuming the condemnatory issue): behold, the Judge standeth before the door (reff. The Judge, viz. the Lord. These last words are added with a view to both portions of the sentence preceding, not to the latter one only as Huther: μη στεν. involving in itself μη κρινετε: the near

approach of the Judge is a motive for suspending our own judgment, as well as for deterring us from incurring that speedy judgment on ourselves which we shall incur if we do not suspend it).

10, 11.] *Encouragement to patience in affliction by O. T. examples.* Take, my brethren, as an example of affliction (not, 'of enduring' or 'suffering affliction.' E. V.: the word is strictly objective, and is found parallel with ξυμφορά and the like: so in reff.: and Thucyd. vii. 77, ἐλπίδα χρη ἔχειν, μηδὲ καταμείψασθαι ὑμᾶς ἄγαν αὐτούς, μήτε ταῖς ξυμφοραῖς, μήτε ταῖς παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν νῦν κακοπαθείαις (spoken by Nicias to the suffering Athenian army in Sicily): so Isocr. p. 127 c, μηδὲ μικρὰν οἶσθαι δεῖν ὑπενεγκεῖν κακοπάθειαν: which examples are decisive) and of patience (beware of the silly hendiadys, which indeed can have no place at all with the right meaning of κακοπάθεια) the prophets (so Matt. v. 12) who spoke in the name (or, by the name. We may consider τῷ ὀνόμ. as equivalent to ἐν τῷ ὀν., or we may explain it as De Wette 'by means of the name') of the Lord (God).

11.] *Another example*, in which a further point is gained. Behold, we count happy them that have endured (see Matt. v. 10. ὑπομένοντες may be a correction to suit the sense, and τέλος below, but it must be adopted as the most ancient reading, and it is connected with Matt. i. c., μακάριοι οἱ δεδιωγμένοι, they who have been persecuted):

ὅτι ^v πολὺσπλαγχνός ἐστιν ὁ κύριος καὶ ^w οἰκτίρμων. ^v here only †.
 12 ^x πρὸ πάντων δέ, ἀδελφοί μου, μὴ ^y ὀμνύετε, μήτε τὸν ^w Luke vi. 36
 οὐρανὸν μήτε τὴν γῆν μᾶτε ἄλλον τινα ^z ὅρκον· ἢ τῷ ^{Exod. xxxiv.}
^{6.} (μὸς, Heb. x. 25) ^z 1 Pet. iv. 8. ^a 1 Cor.

y constr. here only. Isa. lxx. 16. w. ἐν, & εἰς, Matt. v. 34, 35.
 xvi. 22. Ps. ciii. 31. 1 Macc. x. 31.

z Heb. vi. 16, 17 reff.

om o κυριος KL rel vulg-mss Thl : ins A(B)[P]N latt syrr coptt [æth arm] Æc.—om o B.
 12. for 1st δε, ουν N¹ [om K l 106-80 arm]. ορκ. bef τινα A.

ye (have) heard of the endurance of Job; see also (not 'and have seen,' which Wiesinger renders even with the reading ἴδετε. The imperative is not as Huther auffallen, but natural enough, see ch. i. 6, 7) the end of the Lord ('the termination which the Lord (in O. T. sense) gave': do not limit your attention to Job's sufferings, but look on to the end and see the mercy shewn him by God); for (better than "that," as Huther, al.: the sense being, 'Job's patience is known to you all: do not rest there, but look on to the end which God gave him: and it is well worth your while so to do, for you will find that He is' &c. And this has apparently occasioned the repetition by the Apostle of the word ὁ κύριος, which has been left out by those who imagined that ὅτι introduced merely the result of the inspection, and that therefore no new subject was needed) the Lord is very pitiful (πολύσπλαγχνος, a word no where else found: coined after the Heb. רַחוּם (Wiesinger), which the LXX render πολυέλεος, Exod. xxxiv. 6 al., always joined with μακρόθυμος: see in Trommiius. We have εὐσπλαγχνος, Eph. iv. 32; 1 Pet. iii. 8) and merciful (reff. This remembrance of God's pity and mercy would encourage them also to hope that whatever their sufferings, the τέλος κυρίου might prove similar in their own case).

12—20.] Various exhortations and dehortations, connected with the foregoing chiefly by the situation, sufferings, and duties of the readers.

12.] This dehortation from swearing is connected with what went before by the obvious peril that they, whose temptations were to impatience under suffering, might be betrayed by that impatience into hasty swearing and imprecations. That this suffering state of theirs is still in view, is evident from the κακοπαθεῖ τις which follows: that it alone is not in view is equally evident, from the εὐθυμαί τις which also follows. So that we may safely say that the Apostle passes from their particular temptations under suffering to their general temptations in life. But (contrast of the spirit which would prompt that which he is about to forbid, with that recommended in the last verses) above all things (ref.: qu. d. 'So far is the

practice alien from Christian meekness, that whatever you feel or say, let it not for a moment be given way to'), my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath (ὅρκος for 'formula jurandi.' The construction of ὀμνύμι with an accus. of the thing sworn by is classical: that with εἰς or ἐν, as in ref. Matt., according to Hebraistic usage. Huther's note here is valuable and just: "It is to be noticed, that swearing *by the name of God* is not mentioned: for we must not imagine that this is included in the last member of the clause, the Apostle intending evidently by μήτε ἄλλον τινα ὅρκον to point only at similar formulæ, of which several are mentioned in ref. Matt. Had he intended to forbid swearing by the name of God, he would most certainly have mentioned it expressly: for not only is it in the law, in contradistinction to other oaths, commanded,—see Deut. vi. 13; x. 20: Ps. lxxiii. 11,—but in the Prophets is announced as a token of the future turning of men to God: ref. Isa.: Jer. xii. 16; xxiii. 7, 8. The omission of notice of *this oath* shews that James in this warning has in view only the abuse, common among the Jews generally and among his readers, of introducing in the common every-day affairs of life, instead of the common yea and nay, such asseverations as those here mentioned: so that we are not justified in deducing from his words any prohibition of swearing in general, as has been attempted by many expositors of our Epistle, and especially by Æc., Bede, Erasm., Theile, De Wette, Neander, al. (on the other hand the following Commentators refer St. James's prohibition to light and trifling oaths: Calv., Est., Laurentius, Grot., Pott, Michaelis, Storr, Morus, Schneckenburger, Kern, Wiesinger, al.). The use of oaths *by heaven*, &c., arises on the one hand from forgetting that every oath, in its deeper significance, is a swearing *by God*, and on the other from a depreciation of simple truth in words: either way therefore from a lightness and frivolity which is in direct contrast to the earnest seriousness of a Christian spirit." See my note on Matt. i. c.): but (contrast to the habit of swearing) let (on the form ἦτω,

b Matt. v. 37. δε υμῶν τὸ ^bναὶ καὶ τὸ ^bοὐ οὐ, ἵνα μὴ ^cὑπὸ κρίσιν
see 2 Cor. i. ^cπέσῃτε. 13 ^dκακοπαθεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; προσευχέσθω ^eεὐ-
17 &c. θυμῷ τίς; ^fψαλλέτω. 14 ^gἀσθενεῖ τις ἐν ὑμῖν; ^hπρος-
c here only. ⁱκαλεσάσθω τοὺς ^jπρεσβυτέρους τῆς ἐκκλησίας, καὶ ^kπρος-
ὥστε μὴδ' ^lἐκκλησίαν ^mαὐτῶν, ⁿἐξάσθωσαν ^oἐπ' αὐτὸν ^pἀλείψαντες αὐτὸν ^qἐλαίῳ ἐν τῷ ^rῶ.
ἀλλ' αὐτῶν, ^sὀνόματι κυρίου, ^tκαὶ ἡ ^uεὐχὴ τῆς πίστεως ^vὁ σώσει τὸν
Polyb. iv. 15 ^wῶ. ^xABKL P ^y1. ^z1. ^{aa}1. ^{ab}1. ^{ac}1. ^{ad}1. ^{ae}1. ^{af}1. ^{ag}1. ^{ah}1. ^{ai}1. ^{aj}1. ^{ak}1. ^{al}1. ^{am}1. ^{an}1. ^{ao}1. ^{ap}1. ^{aq}1. ^{ar}1. ^{as}1. ^{at}1. ^{au}1. ^{av}1. ^{aw}1. ^{ax}1. ^{ay}1. ^{az}1. ^{ba}1. ^{bb}1. ^{bc}1. ^{bd}1. ^{be}1. ^{bf}1. ^{bg}1. ^{bh}1. ^{bi}1. ^{bj}1. ^{bk}1. ^{bl}1. ^{bm}1. ^{bn}1. ^{bo}1. ^{bp}1. ^{bq}1. ^{br}1. ^{bs}1. ^{bt}1. ^{bu}1. ^{bv}1. ^{bw}1. ^{bx}1. ^{by}1. ^{bz}1. ^{ca}1. ^{cb}1. ^{cc}1. ^{cd}1. ^{ce}1. ^{cf}1. ^{cg}1. ^{ch}1. ^{ci}1. ^{cj}1. ^{ck}1. ^{cl}1. ^{cm}1. ^{cn}1. ^{co}1. ^{cp}1. ^{cq}1. ^{cr}1. ^{cs}1. ^{ct}1. ^{cu}1. ^{cv}1. ^{cw}1. ^{cx}1. ^{cy}1. ^{cz}1. ^{da}1. ^{db}1. ^{dc}1. ^{dd}1. ^{de}1. ^{df}1. ^{dg}1. ^{dh}1. ^{di}1. ^{dj}1. ^{dk}1. ^{dl}1. ^{dm}1. ^{dn}1. ^{do}1. ^{dp}1. ^{dq}1. ^{dr}1. ^{ds}1. ^{dt}1. ^{du}1. ^{dv}1. ^{dw}1. ^{dx}1. ^{dy}1. ^{dz}1. ^{ea}1. ^{eb}1. ^{ec}1. ^{ed}1. ^{ee}1. ^{ef}1. ^{eg}1. ^{eh}1. ^{ei}1. ^{ej}1. ^{ek}1. ^{el}1. ^{em}1. ^{en}1. ^{eo}1. ^{ep}1. ^{eq}1. ^{er}1. ^{es}1. ^{et}1. ^{eu}1. ^{ev}1. ^{ew}1. ^{ex}1. ^{ey}1. ^{ez}1. ^{fa}1. ^{fb}1. ^{fc}1. ^{fd}1. ^{fe}1. ^{ff}1. ^{fg}1. ^{fh}1. ^{fi}1. ^{fj}1. ^{fk}1. ^{fl}1. ^{fm}1. ^{fn}1. ^{fo}1. ^{fp}1. ^{fq}1. ^{fr}1. ^{fs}1. ^{ft}1. ^{fu}1. ^{fv}1. ^{fw}1. ^{fx}1. ^{fy}1. ^{fz}1. ^{ga}1. ^{gb}1. ^{gc}1. ^{gd}1. ^{ge}1. ^{gf}1. ^{gh}1. ^{gi}1. ^{gj}1. ^{gk}1. ^{gl}1. ^{gm}1. ^{gn}1. ^{go}1. ^{gp}1. ^{gq}1. ^{gr}1. ^{gs}1. ^{gt}1. ^{gu}1. ^{gv}1. ^{gw}1. ^{gx}1. ^{gy}1. ^{gz}1. ^{ha}1. ^{hb}1. ^{hc}1. ^{hd}1. ^{he}1. ^{hf}1. ^{hg}1. ^{hh}1. ^{hi}1. ^{hj}1. ^{hk}1. ^{hl}1. ^{hm}1. ^{hn}1. ^{ho}1. ^{hp}1. ^{hq}1. ^{hr}1. ^{hs}1. ^{ht}1. ^{hu}1. ^{hv}1. ^{hw}1. ^{hx}1. ^{hy}1. ^{hz}1. ^{ia}1. ^{ib}1. ^{ic}1. ^{id}1. ^{ie}1. ^{if}1. ^{ig}1. ^{ih}1. ⁱⁱ1. ^{ij}1. ^{ik}1. ^{il}1. ^{im}1. ⁱⁿ1. ^{io}1. ^{ip}1. ^{iq}1. ^{ir}1. ^{is}1. ^{it}1. ^{iu}1. ^{iv}1. ^{iw}1. ^{ix}1. ^{iy}1. ^{iz}1. ^{ja}1. ^{jb}1. ^{jc}1. ^{jd}1. ^{je}1. ^{jf}1. ^{jh}1. ^{ji}1. ^{jj}1. ^{jk}1. ^{jl}1. ^{jm}1. ^{jn}1. ^{jo}1. ^{jp}1. ^{jq}1. ^{jr}1. ^{js}1. ^{jt}1. ^{ju}1. ^{jv}1. ^{jw}1. ^{jx}1. ^{ky}1. ^{kz}1. ^{la}1. ^{lb}1. ^{lc}1. ^{ld}1. ^{le}1. ^{lf}1. ^{lg}1. ^{lh}1. ^{li}1. ^{lj}1. ^{lk}1. ^{ll}1. ^{lm}1. ^{ln}1. ^{lo}1. ^{lp}1. ^{lq}1. ^{lr}1. ^{ls}1. ^{lt}1. ^{lu}1. ^{lv}1. ^{lw}1. ^{lx}1. ^{ly}1. ^{lz}1. ^{ma}1. ^{mb}1. ^{mc}1. ^{md}1. ^{me}1. ^{mf}1. ^{mg}1. ^{mh}1. ^{mi}1. ^{mj}1. ^{mk}1. ^{ml}1. ^{mn}1. ^{mo}1. ^{mp}1. ^{mq}1. ^{mr}1. ^{ms}1. ^{mt}1. ^{mu}1. ^{mv}1. ^{mw}1. ^{mx}1. ^{my}1. ^{mz}1. ^{na}1. ^{nb}1. ^{nc}1. nd1. ^{ne}1. ^{nf}1. ^{ng}1. ^{nh}1. ⁿⁱ1. ^{nj}1. ^{nk}1. ^{nl}1. ^{nm}1. ⁿⁿ1. ^{no}1. ^{np}1. ^{nq}1. ^{nr}1. ^{ns}1. ^{nt}1. ^{nu}1. ^{nv}1. ^{nw}1. ^{nx}1. ^{ny}1. ^{nz}1. ^{oa}1. ^{ob}1. ^{oc}1. ^{od}1. ^{oe}1. ^{of}1. ^{og}1. ^{oh}1. ^{oi}1. ^{oj}1. ^{ok}1. ^{ol}1. ^{om}1. ^{on}1. ^{oo}1. ^{op}1. ^{oq}1. ^{or}1. ^{os}1. ^{ot}1. ^{ou}1. ^{ov}1. ^{ow}1. ^{ox}1. ^{oy}1. ^{oz}1. ^{pa}1. ^{pb}1. ^{pc}1. ^{pd}1. ^{pe}1. ^{pf}1. ^{pg}1. ^{ph}1. ^{pi}1. ^{pj}1. ^{pk}1. ^{pl}1. ^{pm}1. ^{pn}1. ^{po}1. ^{pp}1. ^{pq}1. ^{pr}1. ^{ps}1. ^{pt}1. ^{pu}1. ^{pv}1. ^{pw}1. ^{px}1. ^{py}1. ^{pz}1. ^{qa}1. ^{qb}1. ^{qc}1. ^{qd}1. ^{qe}1. ^{qf}1. ^{qh}1. ^{qi}1. ^{qj}1. ^{qk}1. ^{ql}1. ^{qm}1. ^{qn}1. ^{qo}1. ^{qp}1. ^{qq}1. ^{qr}1. ^{qs}1. ^{qt}1. ^{qu}1. ^{qv}1. ^{qw}1. ^{qx}1. ^{qy}1. ^{qz}1. ^{ra}1. ^{rb}1. ^{rc}1. rd1. ^{re}1. ^{rf}1. ^{rg}1. ^{rh}1. ^{ri}1. ^{rj}1. ^{rk}1. ^{rl}1. ^{rm}1. ^{rn}1. ^{ro}1. ^{rp}1. ^{rq}1. ^{rr}1. ^{rs}1. ^{rt}1. ^{ru}1. ^{rv}1. ^{rw}1. ^{rx}1. ^{ry}1. ^{rz}1. ^{sa}1. ^{sb}1. ^{sc}1. ^{sd}1. ^{se}1. ^{sf}1. ^{sh}1. ^{si}1. ^{sj}1. ^{sk}1. ^{sl}1. sm1. ^{sn}1. ^{so}1. ^{sp}1. ^{sq}1. ^{sr}1. ^{ss}1. st1. ^{su}1. ^{sv}1. ^{sw}1. ^{sx}1. ^{sy}1. ^{sz}1. ^{ta}1. ^{tb}1. ^{tc}1. ^{td}1. ^{te}1. ^{tf}1. th1. ^{ti}1. ^{tj}1. ^{tk}1. ^{tl}1. tm1. ^{tn}1. ^{to}1. ^{tp}1. ^{tq}1. ^{tr}1. ^{ts}1. ^{tt}1. ^{tu}1. ^{tv}1. ^{tw}1. ^{tx}1. ^{ty}1. ^{tz}1. ^{ua}1. ^{ub}1. ^{uc}1. ^{ud}1. ^{ue}1. ^{uf}1. ^{ug}1. ^{uh}1. ^{ui}1. ^{uj}1. ^{uk}1. ^{ul}1. ^{um}1. ^{un}1. ^{uo}1. ^{up}1. ^{uq}1. ^{ur}1. ^{us}1. ^{ut}1. ^{uu}1. ^{uv}1. ^{uw}1. ^{ux}1. ^{uy}1. ^{uz}1. ^{va}1. ^{vb}1. ^{vc}1. ^{vd}1. ^{ve}1. ^{vf}1. ^{vh}1. ^{vi}1. ^{vj}1. ^{vk}1. ^{vl}1. ^{vm}1. ^{vn}1. ^{vo}1. ^{vp}1. ^{vq}1. ^{vr}1. ^{vs}1. ^{vt}1. ^{vu}1. ^{vv}1. ^{vw}1. ^{vx}1. ^{vy}1. ^{vz}1. ^{wa}1. ^{wb}1. ^{wc}1. ^{wd}1. ^{we}1. ^{wf}1. ^{wh}1. ^{wi}1. ^{wj}1. ^{wk}1. ^{wl}1. ^{wm}1. ^{wn}1. ^{wo}1. ^{wp}1. ^{wq}1. ^{wr}1. ^{ws}1. ^{wt}1. ^{wu}1. ^{wv}1. ^{ww}1. ^{wx}1. ^{wy}1. ^{wz}1. ^{xa}1. ^{xb}1. ^{xc}1. ^{xd}1. ^{xe}1. ^{xf}1. ^{xh}1. ^{xi}1. ^{xj}1. ^{xk}1. ^{xl}1. ^{xm}1. ^{xn}1. ^{xo}1. ^{xp}1. ^{xq}1. ^{xr}1. ^{xs}1. ^{xt}1. ^{xu}1. ^{xv}1. ^{xw}1. ^{xy}1. ^{xz}1. ^{ya}1. ^{yb}1. ^{yc}1. ^{yd}1. ^{ye}1. ^{yf}1. ^{yh}1. ^{yi}1. ^{yj}1. ^{yk}1. ^{yl}1. ^{ym}1. ^{yn}1. ^{yo}1. ^{yp}1. ^{yq}1. ^{yr}1. ^{ys}1. ^{yt}1. ^{yu}1. ^{yv}1. ^{yw}1. ^{yx}1. ^{yy}1. ^{yz}1. ^{za}1. ^{zb}1. ^{zc}1. ^{zd}1. ^{ze}1. ^{zf}1. ^{zh}1. ^{zi}1. ^{zj}1. ^{zk}1. ^{zl}1. ^{zm}1. ^{zn}1. ^{zo}1. ^{zp}1. ^{zq}1. ^{zr}1. ^{zs}1. ^{zt}1. ^{zu}1. ^{zv}1. ^{zw}1. ^{zx}1. ^{zy}1. ^{zz}1. ^{aa}1. ^{ab}1. ^{ac}1. ^{ad}1. ^{ae}1. ^{af}1. ^{ag}1. ^{ah}1. ^{ai}1. ^{aj}1. ^{ak}1. ^{al}1. ^{am}1. ^{an}1. ^{ao}1. ^{ap}1. ^{aq}1. ^{ar}1. ^{as}1. ^{at}1. ^{au}1. ^{av}1. ^{aw}1. ^{ax}1. ^{ay}1. ^{az}1. ^{ba}1. ^{bb}1. ^{bc}1. ^{bd}1. ^{be}1. ^{bf}1. ^{bg}1. ^{bh}1. ^{bi}1. ^{bj}1. ^{bk}1. ^{bl}1. ^{bm}1. ^{bn}1. ^{bo}1. ^{bp}1. ^{bq}1. ^{br}1. ^{bs}1. ^{bt}1. ^{bu}1. ^{bv}1. ^{bw}1. ^{bx}1. ^{by}1. ^{bz}1. ^{ca}1. ^{cb}1. ^{cc}1. ^{cd}1. ^{ce}1. ^{cf}1. ^{cg}1. ^{ch}1. ^{ci}1. ^{cj}1. ^{ck}1. ^{cl}1. ^{cm}1. ^{cn}1. ^{co}1. ^{cp}1. ^{cq}1. ^{cr}1. ^{cs}1. ^{ct}1. ^{cu}1. ^{cv}1. ^{cw}1. ^{cx}1. ^{cy}1. ^{cz}1. ^{da}1. ^{db}1. ^{dc}1. ^{dd}1. ^{de}1. ^{df}1. ^{dg}1. ^{dh}1. ^{di}1. ^{dj}1. ^{dk}1. ^{dl}1. ^{dm}1. ^{dn}1. ^{do}1. ^{dp}1. ^{dq}1. ^{dr}1. ^{ds}1. ^{dt}1. ^{du}1. ^{dv}1. ^{dw}1. ^{dx}1. ^{dy}1. ^{dz}1. ^{ea}1. ^{eb}1. ^{ec}1. ^{ed}1. ^{ee}1. ^{ef}1. ^{eg}1. ^{eh}1. ^{ei}1. ^{ej}1. ^{ek}1. ^{el}1. ^{em}1. ^{en}1. ^{eo}1. ^{ep}1. ^{eq}1. ^{er}1. ^{es}1. ^{et}1. ^{eu}1. ^{ev}1. ^{ew}1. ^{ex}1. ^{ey}1. ^{ez}1. ^{fa}1. ^{fb}1. ^{fc}1. ^{fd}1. ^{fe}1. ^{ff}1. ^{fg}1. ^{fh}1. ^{fi}1. ^{fj}1. ^{fk}1. ^{fl}1. ^{fm}1. ^{fn}1. ^{fo}1. ^{fp}1. ^{fq}1. ^{fr}1. ^{fs}1. ^{ft}1. ^{fu}1. ^{fv}1. ^{fw}1. ^{fx}1. ^{fy}1. ^{fz}1. ^{ga}1. ^{gb}1. ^{gc}1. ^{gd}1. ^{ge}1. ^{gf}1. ^{gh}1. ^{gi}1. ^{gj}1. ^{gk}1. ^{gl}1. ^{gm}1. ^{gn}1. ^{go}1. ^{gp}1. ^{gq}1. ^{gr}1. ^{gs}1. ^{gt}1. ^{gu}1. ^{gv}1. ^{gw}1. ^{gx}1. ^{gy}1. ^{gz}1. ^{ha}1. ^{hb}1. ^{hc}1. ^{hd}1. ^{he}1. ^{hf}1. ^{hg}1. ^{hh}1. ^{hi}1. ^{hj}1. ^{hk}1. ^{hl}1. ^{hm}1. ^{hn}1. ^{ho}1. ^{hp}1. ^{hq}1. ^{hr}1. ^{hs}1. ^{ht}1. ^{hu}1. ^{hv}1. ^{hw}1. ^{hx}1. ^{hy}1. ^{hz}1. ^{ia}1. ^{ib}1. ^{ic}1. ^{id}1. ^{ie}1. ^{if}1. ^{ig}1. ^{ih}1. ⁱⁱ1. ^{ij}1. ^{ik}1. ^{il}1. ^{im}1. ⁱⁿ1. ^{io}1. ^{ip}1. ^{iq}1. ^{ir}1. ^{is}1. ^{it}1. ^{iu}1. ^{iv}1. ^{iw}1. ^{ix}1. ^{iy}1. ^{iz}1. ^{ja}1. ^{jb}1. ^{jc}1. ^{jd}1. ^{je}1. ^{jf}1. ^{jh}1. ^{ji}1. ^{jj}1. ^{jk}1. ^{jl}1. ^{jm}1. ^{jn}1. ^{jo}1. ^{jp}1. ^{jq}1. ^{jr}1. ^{js}1. ^{jt}1. ^{ju}1. ^{jv}1. ^{jw}1. ^{jx}1. ^{ky}1. ^{kz}1. ^{la}1. ^{lb}1. ^{lc}1. ^{ld}1. ^{le}1. ^{lf}1. ^{lg}1. ^{lh}1. ^{li}1. ^{lj}1. ^{lk}1. ^{ll}1. ^{lm}1. ^{ln}1. ^{lo}1. ^{lp}1. ^{lq}1. ^{lr}1. ^{ls}1. ^{lt}1. ^{lu}1. ^{lv}1. ^{lw}1. ^{lx}1. ^{ly}1. ^{lz}1. ^{ma}1. ^{mb}1. ^{mc}1. ^{md}1. ^{me}1. ^{mf}1. ^{mg}1. ^{mh}1. ^{mi}1. ^{mj}1. ^{mk}1. ^{ml}1. ^{mn}1. ^{mo}1. ^{mp}1. ^{mq}1. ^{mr}1. ^{ms}1. ^{mt}1. ^{mu}1. ^{mv}1. ^{mw}1. ^{mx}1. ^{my}1. ^{mz}1. ^{na}1. ^{nb}1. ^{nc}1. nd1. ^{ne}1. ^{nf}1. ^{ng}1. ^{nh}1. ⁿⁱ1. ^{nj}1. ^{nk}1. ^{nl}1. ^{nm}1. ⁿⁿ1. ^{no}1. ^{np}1. ^{nq}1. ^{nr}1. ^{ns}1. ^{nt}1. ^{nu}1. ^{nv}1. ^{nw}1. ^{nx}1. ^{ny}1. ^{nz}1. ^{oa}1. ^{ob}1. ^{oc}1. ^{od}1. ^{oe}1. ^{of}1. ^{og}1. ^{oh}1. ^{oi}1. ^{oj}1. ^{ok}1. ^{ol}1. ^{om}1. ^{on}1. ^{oo}1. ^{op}1. ^{oq}1. ^{or}1. ^{os}1. ^{ot}1. ^{ou}1. ^{ov}1. ^{ow}1. ^{ox}1. ^{oy}1. ^{oz}1. ^{pa}1. ^{pb}1. ^{pc}1. ^{pd}1. ^{pe}1. ^{pf}1. ^{ph}1. ^{pi}1. ^{pj}1. ^{pk}1. ^{pl}1. ^{pm}1. ^{pn}1. ^{po}1. ^{pp}1. ^{pq}1. ^{pr}1. ^{ps}1. ^{pt}1. ^{pu}1. ^{pv}1. ^{pw}1. ^{px}1. ^{py}1. ^{pz}1. ^{qa}1. ^{qb}1. ^{qc}1. ^{qd}1. ^{qe}1. ^{qf}1. ^{qh}1. ^{qi}1. ^{qj}1. ^{qk}1. ^{ql}1. ^{qm}1. ^{qn}1. ^{qo}1. ^{qp}1. ^{qq}1. ^{qr}1. ^{qs}1. ^{qt}1. ^{qu}1. ^{qv}1. ^{qw}1. ^{qx}1. ^{qy}1. ^{qz}1. ^{ra}1. ^{rb}1. ^{rc}1. rd1. ^{re}1. ^{rf}1. ^{rh}1. ^{ri}1. ^{rj}1. ^{rk}1. ^{rl}1. ^{rm}1. ^{rn}1. ^{ro}1. ^{rp}1. ^{rq}1. ^{rr}1. ^{rs}1. ^{rt}1. ^{ru}1. ^{rv}1. ^{rw}1. ^{rx}1. ^{ry}1. ^{rz}1. ^{sa}1. ^{sb}1. ^{sc}1. ^{sd}1. ^{se}1. ^{sf}1. ^{sh}1. ^{si}1. ^{sj}1. ^{sk}1. ^{sl}1. sm1. ^{sn}1. ^{so}1. ^{sp}1. ^{sq}1. ^{sr}1. ^{ss}1. st1. ^{su}1. ^{sv}1. ^{sw}1. ^{sx}1. ^{sy}1. ^{sz}1. ^{ta}1. ^{tb}1. ^{tc}1. ^{td}1. ^{te}1. ^{tf}1. th1. ^{ti}1. ^{tj}1. ^{tk}1. ^{tl}1. tm1. ^{tn}1. ^{to}1. ^{tp}1. ^{tq}1. ^{tr}1. ^{ts}1. ^{tt}1. ^{tu}1. ^{tv}1. ^{tw}1. ^{tx}1. ^{ty}1. ^{tz}1. ^{ua}1. ^{ub}1. ^{uc}1. ^{ud}1. ^{ue}1. ^{uf}1. ^{ug}1. ^{uh}1. ^{ui}1. ^{uj}1. ^{uk}1. ^{ul}1. ^{um}1. ^{un}1. ^{uo}1. ^{up}1. ^{uq}1. ^{ur}1. ^{us}1. ^{ut}1. ^{uu}1. ^{uv}1. ^{uw}1. ^{ux}1. ^{uy}1. ^{uz}1. ^{va}1. ^{vb}1. ^{vc}1. ^{vd}1. ^{ve}1. ^{vf}1. ^{vh}1. ^{vi}1. ^{vj}1. ^{vk}1. ^{vl}1. ^{vm}1. ^{vn}1. ^{vo}1. ^{vp}1. ^{vq}1. ^{vr}1. ^{vs}1. ^{vt}1. ^{vu}1. ^{vv}1. ^{vw}1. ^{vx}1. ^{vy}1. ^{vz}1. ^{wa}1. ^{wb}1. ^{wc}1. ^{wd}1. ^{we}1. ^{wf}1. ^{wh}1. ^{wi}1. ^{wj}1. ^{wk}1. ^{wl}1. ^{wm}1. ^{wn}1. ^{wo}1. ^{wp}1. ^{wq}1. ^{wr}1. ^{ws}1. ^{wt}1. ^{wu}1. ^{wv}1. ^{ww}1. ^{wx}1. ^{wy}1. ^{wz}1. ^{xa}1. ^{xb}1. ^{xc}1. ^{xd}1. ^{xe}1. ^{xf}1. ^{xh}1. ^{xi}1. ^{xj}1. ^{xk}1. ^{xl}1. ^{xm}1. ^{xn}1. ^{xo}1. ^{xp}1. ^{xq}1. ^{xr}1. ^{xs}1. ^{xt}1. ^{xu}1. ^{xv}1. ^{xw}1. ^{xy}1. ^{xz}1. ^{ya}1. ^{yb}1. ^{yc}1. ^{yd}1. ^{ye}1. ^{yf}1. ^{yh}1. ^{yi}1. ^{yj}1. ^{yk}1. ^{yl}1. ^{ym}1. ^{yn}1. ^{yo}1. ^{yp}1. ^{yq}1. ^{yr}1. ^{ys}1. ^{yt}1. ^{yu}1. ^{yv}1. ^{yw}1. ^{yx}1. ^{yy}1. ^{yz}1. ^{za}1. ^{zb}1. ^{zc}1. ^{zd}1. ^{ze}1. ^{zf}1. ^{zh}1. ^{zi}1. ^{zj}1. ^{zk}1. ^{zl}1. ^{zm}1. ^{zn}1. ^{zo}1. ^{zp}1. ^{zq}1. ^{zr}1. ^{zs}1. ^{zt}1. ^{zu}1. ^{zv}1. ^{zw}1. ^{zx}1. ^{zy}1. ^{zz}1. ^{aa}1. ^{ab}1. ^{ac}1. ^{ad}1. ^{ae}1. ^{af}1. ^{ag}1. ^{ah}1. ^{ai}1. ^{aj}1. ^{ak}1. ^{al}1. ^{am}1. ^{an}1. ^{ao}1. ^{ap}1. ^{aq}1. ^{ar}1. ^{as}1. ^{at}1. ^{au}1. ^{av}1. ^{aw}1. ^{ax}1. ^{ay}1. ^{az}1. ^{ba}1. ^{bb}1. ^{bc}1. ^{bd}1.

^p κάμνοντα, καὶ ^q ἐγερεῖ αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος· κὰν ^r ἁμαρτίας ^p Heb. xii. 3
^η ^{rs} πεποικώς, ^t ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ. ¹⁶ ^u ἐξομολογείσθε ^q (Rev. ii. 3
³¹ Matt. viii. 15, ix. 5, 6, 7 al. ^r 1 Pet. ii. 22 reff. ^s = 1 Cor. vi. 18.
^t = & constr., Matt. xiii. 31, 32. ^u = Matt. iii. 6 || Mk. Acts xix. 18 †.

byters praying, Bengel says, "qui dum orant, non multo minus est quam si tota oraret Ecclesia"), anointing (or, *when they have anointed*) him with oil in the name of the Lord (the ἐν τῷ ὄν. κυρ. belongs to ἀλείφαντες, not, as Gebser, to προσευχ., nor as Schneckenburger, to both. And thus joined, they shew that the anointing was not a mere human medium of cure, but had a sacramental character: cf. the same words, or ἐν τῷ ὄν., εἰς τὸ ὄν., used of baptism, Matt. xxviii. 19: Acts ii. 38; x. 48; xix. 5: 1 Cor. i. 13, 15. κυρίου here is probably Christ, from analogy: His name being universally used as the vehicle of all miraculous power exercised by his followers).

15.] And the prayer of faith (gen. subj.: the prayer which faith offers) shall save (clearly here, considering that the forgiveness of sins is separately stated afterwards, σώσει can only be used of corporeal healing, not of the salvation of the soul. This has not always been recognized. The R.-Cath. interpreters, who pervert the whole passage to the defence of the practice of extreme unction, take σώσει of the salvation of the soul. Thus Corn. a-Lapide: "Oratio fidei, id est, sacramentum et forma sacramentalis extremæ unctionis, salvabit infirmum, hoc est, conferet ei gratiam qua salvetur anima." Some Commentators, as Lyra and Schneckenb., take both meanings. The Council of Trent prevaricates: "Ægroti animam alleviat et confirmat (unctio extrema), magnam in eo divinæ misericordiæ fiduciam excitando: qua infirmus sublevatus, et morbi incommoda ac labores levius fert, et tentationibus dæmonis calcaneo insidiantis facilius resistit: et sanitatem corporis interdum, ubi salutis animæ expedierit, consequitur") the sick man (κάμνω, ægrotō, is classical, even in its absolute use: cf. Soph. Phil. 262: Xen. Cyr. i. 6. 16), and the Lord (most probably Christ, again: He who is Lord in the Christian Church) shall raise him up (from his bed of sickness: see reff. Here again our R.-Cath. friends are in sad perplexity. The vulg. led the way with its "alleviabit." The interpretations may be seen in Corn. a-Lap., Justiniani, Estius, al. Cf. the Council of Trent above. A curious contrast is furnished by the short comm. of Ec.: τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ κυρίου ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις συναναστροφόμενοι οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐποίησαν, ἀλείφοντες τοὺς ἀσθενούντας ἐλαφὶ καὶ ἰώμενοι: even if (κὰν precedes

a climax: see the sense below. So that the καὶ is not copulative, but the sentence is abruptly introduced) he have committed (he be in a state of having committed, i. e. abiding under the consequence of, some commission of sin; for so the perf. implies; and hereby the sin in question is presumed to have been the working cause of his present sickness. So Bede: "Multi propter peccata in anima facta, infirmate vel etiam morte plectuntur corporis:" citing 1 Cor. xi. 30. On this necessary force of the perfect, see Winer, § 40. 4: and on the sense, cf. Matt. ix. 2, 5 f.: John v. 14) sins, it shall be forgiven him (supply as a subject, τὸ πεποιημέναι, from the foregoing). Among all the daring perversions of Scripture by which the Church of Rome has defended her superstitions, there is none more patent than that of the present passage. Not without reason has the Council of Trent defended its misinterpretation with the anathema above cited: for indeed it needed that, and every other recommendation, to support it, and give it any kind of acceptance. The Apostle is treating of a matter totally distinct from the occasion, and the object, of extreme unction. He is enforcing the efficacy of the prayer of faith in afflictions, ver. 13. Of such efficacy, he adduces one special instance. In sickness, let the sick man inform the elders of the Church. Let them, representing the congregation of the faithful, pray over the sick man, accompanying that prayer with the symbolic and sacramental act of anointing with oil in the name of the Lord. Then, the prayer of faith (see Corn. a-Lap. above for the audacious interpretation) shall save (heal) the sick man, and the Lord shall bring him up out of his sickness; and even if it were occasioned by some sin, that sin shall be forgiven him. Such is the simple and undeniable sense of the Apostle, arguing for the efficacy of prayer: and such, as above seen, the perversion of that sense by the Church of Rome. Here, as in the rest of these cases, it is our comfort to know that there is a God of truth, whose judgment shall begin at His Church. Observe, the promises here made of recovery and forgiveness are unconditional, as in Mark xvi. 18 al.

16.] A general injunction arising out of a circumstance necessarily to be inferred in the preceding example. There, the sin would of necessity have been

v Matt. vi. 14, 15 xvi. 35, 2 Cor. v. 19, Eph. i. 7 al. ABKLP
N a b c d
f g h j k
m o 13
 Ezech. iii. 20, w = Gal. v. 8, Heb. ix. 17.
 x 1 Tim. ii. 1, Heb. v. 7 reff. y = Gal. v. 6. Col. i. 29. 2 Thess. ii. 7 al. z Acts xiv. 15
 only t. Wisd. vii. 3 only.

16. rec om *οὖν*, with L rel lat-ff₁ æth [arm] Thl Ec: ins ABK[P]N a c g 36 vulg
 syr coptt. * τὰς ἀμαρτίας AB[P]N a c d 13 [Ephr₁]: τὰ παραπτώματα KL rel
 [Damasc₁-ed] Thl Ec. προσευχέσθε A B[-(ai B)] Ephr₁.

confessed to the *πρεσβύτεροι*, before the prayer of faith could deal with it. And seeing the blessed consequences in that case, —‘generally,’ says the Apostle, in all similar cases, ‘and one to another universally, pursue the same salutary practice of confessing your sins.’ Confess therefore to one another (emphatically placed before τὰ παραπτώματα —‘not only to the presbyters in the case supposed, but to one another generally’) your transgressions (i. e. not merely, as Wolf, al., offences against your brethren; but also sins against God: cf. ref. Matt. vi.), and pray for one another, that ye may be healed (in case of sickness, as above). The context here forbids any wider meaning: and so rightly De Wette, Wiesinger, and Huther. So even Corn. a-Lap., ‘id est, ut sanemini, scilicet, ab infirmitate quæ vos detinet.’ On the other hand Justiniani, ‘recte Latinus interpres animæ sanitatem intellexit, hoc est, salutem sempiternam.’ And similarly Estius, Carpov, Grot., al. Baumgarten, Schneckenburger, Kern, al., would join both). It might appear astonishing, were it not notorious, that on this passage among others is built the Romish doctrine of the necessity of confessing sins to a priest. As a specimen of the way in which it is deduced, I subjoin Corn. a-Lapide’s exegesis: “*Alterutrum*, id est, homo homini, similis simili, frater fratri confitemini, puta sacerdoti, qui licet officio sit superior, natura tamen est par, infirmitate similis, obligatione confitendi æqualis.” Cajetan, on the contrary, denies that “sacramental confession” is here spoken of: “nec hic est sermo de confessione sacramentali” [here, as in so many other cases, the much-vaunted unity of Roman interpreters embracing the most opposite opinions]. The supplication of a righteous man (i. e. of one who shews his faith by his works, see ch. ii. 24) availeth much in its working (i. e. worketh very effectually. Much doubt has arisen about the meaning and reference of *ἐνεργουμένη*. It is usually taken as in E. V., “the effectual fervent prayer,” —as an epithet to *δήσις*, setting forth its fervency. Ec. seems to take it passively, “helped forward by the sympathy of the person prayed for:”

for he says, *ἐνεργείται ἡ τοῦ δικαίου εὐχή, ὅταν καὶ δὲ ὑπὲρ οὗ εὐχεται συμπράττει διὰ κακώσεως πνευματικῆς τῷ εὐχομένῳ*. *ἂν γάρ, ἐτέρων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εὐχομένων, σπαταλαῖς ἡμεῖς σχολάζωμεν κ. ἀνέσει κ. ἐκδεδητημένῳ βίῳ, ἐκλύομεν διὰ τούτου τὸ σύντονον τῆς εὐχῆς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀγωνιζομένου*. The following is from Huther’s note: “Michaelis explains it ‘preces agitant Spiritu sancto effusæ’ Carpov, *δήσις διὰ πίστεως ἐνεργουμένη*: Gebser understands prayer in which the suppliant himself works for the accomplishment of his wish: similarly Calvin, — ‘Tunc vere in actu est oratio, quum succurrere contendimus iis, qui laborant.’ Commonly, *ἐνεργουμένη* is assumed to be synonymous with *ἐνεργής* or *ἐνεργός* (*ἐκτενής*, Luke xxii. 44: Acts xii. 5), ‘streuous,’ ‘intentus,’ ‘earnest,’ &c.: and this qualification of the prayer of the righteous man is attached to πολλὸν ἰσχύει as its condition (so Wiesinger, and similarly Erasmus, Beza, Gataker, Horneius, Grot., Wolf, Baumg., Hottinger, Schneckenb., Kern, Theile, al.). This interpretation however has not only, as Wiesinger confesses, N. T. usage against it, but can hardly be justified from the context, it being necessarily implied that the prayer of the righteous man is not a dead and formal one. Besides which, the force of the general sentence, πολλὸν ἰσχύει *δήσις δικαίου*, suffers much from the appending of a condition under which alone the sentence could be true. Rightly therefore does Pott adhere to the *verbal* meaning of the participle *ἐνεργουμένη*, in paraphrasing, πολλὸν ἰσχύει *ἐνεργεῖν*, or πολλὸν ἰσχύει καὶ *ἐνεργεῖ* *δήσις*: but both these periphrases are arbitrary: the first weakens the force of ἰσχύει, and the second makes the two ideas co-ordinate, which the Apostle never intended. At all events we must connect *ἐνεργουμένη* closely with ἰσχύει: not as above, but so that by it may be expressed that which is the field or element of the πολλὸν ἰσχύει: the prayer of the righteous can do much in its working (not, as De Wette, if it develops itself in act). That it *does work*, this is assumed: that, besides working, it πολλὸν ἰσχύει, this is it which St. James puts forward, and confirms by the follow-

1 = Rom. i. 27. ^k ἐπιστρέψας ἁμαρτωλὸν ἐκ ¹ πλάνης ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ ^m σώσει ABKLP
 2 Pet. ii. 18. ^{ψυχήν} ^m ἐκ θανάτου, καὶ ⁿ καλύψει ^{no} πληθὺς ^o ἁμαρτιῶν. ABKLP
 a b c d
 f g h j k
 m o 13
 Jude 11. Jer.
 xxiii. 17.
 m Heb. v. 7 reff.
 n 1 Pet. iv. 8.
 o Ezek. xxviii.
 18.

ΙΑΚΩΒΟΥ.

ins την bef ψυχήν A 73. 81 [arm]. add αυτου A[P]N 13. 36 vulg vind Cyr[1-p]
 Did₁ Ambrst Cassiod. aft θανατου ins αυτου B [lat: ff₂ æth].

SUBSCRIPTION. τέλος· του αγιου αποστολου ιακωβου επιστολη καθολικη L: [ιακ.
 αποστ. επ. καθολ. P 63:] τέλος h: om rel: ιακωβου επιστολη A 40. 69: επιστολη
 ιακωβου N: txt B.

encouragement of others to do the like by this proclamation of the fact), that he who converteth (not, 'has converted:' our English present, when connected with a future, exactly gives the aor. participle. The first action is necessarily antecedent to the second, which is all that the Greek requires) a sinner from the error of his way (thus is the person converted more generally expressed than before; not only, τὸν πλανηθέντα, but any ἁμαρτωλόν) shall save a soul from death (in eternity: the future shews that the σωτηρία spoken of is not contemporary with the ἐπιστρέψαι, but its ultimate result), and shall cover a multitude of sins (viz. by introducing the convert into that state of Christian faith, wherein all sins, past, present, and future, are forgiven and done away. See reff. and for the expression, Ps. xxxi. 1: Neh. iv. 5 LXX. The ἁμαρτιῶν, following ἁμαρτωλόν,

necessarily binds the reference to the converted, not the converters. It is not τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτοῦ (as Syr., "hideth the multitude of his sins"), because the Apostle wishes to put in its most striking *abstract* light the good deed thus done. The objection (Whitby) that thus we should have a tautology,—the saving of his soul including the covering of his sins, is entirely obviated by this latter consideration: even without Wiesinger's reply, that "the words carry on further the σώσει ψυχήν, and state the ground of that salvation." The idea that they are the sins of the converter (Zacharias Ep. i. ad Bed., Erasmus, Whitby, Hammond, al.) is thus as abhorrent from the context, as it is generally repugnant to apostolic teaching: cf. on the whole, 1 Pet. iv. 8. "Commendat," says Calvin, "fratrum correctionem ab effectu, ut majore studio in eam intenti simus").

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Α.

ABKLP I. ¹ Πέτρος ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ^a ἐκλεκτοῖς ^b παρ- ^a ch. ii. 4 &c.
 N a b c d επιδήμοις ^c διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, ^c Matt. xx. 16.
 f g h j k ^c διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, ^c Luke xviii. 7.
 m o 13 ^c διασπορᾶς Πόντου, Γαλατίας, Καππαδοκίας, ^c Tit i. 1.
^c ² Asiaς καὶ Βιθυνίας, ² κατὰ ^d πρόγνωσιν θεοῦ πατρὸς, ^b Heb. xi.
¹³ reff. ^c John vii. 35. James i. 1 only. Ps. cxlvi. 2. ^d Acts ii. 23 only +. Judith ix.
 6. xi. 19 only.

TITLE. Steph *πετρον καθολικη επιστολη πρωτη*: elz *πετρον του αποστολου επιστολη καθ. πρωτη*: επ. καθ. α' του αγιου και πανευφημου αποστολου πετρον L: *πετρον επιστολη α'* ACN j k m o 13: [*πετρον . . . P*:] txt B. (After the title three lines are lost in C.)

CHAP. I. 1. aft *εκλεκτοις* ins *και* (but erased) N¹ [syrr]. om *ασιας* N¹. om *και βιθυνιας* B¹.

CHAP. I. 1, 2.] ADDRESS AND GREETING: corresponding generally with those of St. Paul's Epistles, designating however himself more briefly, and his readers more at length. 1.] Peter (the Greek form of the name Cephas, a stone, given him by our Lord, see John i. 43: in 2 Pet. i. 1 it is "Symeon Peter") an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect strangers (see on *παρεπιδήμοις*, Heb. xi. 13 note. *ἐκλεκτοῖς*, chosen of God to His adopted family in Christ. The construction is irregularly carried on from *ἐκλ.* by *κατὰ πρόγνωσιν κ.τ.λ.* below, where see) of the dispersion (i. e. belonging to the *Jewish* dispersion, as in reff. This leading character of the readers of 1 Peter has been acknowledged generally: see testimonies in Prolegg. At the same time, as there argued (§ iii. 3 ff.), there is no reason to exclude Gentile Christians from among them, as forming part of the Israel of God. Indeed, such readers are presupposed in the Epistle itself: cf. ver. 14; ch. ii. 10; iv. 3) of Pontus (see Acts ii. 9, note), Galatia (see Prolegg. to Gal. § ii.), Cappadocia (Acts, ut supra), Asia (not quite as in Acts ii. 9; xvi. 6, where Phrygia is distinguished from it: here it must be included) and Bithynia (Acts xvi. 7, note: and on the whole geographical extent embraced by the terms, and inferences to be gathered from their order of sequence,

see Prolegg. § iii. 6 ff., iv. 17). 2.] according to (i. e. in pursuance of. The local meaning of *κατά* with an accus., 'along (down) the direction of,' gives at once the derived meaning here. *κατὰ πρόγ.* κ.τ.λ. follows *ἐκλεκτοῖς*, the emphatic position of the predicative epithet having as it were left its sound yet ringing in the ear, so that this expegegesis of it, though unusual, does not occasion any difficulty. Ec., as also Cyr.alex. de Recta Fide (Huther), joins *κατὰ πρόγν.* with *ἀπόστολος*: which can hardly be) foreknowledge (not merely "prævisio fidei," as Calov., but nearly synonymous with *βουλή* or *προορισμός*. It may be, and often is, this "prævisio" merely: see the word *πρόγνωσις* in Suicer, and Origen in Cramer's Catena: but can hardly be this here, where it is made distinctly to be the moving cause of election. See again on ver. 20, where the signification "fore-decreed" is necessary to the context. "The difference between *προγινώσκειν* and *προορίζειν* is this, that in the former idea, the fact of knowledge is especially put forward, seeing that all God's decrees rest on the ground of His omniscience." Huther. "Eligendos facit Deus, non invenit," is an important remark of Augustine. Cf. Hofmann's Schriftbeweis, i. 228 ff.) of God the Father (thus indicated, as

e 2 Thess. ii 13.
 f 1 Thess. iv 3 &c.
 g & constr. Rom i 5.
 h 2 Cor. x. 5.
 i Heb. v. 9 (reiff)
 j Heb. xii 24 (ieiff) only.
 k 1 Cor. i 26.
 l = Matt. xxiv.
 m 2 Pet. i. 2. Jude 2. Dan. iii. 31.
 n 31. Eph. i. 3 only. Gen. ix. 26.
 o James i. 27.
 p 51. vii. 38. Acts vii. 38. Heb. x. 20. ch. ii. 4.
 q k Mark xiv. 61. Luke i. 68. Rom. i. 25 ix 5 2 Cor. i. 3. xi.
 r 1 Paul (Rom. xv. 6. Eph. i. 3 al.) only, exc. here and Rev. i. 6. see
 s n ver. 23 only t o = John iv. 10. vi.
 u p Luke xx. 35. Acts iv. 2. see Phil. ii. 11.

3. [elz νμας, with 23. 88¹: txt ABCKLPN rel.]

δια Ν α².

leading on to the great mystery of the Holy Trinity in the work of our salvation) in (not "through," as E. V.: the κατά betokens the origin, and enduring pattern after which,—έν, the conditional and abiding element in which, and εἰς, the result for which. So that έν is not = εἰς τὸ εἶναι έν as De Wette) sanctification (reiff.) of the Spirit (gen. subjective, or rather efficient, the Spirit being the worker of the sanctification: πνεύματος, not, as Beza, "vel spiritus sanctus, vel anima, quæ sanctificatur" unto (result as regards us—the fruit which we are to bring forth, and the state into which we are to be brought) obedience (absolutely, Christian obedience, the obedience of faith, as in ver. 14: see reiff.: not to be taken with Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, which belongs closely to αἵματος) and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ (i. e. admission into and standing in that covenant, whose atoning medium is Christ's blood,—and mode of application, the sprinkling of that blood on the heart by faith. The allusion is to Exod. xxiv. 8, where the covenant was inaugurated by sprinkling the blood on the people. This, as Huther remarks, was the only occasion on which the blood was thus sprinkled on persons: for on the great day of atonement, only the sacred vessels were thus sprinkled. So also in Heb. ix. 13. But we need not confine the virtue of the sprinkling to admission into the covenant. Doubtless its purifying power, especially as connected with ὑπακοή, is also in the mind of the Apostle. And thus Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. l. 305: maintaining that the Death of Christ is not only, as looking back on the past, a propitiation for sin, thereby removing the obstacle which stood in the way of God's gracious purpose towards man,—but also, looking forward to the future, a capacitating of us for the participation in God's salvation: just as Israel, sin having been atoned for by the sacrifice itself, was admitted into the actual state of reconciliation by the sprinkling

on them of the sacrificial blood. The gen. αἵματος is that of the object, or material with which: cf. Heb. ix. 21, αἵματι ἐράντισεν. "By this description of the readers, an anticipation is given of the whole train of thought in the Epistle: the aim of which is to impress the blessed certainty of salvation, and with that, the obligations incurred by receiving God's gift." Harless): grace and peace be multiplied unto you (so, but more fully, in reiff. 2 Pet. and Jude. "Pax a gratia distinguitur, tanquam fructus et effectus a sua causa." Gerhard. "Pax vestra multiplicetur" is quoted as a Rabbinical salutation by Wetstein and Schöttgen).

3—12.] The Apostle begins, much after the manner of St. Paul in the opening of his Epistles, with giving thanks to God for the greatness of the blessings of salvation; thus paving the way for the exhortations which are to follow. And herein, he directs his readers' look, first, forward into the future (vv. 3—9); then backward into the past (vv. 10—12). 3—5.] Thanks-giving for the living hope into which the Christian has been begotten. 3.]

Blessed be (εὐλογητός) is used in the N. T. of God only: and so almost always in the O. T.: while εὐλογημένος is applied to men. The shade of distinction is perhaps this: that εὐλογητός carries with it rather the imperative, 'Blessed be' &c.,—εὐλογημένος the indicative, 'Blessed is' &c. This is better than Van Hengel's distinction (on Rom. p. 140), that the verbal adjective gives "quod sibi constat,"—the participle, "quod aliunde pendet:" for thus we should not get the idea of praise in εὐλογητός) the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (so verbatim reiff. Eph., where see note), who according to (see on ver. 2, κατὰ πρόγνωσιν κ.τ.λ.) his much mercy (cf. πλοῦσιος ὧν έν ἐλεί, reiff. Eph.) begat us again (as in reiff. and elsewhere in the N. T., where the idea, though not the word, occurs,—of the new birth from the state of nature to the state of grace,

χριστοῦ ὁ ἐκ νεκρῶν, ἡ εἰς ἡ κληρονομίαν ἡ ἀφθαρτον καὶ ἡ ἀμείαντον καὶ ἡ ἀμάραντον, ἡ τετρημένην ἐν οὐρανοῖς εἰς

1 και
αμαραν-
τον...

23. 1 Cor. ix. 25. xv. 52. 1 Tim. i. 17. ver. 23. ch. iii. 4 only τ. Wisd. xii. 1. xviii. 4 only. s Heb vii. 26 reff. t here only τ. Wisd. vi. 12 only. (-τινος, ch. v. 4.) u = John ii. 10. w εἰς, John xii. 7. Acts xxv. 21. 2 Pet. ii. 4. v = Matt. v. 12. xix. 21. Phil. iii. 20. Col. i. 5.

4. transp αμειαντον and αμαραντον N [Cyr, Gild]: om και αμαρ. ο [Oros,]. τετρημενον N'. ουρανω N.

the work of God the Spirit (ver. 2), by means of the word (ver. 23), in virtue of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice and of union with Him (vv. 2, 18; ch. ii. 24; iii. 18)) unto (εἰς, either *telic*, unto as aim and end, = 'that we might have,' or *local*, unto = into; = 'so that we have.' The latter is here preferable, seeing that hope is not the aim but the condition of the Christian life) a living hope (ζῶσαν, as connected with ἀναγεννήσας; it is a life of hope, a life in which hope is the energizing principle. This is better than to understand it as contrasting our hope with that of the hypocrite, which shall perish: as Leighton, in some of his most beautiful language. *ἐλπίς* is not to be understood of the *object of hope*, but of hope properly so called, subjectively. This hope of the Christian "has life in itself, gives life, and looks for life as its object," De Wette) through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead (to what does δι' refer? Ec. says, καὶ πόθεν τὸ ζῶην ἔχουσα; ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. And similarly, referring διὰ τὸ ζῶσαν, Luth., Bengel, De W., al. But, while we retain distinctly the connexion of our living hope with the life of Him on whom it depends, it is much more natural to join this instrumental clause with the verb ἀναγεννήσας, as bringing in with it the whole clause, ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐλπίδα ζῶσαν, by which it is defined. The resurrection of Christ, bringing in life and the gift of the life-giving Spirit, is that which potentiates the new birth unto a living hope).

4.] unto (this εἰς, as the former one, depends on ἀναγεννήσας, and is co-ordinate to the other. It introduces the objective end to which our hope is directed. "Quamdiu peregrinamur, habemus spem vivam: finita peregrinatione, ζῶσα ἐλπίς fit κληρονομία τῆς ἐπαγγελίας." Steinmeyer, in Wies.) an inheritance ("By κληρονομία (cf. ch. iii. 7, 9) is imported the whole fulness of blessings not seen, of which the Christian as a child of God (ἀναγενν. ver. 3) has expectation, cf. Gal. iv. 7. This inheritance is more closely defined, as σωτηρία (vv. 5, 9), as χάρις, χάρις ζωῆς (ver. 13; ch. iii. 7), as δόξα (ch. v. 1), as ἀμάραντινος τῆς δόξης στέφανος (ch. v. 4), or ἡ αἰώνιος τοῦ θεοῦ

δόξα (ch. v. 10). The simplest expression for that, which the Apostle calls κληρονομία, is on the one side the χάρις ζωῆς with its δόξα, on the other the σωτηρία ψυχᾶν. This κληρονομία is the full possession of that, which was promised to Abraham and all believers (Gen. xii. 3, see Gal. iii. 6 ff.), an inheritance, as much higher than that which fell to the children of Israel in the possession of Canaan, as the sonship of the regenerate, who have already received the ἐπαγγελία τοῦ πνεύματος διὰ τῆς πίστεως as a pledge of their κληρονομία, is higher than the sonship of Israel: cf. Gal. iii. 18, 29: 1 Cor. vi. 9: Eph. v. 5: Heb. ix. 15: and De Wette, h. 1." Wiesinger) incorruptible (not liable to φθορά, decay. "We are here *inter peritura perituri*: the things are passing which we enjoy, and we are passing who enjoy them. . . . When death comes, that removes a man out of all his possessions to give place to another: therefore are these inheritances decaying and dying in relation to us, because we decay and die: and when a man dies, his inheritances, and honours, and all things here, are at an end in respect of him: yea we may say the world ends to him." Leighton), undefiled (Leighton quotes from Jerome, "Dives aut iniquus est, aut iniqui heres." "All possessions here are defiled and stained with many defects and failings: still somewhat wanting, some damp on them, or crack in them: fair houses, but sad cares flying about the gilded and ceiled roofs: stately and soft beds and a full table, but a sickly body and queasy stomach. . . . All possessions are stained with sin, either in acquiring or using them, and therefore they are called mammon of unrighteousness, Luke xvi. 9") and unfading (in its beauty; which in all earthly things is passing and soon withered: see ver. 24. So that our inheritance is glorious in these three respects: it is in *substance*, incorruptible: in *purity*, undefiled: in *beauty*, unfading. "Amat Petrus synonyma cumulata: vv. 7, 8, 19; cap. v. 10." Bengel), reserved (= ἀποκειμένην, laid up, Col. i. 5) in the heavens ("ut sciamus eam esse extra periculum," Calv.: also reflecting back on the epithets above, because all that is *there* is incorruptible and undefiled and

^w 1 Cor. ii. 5. ^υ μᾶς τοὺς ^{ἐν} ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ ^φ φρουρουμένους ^γ διὰ πισ- ABCKL
² Cor. vi. 7. ^τ τωας εἰς σωτηρίαν ^ἑ ἐτοίμην ^ἀ ἀποκαλυφθῆναι ἐν καιρῷ P a b c
^x 2 Cor. xi. 32. ^ἑ ἐσχάτῳ. ^ῶ ἐν ^ῶ ῶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ^ῶ ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ ^ῶ δέον d f g h j
^{Gal. iii. 23.} ^ῶ ἐσχάτῳ. ^ῶ ἐν ^ῶ ῶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ^ῶ ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ ^ῶ δέον k l m o
^{Phil. iv. 7.} ^ῶ ἐσχάτῳ. ^ῶ ἐν ^ῶ ῶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ^ῶ ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ ^ῶ δέον 13
^{only t.} ^ῶ ἐσχάτῳ. ^ῶ ἐν ^ῶ ῶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ^ῶ ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ ^ῶ δέον
^{Judith ii. 6} ^ῶ ἐσχάτῳ. ^ῶ ἐν ^ῶ ῶ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, ^ῶ ὀλίγον ἄρτι, εἰ ^ῶ δέον
^{y Rom. iii. 22.} ² Cor. v. 7 al. fr. ^z = John vii. 6. ^w inf., Luke xlii. 33. ^w τοῦ Acts xlii. 15. ^{mic} vi. 8.
^a = Rom. viii. 18. ^h v. 1. ^{isa} lvi. 1. ^b v. καμρ., here only. = John vi. 39 &c. see ver. 20.
^c Matt. v. 12. ^{Acts} xvi. 34 ^{ver} 8. ^{ch} ii. 13. ^{Rev} xix. 7. ^{Ps} ii. 11. ^d = Mark vi. 31, ch. v. 10. ^{Rev}.
^{xvii. 10.} ^{Prov} xiv. 33. ^e Acts xix. 36 only. ¹ Macc. xii. 11. see 1 Tim. v. 13.

rec ημας, with c [5. 381. 42] harl copt Thl: txt ABCKL[P]N rel latt syrr [arm] Jer Aug Gild Bede.

5. ετοιμας N¹. [ανακαλυφθῆναι P.]

6. om εν ω C² [æth]. om εστιν BN¹ c Clem₁ Thl₁-comm(ins): om ει δεον

unfading. The Greek interpreters make these words an argument against the millenarians: so *Æc.*, εἰ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἡ κληρονομία, μυθώδης ἡ χιλιότης ἀποκατάστασις. See also in Cramer's *Catena* for (with a view to, see Rom. viii. 18) you (turning again to his readers from the general statement of ver. 3), 5.] who are being guarded ("Quid juvat, salutem nobis in cælo esse repositam, quum nos in mundo tanquam in turbulento mari jactemur? quid juvat, salutem nostram statui in tranquillo portu, quum inter mille naufragia fluctuemur? Prævenit apostolus ejusmodi objectiones," &c. Calvin. "Hæreditas servata est: hæredes custodiuntur: neque illa his, neque hi deerunt illi. Corroboratio insignis." Bengel. "Militare est vocabulum φρουρά: præsidium. Pii igitur dum sunt in periculis, sciant totidem eis divinitus parata esse præsidia: millia millium custodiunt eos." Aretius, in Huther) in (ἐν, of the power in which, and by virtue of which, the φρουρά is effectual: not, as Steinmeyer, al., "in," as in a φρουρά or fortress) the power of God by (the δύναμις θεοῦ was the efficient cause: now we come to the effective means) faith ("The causes of our preservation are two: 1. Supreme, the power of God; 2. Subordinate, faith. . . . Our faith lays hold upon this power, and this power strengthens faith, and so we are preserved." Leighton) unto (the end and limit of the φρουρεῖσθαι: cf. the very similar expression, in ref. Gal., φρουρούμεθα συγκλειόμενοι εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν πίστιν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι. Calvin, Steiger, al. take this εἰς as co-ordinate with εἰς κληρ. above, and this clause as a second (third) pendant on ἀναγεννήσας: "Rem unam duobus modis exprimit," Calv. But it seems better, as in Gal. i. c., to attach εἰς to φρουρουμένων) salvation (σωτηρία, though in itself a merely negative idea, involves in itself, and came to mean in the N. T., the positive setting in bliss of the people of God: cf. ver. 9: James i. 21 al. fr.) ready (stronger than μέλλουσιν, Gal. iii. 23: Rom. viii. 18: ch. v. 1) to be

revealed (see the two last cited places. The stress of the ἐτοίμην ἀποκαλυφθῆναι is, as Wiesinger well remarks, not the nearness of the ἀποκάλυψις, but the fact of the salvation being ready to be revealed: not yet to be brought in and accomplished, but already complete, and only waiting God's time to be manifested. On the inf. aor. after ἐτοίμην, here giving the rapid completion of the act of ἀποκάλυψις as contrasted with the enduring φρουρεῖσθαι, see Winer, § 44. 7, b, c) in the last time (not, as Bengel, "in comparatione ad tempora V. T.," but absolutely, as in τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. It is otherwise in Jude 18, where see): 6—9.] Joy of the Christian at the realization of this end of his faith. 6.] It has been much disputed whether this verse (as also ver. 8, see there) is to be taken of present joy, or of future. In the latter case the present ἀγαλλιᾶσθε in both places must be a categorical present, used of a future time: as Thl., *Æc.* τὸ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ἀντὶ μέλλοντος εὐληπται. And this sense seems to be sanctioned by ver. 8, in which he could hardly predicate of his readers, that they at the present time rejoiced χαρὰ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξαμένῃ. To avoid this, those who suppose the whole to allude to the time present, and the realization of future bliss by faith, imagine the present ἀγαλλιᾶσθε (not to be an imperative, as Aug., al., but) to have a slight hortatory force, reminding them of their duty in the matter. This however again will hardly suit the very strong qualifying terms above quoted from ver. 8. On the whole, after consideration, I prefer the former interpretation, and the quasi-future sense of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε in both places, with Syr., *Æc.* (alt.), Thl., Erasm., Luther, Huther, Wiesinger, against Calv., Estius, Grot., Calov., Steiger, De Wette, al. And this interpretation will be found confirmed, as we proceed, by many lesser accuracies and proprieties of rendering. In which (i. e. ἐν ἐσχάτῳ καιρῷ: the ἐν ῶ is temporal, ἐν bearing the same sense in the resumption as it did at the end of ver. 5, from which it

^e ἐστίν, ^f λυπηθέντες ἐν ^g ποικίλοις ^h πειρασμοῖς, ⁱ ἵνα τὸ ^j δοκίμιον ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως, ^k πολυτιμότερον χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἀπολλυμένου, διὰ πυρὸς δὲ ^l δοκιμαζομένου, ^m εὑρεθῇ ⁿ εἰς ^o ἔπαινον καὶ ^p δόξαν καὶ ^q τιμὴν ^r ἐν ^s ἀποκαλύψει ^t Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ^u ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες ἀγαπᾶτε, ^v εἰς ὃν ἄρτι μὴ

uu. 10 al. Deut. iv. 34. i James i. 3 only. Ps. xi. 6. Prov. xxvii. 21 only.
 xiii. 46. John xii. 3 (v. r.) only t. k = John vi. 27. Heb. i. 11 (from Ps. ci. 26). James
 i. 11 art. w. particip. ver. 21. Winer, § 20. 4. see Acts viii. 20 (Pet.). m = Rom. vii. 10. 1 Cor. iv. 2. 2 Cor. v. 3 al.
 19. 1 Cor. iii. 13. Gal. vi. 4 al. Zech. xiii. 9. o = Rom. ii. 29. p Rom. ii. 7, 10.
 n Eph. i. 6, 12, 14. Phil. i. 11. ch. ii. 14. q 2 Thess. i. 7, ver. 13. ch. iv. 13. r = as above (q) & 1 Cor. i. 7 only. (2 Cor. xii. 1, 7, al.)
 q 2 Thess. i. 7, ver. 13. ch. iv. 13. s chiefly John (i. 12. ii. 11 al. fr.). Acts x. 43 (Peter). Rom. x. 14 al.

ἐστιν Syr.

λυπηθεντας LN¹ d f j (k?) m: λυπηθηται 105 vulg.

7. rec πολυ τιμωτερον, with KL rel Clem Orig Thl Ec-text: txt A B(sic: see table) C[P]N b d j k m o [Euthal.]. χρυσου B. rec transp δοξαν and τιμην, with KL[P] Syr Thl Ec: txt ABCN a c d h m 13. 36 vulg syr copt [arm] Orig. [—ins eis bef δοξαν KLP.]

8. rec ειδοτες, with AKL[P] rel copt Clem, [Cyr, Euthal,] Thl Ec: txt BCN j o vulg syrr æth [arm] Polyc, Iren-int.,

is resumed. Such is our Apostle's manner, to resume, in proceeding further, the thing or person just mentioned, in the same sense as before: cf. vv. 5, 8, 10. Or, ἐν ᾧ may mean, 'at which,' 'wherein,' as ch. iv. 4: the καιρὸς ἔσχατος being not the time, but the object of your joy. Those who regard ἀγαλλιᾶσθε as strictly present, understand ἐν ᾧ as in ch. iv. 4, but refer it to the whole preceding: so Calv., "Articulus, 'in quo,' refert totum illud complexum de spe salutis in cœlo repositæ") ye rejoice (ἀγαλλ. is a stronger word than χαίρειν, implying the external expression and exuberant triumph of joy. It is sometimes joined with χαίρειν, as in ref. Matt. and Rev.), for a little time (as in ch. v. 10 and other ref.) at present (ἄρτι would, on the hypothesis of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε being a proper present, be superfluous) if it must be so (= 'si res ita ferat,'—if it be God's will that it should be so: 'si' is hypothetical, not affirmative as Bengel. Cf. Ec. (alt.), τούτέστιν, εἰ καὶ τοῦτο δεῖ οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἅγιοι θλιβονται) having been afflicted (this past part., more than any thing, favours the quasi-future acceptance of ἀγαλλιᾶσθε: looking back from the time of which exultation, the grief is regarded as passed away and gone. It carries with it a slightly adversative sense—'though ye were troubled,' 'troubled as ye were,' or the like) in (not = διὰ, but the element and material of the λύπη) manifold temptations (πειρασμοῖς, as in ref. James, trials, arising from whatever cause; here, mainly from persecution, see ch. iv. 12 ff., on the πύρωσις πρὸς πειρασμὸν ὁμῶν γινομένη. ποικίλοις: cf. James i. 2: "non unam tentationem ponit, sed plures; neque unum tantum genus, sed diversa." Calv.), 7.] that (end and aim of these temptations) the proof

(see on ref. James) of your faith (= the fact of your faith being proved, and so, by an easy transition, the result of that proof, the purified and proved faith itself), more precious than gold which perisheth (πολυτιμότερον is in apposition with δοκίμιον above, forming part of the subject of εὑρεθῇ, not a predicate after it. No supply before 'gold,' such as 'of,' E. V., or 'that of,' is legitimate. It is not 'the proof' which is precious, though the literal construction at first sight seems to be this, but the faith itself: see above), yet is (usually, habitually) proved by fire (the δέ in this clause brings out this, that gold though perishable yet needs fire to try it—the inference lying in the background, how much more does your faith, which is being * proved for eternity, not for mere temporary use, need a fiery trial?), may be found (finally and once for all, aor., as the result of the judicial trial at that day='evadat.' εὑρ. eis, see ref. Rom.) unto (having as its result: eis belongs to εὑρεθῇ, not (De W.) to the whole sentence) praise and glory and honour (whose? "Hic agitur de ipsorum electorum laude," Beza, rightly: and so most of the Commentators. Some have pressed the meanings of the separate words: ἔπαινος being the praise from the Judge, His εἶχε δοῦλε ἀγαθῆ: δόξα, admission into His glory, ch. v. 1, 10: τιμή, the dignity and personal honour thence accruing, ch. iii. 7. But perhaps, as in Rom. ii. 7, we should rather regard them here as cumulative) in (i. e. 'at the day of' the element, in time, in which it shall be manifested) the revelation of Jesus Christ (i. e. His return, who is now withdrawn from our sight, but shall then appear again: and with His ἀποκάλυψις shall come also the ἀποκάλυψις τῶν νῦν τοῦ θεοῦ, Rom. viii. 19: 1 John iii. 2):

t ver. 6.
u and constr.,
John iii. 29.
Isa. lxi. 10
BN.

v here only +.
w = 2 Cor. iii.
10. 2 Thess.
iii. 1.

x = 2 Cor. v.
10. Eph. vi.
8. Col. iii.

25. ch. v. 4.

2 Pet. ii. 13.

πόνων ἤρρισκε τῆς πολιτοκρίας, Jos. Antt. v. 2. 6.

only. (Heb. xii. 17 reff.) Ps. xlii. 21.

23. Prov. ii. 4. d 1 Cor. xv. 10

23 only. Joel i. 7. f = Heb. vii. 14 reff.

y = 1 Tim. i. 5.

Ecd. xii. 13. τέλος οὐδὲν ἄξιον τοῦ χρόνου κ. τῶν

z James i. 21. see John xii. 25 al. a = here

b 1 Macc. ix. 25. c here only. 1 Kings xxiii.

e John v. 29. vii. 52. Rom. vii. 27. 1 Cor. ii. 10. Rev. ii.

g Luke i. 20.

ABCKL
P^a a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

ὁρῶντες ^s πιστεύοντες δὲ ^t ἀγαλλιᾶσθε ^u χαρᾷ ^v ἀνεκλαλήτῳ
καὶ ^w δεδοξασμένη, ^x κομιζόμενοι τὸ ^y τέλος τῆς πίστεως
ὑμῶν, σωτηρίαν ^z ψυχῶν. ¹⁰ περὶ ἧς σωτηρίας ^{ab} ἐξεζητή-
σαν καὶ ^{bc} ἐξηραύνησαν προφητῆται οἱ περὶ τῆς ^d εἰς ὑμᾶς
^d χάριτος προφητεύσαντες, ¹¹ ἐραυνῶντες ^e εἰς τίνα ἧ

αγαλλιᾶτε B C¹(appy) Orig.: txt AC²KL[P]N rel Poly^c, Clem₁[Cyr₁] Thl Ec.

9. om υμων B 1. 45 Clem, Ath₁ Cyr₁, -p Orig-int₁ Aug: ins ACKL[P]N rel vss
Thl Ec Oros Fulg.

8.] whom (it is in the manner of our Apostle to take up anew and with a fresh line of thought, a person or thing just mentioned: see above on ver. 6) **having not seen** (so the E. V. with more than usual accuracy: the οὐκ, as distinguished from μή, adhering closely to the verb. If οὐκ εἶδότες be read, the meaning will be the same: the lack of knowledge there predicated being that which arises from absence of personal eye to eye acquaintance) **ye love** (now, at this present time): **in whom though now ye see Him not, yet believing** (so E. V. again accurately. With this word the *ἔρτι* condition of believers ends, and with the next, ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, the then state again begins) **ye (then) rejoice** (pres. categoric, as before. Some would join εἰς ὃν with ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, taking ὁρῶντες and πιστεύοντες absolutely. So Huther (alt.), and probably E. V. which may be taken either way. The objection to this is, that ἀγαλλιάω is not found with εἰς, as neither are verbs of cognate meaning. Others again, as De Wette, would take εἰς ὃν with πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, leaving an object (αὐτόν) to be supplied after ὁρῶντες. This would confine ἀγαλλιᾶσθε to a strictly present meaning, as (see above) De W. maintains it has) **with joy unspeakable** (ineffable, which cannot be spoken out = ἀλόγως, Rom. viii. 26) and **glorified** (this word δεδοξασμένη is the strongest testimony for the quasi-future sense which we have adopted and maintained for ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, both times. It fixes the reference of the verb to that time when hope shall have passed into enjoyment, and joy shall be crowned with glory. The meaning on the other interpretation is obliged to be weakened down to "joy bearing in itself glory, i.e. the high consciousness of glory:" so De Wette (Gerrlichkeit, daß Frohgefühl derselben in sich tragen der Freude), and Steinmeyer, "quia dōξαν futuram praesentem habet et sentit" [the E. V. "full of glory" is quite beside the

meaning. It is no *quality of the joy* which is asserted, but a fact which has happened to it]).

9.] **receiving** (the word κομιζόμενοι quite forbids the sense of 'present realizing' in every one of the reff. it betokens the *ultimate reception* of glory or condemnation from the Lord. Here it is, 'receiving (pres.) as you then, in a blessed eternity, will be receiving') **the end of your faith** (that, to which your faith ultimately looked forward: see, besides reff., Rom. vi. 21, 22. Cf. Aeschyl. Choeph. 874, μάχης γάρ δὴ κεκύρωται τέλος), **salvation of (your) souls** (the great inclusive description of future blessedness: the ψυχὴ being the central personality of the man. See reff.).

10-12.] *The weightiness of this salvation*, as having been the object of earnest *enquiry of Prophets*, by whom it was announced, and even of *angels*.
10.] **Concerning which salvation** (its time especially, as explained below, but its manner and issue also) **sought earnestly and examined earnestly** (the prep. ἐξ both times strengthens the verb) **prophets (προφῆται—ἄγγελοι, both times generic, to exalt the greatness of the σωτηρία. The οἱ περὶ . . . limits the assertion and defines the Prophets intended. Some take προφῆται as = οἱ προφ., as in ch. v. 1 (rec.), πρεσβυτέρους τοῖς ἐν ὑμῖν: but placed as the word is here parallel with ἄγγελοι, the other way seems better. So Bengel, "Articulus hic prætermisissus grandem facit orationem, nam audiretore a determinata individuorum consideratione ad ipsum genus spectandum traducit: sic, ver. 12, angeli")**, **they who prophesied concerning the grace that was (destined) for you** (we cannot fill up τῆς εἰς in English without defining the tense of the verb substantive, which here may be twofold: as above, or 'that hath come unto you.' The specification of ὑμᾶς makes this latter more probable: the whole cast of the sentence, the former. For we are considering what the *Prophets* felt, and looking forward with them: and the ὑμᾶς is not inconsistent

ποῖον ^ε καιρὸν ^h ἐδήλου τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς ⁱ πνεῦμα ⁱ χριστοῦ, ^h indef., 1 Cor.
^h προμαρτυρόμενον τὰ ¹ εἰς χριστὸν ^m παθήματα καὶ τὰς ^h
¹³ μετὰ ταῦτα ⁿ δόξας. ¹² οἷς ^o ἀπεκαλύφθη ὅτι οὐχ ⁱ εαυτοῖς ^o
^k here only +. ^l ver. 10. ^m = Pet., ch. iv. 13. v. 1 (9). Heb. ii. 10. Phil. iii. 10.
^{xxiv.} 26 al. plur. = here (2 Pet. ii. 10. Jude 8) only. see 2 Cor. iii. 18, ἀπὸ δ. εἰς δ.
^{xii} 38, from Isa. lxi. 1. 1 Cor. iv. 30. ⁿ Luke
^o = John

11. om χριστου Β. προμαρτυρουμενον Α[P] 42 Did₁ Thl.

12. for ουχ εαυτοις, ουκ αυτοις C²: ουχ εαυτον 13.

with this. In matter of fact, in God's purposes it was *you*, for whom the salvation was destined, though you as individuals were not in their view), 11.] searching (the part. takes up again the two verbs, with a view to mark more definitely the object of their search, now about to be described) at (towards, with reference to) what or what sort of (τίνα as identifying, ποῖον as describing. "Quod innuit tempus per se, quasi dicas æram suis numeris notatam: quale dicit tempus ex eventibus variis noscendum." Bengel. And Justiniani: "Non modo quod . . . sed etiam quale . . . pacisne an belli tempore, servitutis an libertatis, quo denique reipublicæ statu. . . . Et quidem David, 'Orietur,' ait, 'in diebus ejus justitia, et abundantia pacis': et in eandem sententiam Esaias, 'Confabunt gladios suos in vomeres,' &c. &c.") season was declaring (signifying, revealing) the Spirit of Christ which was in them (the Spirit of Christ, i. e. Christ's Spirit, gen. subj.: the Spirit which Christ has and gives, being He who reveals all things relating to Christ and the purposes of the Father: see Matt. xi. 27: John xvi. 14, 15, which passages, though in their normal sense they apply to N. T. revelations, yet in their declarative and abstract truth regard the Spirit's office in all ages. Cf. also Acts xvi. 7. "Prophetæ ab ipso habentes donum in illum prophetarunt," Ep. Barnab. c. 5, p. 735), testifying beforehand the sufferings regarding (spoken of with reference to; or, as before, 'destined for') Christ (it is disputed, whether χριστὸν be meant of Christ individually, or of Christ mystically, including His Church. The former view is taken by Æc., Thl., Erasm., Grot., Aret., Piscator, Vorst, Bengel, Steiger, De Wette, al.: the latter by Luther, Calvin, Huther, Wiesinger. Our answer may be thus given. The expression is not indeed strictly parallel with that in Col. i. 24, ἀναπαληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ χριστοῦ: see note there: but still the two are so far analogous that they may throw light one on the other. In both, as in ch. ii. 21; iii. 18; iv. 1, 13; v. 1, and in many other places where Christ's sufferings are spoken of, χριστός is used without Ἰησοῦς, not thereby precluding

the personal designation of our Lord, but still carrying into prominence the official and mediatorial: and on this latter account, if the context seem to require it, including also the wider mystical sense in which Christ's sufferings are those of the whole aggregate of His spiritual body. The question for us then is, Does the context here require this latter extended meaning? And to this we must answer decidedly in the negative. The ἃ νῦν ἀνηγγέλῃ ὑμῖν διὰ τῶν εὐαγγελισαμένων ὑμᾶς, are the contents of the gospel history, the sufferings and triumphs of Christ. And it was of these as appointed for (εἰς) Him as means of bringing in the grace which was appointed for (εἰς) you, that the prophets testified beforehand), and the glories after these (sufferings) (on these δόξαι, see ch. iii. 18, 22; v. 1. "Gloriam resurrectionis: gloriam adscensionis: gloriam judicii novissimi ad regni celestis." Bengel. If it be asked, what prophets are meant, we may reply, the prophets generally. Of one of them, who did prophesy of the sufferings of Christ, and the glories after them, viz. Daniel, we have it related, that he "understood by books the number of the years" destined for the desolations of Jerusalem: and our Lord declared that many Prophets and kings desired to see the things which his disciples saw, and saw them not): 12.] to whom (taking up again προφηται οἱ . . .) it was revealed (how are these words to be taken? Does ἀπεκαλύφθη, 1. correspond to ἐραυνῶντες κ.τ.λ., so as to signify that the revelation was the result of their search, or the answer to it? The difficulty in such a rendering would be, that in one instance only would this be true, viz. that of Daniel, and even in that, not strictly correspondent: whereas it is here predicated of the Prophets generally. Most certainly it cannot be in any sense said of them, that the exact time of the fulfilment of their prophecies was revealed to them. Or does it, 2. signify that just so much was revealed to them, as that their prophecies were not to be fulfilled in their own time, but in ours? This again would be objectionable, seeing, a. that there would be nothing corresponding to it in prophetic

^p transit.,
² Cor. ii. 3.
^{viii.} 19, 20.
² Tim. i. 18.
^{ch.} iv. 10
^{only} t.
^q John iv. 25.
^{Acts} xx. 20.
¹ John i. 5
^{al.} Isa. xl. 21.
¹⁰ (φ). see 1 Cor. xiv. 15.
^{Matt.} xiii. 17. Luke xxii. 15 al. Prov. xxiv. 1.
¹⁷ only.
^{11.}

¹ εὐαγγελισαμένων ¹ ὑμᾶς ^s πνεύματι ¹ ἀγίῳ ¹ ἀποσταλῆντι
^{ἀπ'} οὐρανοῦ, εἰς ᾧ ^u ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄγγελοι ^v παρακύψαι.
¹³ Διὸ ^{wx} ἀναξωσάμενοι τὰς ^{wy} ὁσφύας τῆς ^z διανοίας

^Δ constr., Luke iii. 18. Acts viii. 12, xiv. 15, 21, xvi 10. Gal. i. 9. s dat., Acts vi.
^t of the H. Spirit, here only see Luke xxiv. 49. u = & constr.,
^v James i. 25 reff w here only. Prov. xxxi.
^x as above (w) only. y = Luke xii. 35. Eph. vi. 14. (Heb. vii. 5 reff.) Exod. xii
^z = Matt. xxii. 37. Col. i. 21. 2 Pet. iii. 1. 1 Chron. xxix. 18.

rec **ημιν**, with K b d l o Syr copt [arm Cyr.] Thl Œc : txt ABCL[P]N rel vulg syr æth
 Vig Bede. rec ins **εν** bef **πνευματι**, with CKL[P]N rel copt Thl Œc Vig; om AB
 13 vulg Did, Cyr[-p.] Hil Ambr Vict-vit Bede.

history, with the sole exception of Daniel, as before : β. that it would rather indicate a stop and discouragement of their search, than its legitimate result. Add to this, that the cases in which St. Peter himself, in the Acts, cites the prophecies, shew how he intended this ἀπεκαλύφθη to be taken : e. g. he quotes Joel, Acts ii. 17, speaking of the things prophesied by him as to take place *ἐν ταῖς ὀσφύταις ἡμέραις* : he says of David, ib. ver. 31, *προϊδὼν ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως* : and ib. iii. 24, he says, *καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας*. From these examples it would appear, that the ἀπεκαλύφθη here is not said of any result or consequence of their ἐραυνῆσαι, but of the general revelation made to them : that it is co-ordinate with, not subordinate to ἐραυνῶντες. So in substance Wiesinger : the great stream of interpreters being the other way, or not touching the difficulty at all), that (not, 'because,' as on interpretation (1) above it must be, and as Luther, al. take it : this clause does not contain the reason for the ἀπεκαλύφθη, but the content and purport of the ἀποκάλυψις) not to themselves (dat. commodi) but to you they were ministering (i. e. by announcing, foretelling : see reff. : Orig. on Ps. xlviii., vol. ii. p. 718, *διακονεῖν τὸν λόγον* : Jos. Antt. vi. 13. 6, of David's message to Nabal, ταῦτα τῶν πεμφθέντων διακονησάντων πρὸς τὸν Νάβαλον κ.τ.λ.) the things (in their previous announcement and foreshadowing) which now have been declared (aor., 'were declared' : νῦν embracing the N. T. period; but we in English cannot join 'were' with 'now') unto you by means of those who preached the gospel to you by (dat. instrumental) the Holy Spirit sent (historic tense again, referring distinctly to the day of Pentecost) from heaven (herein consists the great difference between Prophet and Evangelist : the former was the organ of τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ πνεῦμα χριστοῦ, the latter preached by the πνεῦμα ἁγίον ἀποσταλὲν ἀπ' οὐρα-

νοῦ. Still, both are one in design, and in the contents of their testimony : cf. the τῆς εἰς ὑμᾶς χάριτος, and τὰ εἰς χριστὸν παθήματα. And both are here mentioned, to set before the readers their exceeding happiness in being the favoured objects of the ministration of salvation by Prophets and Apostles alike. "Ideo præcesserunt eorum vaticinia, quo certior esset fides nobis, qui nunc eadem vobis nuntiamus facta quæ prædixerant illi futura." Erasmus. (paraph.), which things (viz. the things announced to you : the αὐτὰ . . . ᾧ : not, as many, the future glories promised to us : see below) angels (generic, as προφῆται above : see there) desire to look into (παρακύψαι, see reff., to stoop down and peer into. It enhances further still the excellence of the salvation revealed to us, that angels, for whom it is not designed as for us (Heb. ii. 16), long to pry into its mysteries. To the principalities and powers in heavenly places is made known, by the Church, the manifold wisdom of God, Eph. iii. 10. Hofmann remarks, Schriftb. i. 313, "Angels have only the contrast between good and evil, without the power of conversion from sin to righteousness. Being then witnesses of such conversion to God, they long to penetrate the knowledge of the means by which it is brought about. . . . They themselves are placed outside the scheme of salvation : therefore it is said that they desire to look into the facts of the apostolic preaching").

13—II. 10.] GENERAL EXHORTATIONS
 FOUNDED ON THE BLESSEDNESS OF THE
 CHRISTIAN STATE. 13.] *First exhortation*—to WATCHFULNESS and ENDURANCE OF HOPE. Wherefore (αἰτιολογικῶς ἀπὸ τῶν προτιμημένων ἢ παρακλήσις : εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι οἱ προφῆται διεκόνησαν ἡμῖν τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν, ταῦτα δὲ οὕτως ἦν θαυμαστά, ὥς, καὶ ἄγγελοι ἐράσματα καταστήναι, . . . ἐπάγει τὸ αἷτιον τούτων καὶ φησιν, ἐπεὶ οὖν τοιαῦτα τὰ δεδικονημένα ὑμῖν πᾶσι καὶ ἐράσματα καὶ τριπλόητα οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄγγελοις, διὰ τοῦτο μηδὲ ὑμεῖς ἀμε-

ὡμῶν, ^a νήφοντες, ^b τελείως ^c ἐλπίζετε ^c ἐπὶ τὴν ^d φερομένην ^{a 1 Thess. v. 6.}
^{e 2 Tim.}
 ἡμῶν ^e χάριν ^e ἐν ^e ἀποκαλύψει ^e Ἰησοῦ ^e χριστοῦ. ¹⁴ ὥς ^{iv. 5. ch. iv.}
^{7. v. 8 only t.}
^{b here only t.}
^{c Judith xl. 6.}
^{d 2 Macc. xii.}
^{e Ps. xxi. 6.}
^{e ver. 7 reff.}
^{f (see note)}
^{g Heb. v. 9 reff.}
^{h Rom. xii. 2 only t.}
^{i = Heb. x. 32.}

14. συσχηματιζόμεναι Β.

λὼς πρὸς αὐτὰ διατεθῆτε, ἀλλὰ συντείναντες ἑαυτοὺς κ. ἀνδρικῶς διατεθέντες. Ec. This connexion is better than that imagined by some Commentators, with vv. 5—9 generally; nor is the reason underlying διό, "because the Christian must through trial and proof reach glory" (De Wette), which rather lies in vv. 5—7, and is not again mentioned in the course of these exhortations gird up (dynamic middle: the aor. conveying the sense of completeness and once-for-all-nature of the action) the loins of your mind (the figure is one throughout,—not *your loins*, viz. *those of your mind*, τὰς δσφύας ὑμῶν τῆς διανοίας. On διάνοια, see note on ref. 2 Pet. The exhortation seems to be taken from our Lord's command, Luke xii. 35, where, as here, the girding up is a preparation for the coming of the Lord. On the figure see Eph. vi. 14 ff., and Ec. above), being sober ("Mentis sobrietas et vigilantia requiritur, sicque metaphora in lumborum cinctura prius reposita ἐξηγητικῶς explicatur." Gerhard in Wiesinger. Calvin explains it well, "Non temperantiam solum in cibo et potu commendat, sed spirituales potius sobrietatem, quum sensus omnes nostros contineamus, ne se hujus mundi illecebris inebrient." Observe νήφοντες, pres. part., indicating the continuing state in which the ἀναζώσασθαι and the ἐλπίζειν take place), hope perfectly (i. e. "without doubt or dejection, with full devotion of soul," De W.: even better Wahl, Lex., "ita, ut nihil desideretur." Erasm., Grot., Bengel take τελείως as merely temporal, "in finem usque"; and so E. V., "hope to the end," but this clearly does not reach the full meaning. Syr., Ec., Jer., Benson, Semler, al. join τελείως with νήφοντες, which is of course possible, and better satisfies the rhythm of the sentence, in which on the other view νήφοντες stands rather feebly alone. But all things considered, I feel persuaded the majority of Commentators are right in making it an emphatic adjunct to the great word of exhortation, ἐλπίζετε) for (in the direction of: so ref. 1 Tim.) the grace (i. e. the great gift of grace, the crowning example of grace. Syr., Ec., al. read χαράν) which is being brought (E. V., "is to be

brought;," not amiss, but not giving, what φερομένην expresses, the near impending of the event spoken of: q. d. "which is even now bearing down on you") to you in the revelation of Jesus Christ (the meaning of St. Peter's own ἐν ἀποκαλύψει Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, as applied to the revelation of the Lord at His second advent, ver. 7, seems to fix the meaning of the above words as here given, and to preclude the rendering of Erasm. ("dum vobis patefit, seu manifestatur, Jesus Christus:" but doubtfully), Luther, Calov., Bengel, Steiger, al., who take the whole as referring to the present revelation of grace made by the gospel, in which Jesus Christ is revealed. The right meaning is given by Ec., Calv. (but taking ἐν for εἰς "usque ad"), Beza, Grot., Est., Semler, Pott, De W., Huther, Wiesinger). 14—21.] Second Exhortation—to OBEDIENCE, and HOLINESS, and REVERENCE. This exhortation is intimately connected with the former; but not therefore, as Wiesinger, to be regarded as one and the same. Each of these is evolved regularly out of the last (cf. again ver. 22), but each is an advance onward through the cycle of Christian graces and dispositions. 14.] As ("ὥς here, as in ch. ii. 2, 5; iii. 7, does not serve for comparison, but marks the essential quality of the subject: Lorinus says on ch. ii. 14 rightly, "Constat hujusmodi particulas sæpe nihil minuire, sed rei veritatem magis exprimere." Huther) children of obedience (cf. τέκνα ὁργῆς, Eph. ii. 3; τέκνα φωτός, ib. v. 8; and esp. τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ἀπειθείας, ib. v. 6: τέκνα κατὰρας, 2 Pet. ii. 14. "This mode of expression," says Winer, Gram. § 34. 3. δ, Remark 2, "must be referred to the more vivid way of regarding things prevalent among the Orientals, which treats intimate connexion, derivation and dependence, even in spiritual matters, as the relation of a child or a son. 'Children of disobedience' are accordingly those, who belong to ἀπειθεία as a child to its mother, to whom disobedience is become a nature, a ruling disposition." Hence the student may learn to rise above all such silly and shallow interpretations as that τέκνα ὑπακοῆς is a Hebraism for τέκνα ὑπήκοα. The depths

κ Acta iii. 17. xvi. 30. Eph. iv. 18 only. Wisd. xiv. 22. 1 = ch. ii. 11 ref. m = Eph. iv. 24. n Heb. ix. 15 ref. 16. 2 Pet. ii. 7. iii. 11 f. Tobit iv. 14 AB (om. N). 2 Macc. v. 8 Ed-vat. (not AB) only. (art. omd., Eph. ii. 21. Col. iv. 12.) p = ver. 24. q Levit. xi. 44. xix. 2, xx. 7, 26. r = Acts ii. 21 (from Joel ii. 32). ix. 14. Rom. x. 12. 2 Tim. ii. 22 al. s here only t. Clem. ad Cor. § 1, p. 208.

ἐν τῇ^k ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν¹ ἐπιθυμiais, ¹⁵ ἀλλὰ^m κατὰ τὸνⁿ καλέ-
σαντα ὑμᾶς ἅγιον καὶ αὐτοὶ ἅγιοι ἐν πάσῃ^o ἀναστροφῇ
γενήθητε, ¹⁶ ὅτι γέγραπται^q Ἅγιοι ἔσεσθε, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἅγιος.
¹⁷ καὶ εἰ πατέρα^r ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸν^s ἀπρὸς πολλήμπτως

ABCKL
FN abc
d f g h j
k l m o
13

16. for *δοτι*, *διο* [C^N]. aft γεγραπται ins *οτι* B m [syrr æth]. rec (for *εσεσθε*) *γενεσθε*, with K[P] rel, *γενεσθε* L b² h j k m Thl Ec [*estote* am (and harl tol) spec Syr coptt arm]: txt ABCN a d 13. 36 [vulg-ed syr æth] Clem Cyr[-p₂] (Opti). for *οτι*, *δοτι* N [Clem.]. rec aft *αγιος* ins *ειμι*, with CKL[A²P] rel [vss] Thl Ec: om A¹BN Clem₁ Cyr[-p₁].

of the sacred tongue were given us to descend into, not to bridge over) not conforming yourselves (thus only, by expressing a middle sense, can we bring out the present participle as combined with the subjective prohibitory particle: and so E. V., well: "not fashioning yourselves according to." [But it would have been better to keep the same English for the word as is given in] ref., where the expression, and tense, are similar. The word *συνσχηματίζεσθαι* belongs to later Greek. The participial construction is variously explained: Wiesinger refers it back to *ἀναζωσάμενοι* and *νήφοντες* above; Bengel supplies *γενήθητε*; De Wette connects it with *γενήθητε* following, ἀλλά being inserted in negligence of the strict construction; Huther regards it as belonging not to *γενήθητε*, but to *κατὰ τὸν καλέσ. ὑμ. ἁγιον* below (?). De Wette's view is in the closest analogy with the construction in ver. 22, *ἡγνικότες . . . ἀγαπήσατε*: and perhaps therefore to be preferred: but Wiesinger's is very obvious and natural) to your lusts (which were) formerly in your ignorance (*ἄγνοια*, as in ref., ignorance of things divine, even to the extent of heathenish alienation from God, which latter is most probably here pointed at. Cf. Rom. i. 18 ff. This ignorance marks not only the period, but also the ground and element of these lusts prevailing in fashioning the life. As to the construction in *ταῖς | πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν | ἐπιθυμiais*, — *πρότερον-ἐν-τῇ-ἀγν-ὐμῶν*, which would more naturally stand as predicate (*ταῖς ἐπιθυμiais ταῖς πρότ.-ἐν-τῇ-ἀγν.-ὐμ.*), forms an adjectival epithet), 16.] may rather (owing to the broken construction, ἀλλά is not, strictly speaking, the negation of *μὴ συνσχημ.*, but of whatever we supply to complete it; and thus is stronger than merely 'but.' So Ec., ἀλλὰ νῦν γοῦν, λέγει, τῷ καλέσαντι *συνσχηματίζόμενοι, ἀγίῳ ὄντι κ.τ.λ.*) after the pattern of (the prep. still carries on the idea of conformity of *σχῆμα*) that Holy One (*ἅγιον* is a substantive, not an

adjectival predicate, as Ec. above, E. V., and De Wette) who called you, be ye yourselves also (*γενήθητε*, aor. imperat., setting forth the completeness with which this holiness is to be put on. But the passive sense of *ἐγενήθητε* must not be every where pressed: see notes on 1 Thess. i. 5: Heb. iv. 3. The attempt to assign an agent wherever *ἐγενήθητε* is used, quite breaks down in some passages, e. g. 2 Cor. iii. 7; vii. 14) holy in all (manner of, every instance of: not *πάσῃ τῇ* nor *τῇ πάσῃ*: nor need we suppose, as De W., an irregular construction such as it is almost impossible to avoid recognizing in Eph. ii. 21) behaviour (conversation, in the old sense of turning and walking about in life: "Nulla sit pars vitæ quæ non hunc bonum sanctitatis odorem redoleat." Calv.): 16.] because it is written (*δοτι* gives the reason not only for the designation of God as the Holy One, but for the whole exhortation which precedes—for the duty of assimilation to Him in His Holiness), Ye shall be holy because I am holy (see Matt. v. 48: Eph. v. 1: 1 John iii. 3).

17.] Further exhortation, in consideration of our close relation of children to God our Judge, to reverence and godly fear. And if ("Si non dubitantis est, sed supponentis rem notam. Est enim omnium renatorum communis oratio, Pater noster qui es in celis." Estius. The εἰ introduces an hypothesis with an understood background of fact: If, (as is the case) &c.) ye call upon as father (*πατέρα*, not, as E. V. "the Father," but used predicatively and prefixed for emphasis) Him who judgeth impartially (see Acts x. 34: James ii. 1 ref. The pres. part. gives the attribute or office: "Him, who is the Judge," see ref. So that there is not even an apparent inconsistency with the declaration that the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, John v. 22: for this last fact of itself implies that the Father is the Judge, the 'fons iudicii' as Didymus says here,

^t κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ^u ἔργον, ἐν φόβῳ τὸν τῆς ^t pres. as ch.
^v παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον ^w ἀναστράφητε, ¹⁸ εἰδότες ὅτι ^u = Acts iii. 16.
^x φθαρτοῖς, ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, ^y ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ¹ Cor. vii. 5.
^z ματαίας ὑμῶν ^a ἀναστροφῆς ^b πατροπαραδότου, ¹⁹ ἀλλὰ ¹ Cor. vi. 10.
^c τιμῇ αἵματι ὡς ^{de} ἀμνοῦ ^{ef} ἀμώμου καὶ ^g ἀσπίλου χριστοῦ, ^{Rev. xxii. 12.}
^{xi. 9.)} ^w = Heb. xiii. 18 reff. ^x Rom. i. 23. ¹ Cor. ix. 25. ^{xv. 53, 54.} ver. 23
^{only τ.} ^{Ps. cxix. 8.} ² Macc. vii. 16. ^y Luke xxiv. 21. ^{Tit. ii. 14 (w. ἀπὸ)} only. ^{w. ἔκ,}
^{c = Acts xx. 24.} ^{James v. 7.} ² Pet. i. 4 al. ^{Prov. iii. 15.} viii. 11. ^a ver. 15 reff. ^b here only.
^{32 (from Isa. lxi. 7) only.} ^e Num. vi. 14. ^f Heb. ix. 14 reff. ^d John i. 29, 36. ^g James i. 27 reff.

17. κρίνοντα C. ἀναστρεφομενοι N¹ (Tischd^{exp}).

18. φθαρτου αργυριου N¹. πατροπαρ. bef αναστρ. C a m arm Thl.

19. ins τω bef τιμω C m [Cyr¹].

“judicante Filio Pater est qui judicat”) according to the work of each man (ἔργον: “Unius hominis unum est opus, bonum malumve.” Bengel. Cf. James i. 4: Gal. vi. 4. ἐκάστου, be he Jew or Gentile, high or low, rich or poor: thus by setting God’s just judgment above all alike, His Majesty, as inculcating godly fear, is enhanced), behave (see on ἀναστροφή above) during the time of your sojourning (on παροικία, see note, Heb. xi. 9. The Christian, who calls God his Father, is in exile, tarrying in a strange country, while here-on earth) in fear (ἐν φόβῳ stands first as emphatic. How, it is asked, is this, seeing that “there is no fear in love: for perfect love casteth out fear: because fear hath torment” (1 John iv. 18)? Ec. answers, that the fear here recommended is not the φόβος καταρκτικός, leading to repentance, but the φόβος τελειωτικός, which accompanies the Christian through his whole course. And Leighton beautifully says, “This fear is not cowardice: it doth not debase, but elevates the mind: for it drowns all lower fears, and begets true fortitude and courage to encounter all dangers for the sake of a good conscience and the obeying of God. The righteous is as bold as a lion, Prov. xxviii. 1. He dares do any thing, but offend God: and to dare to do that, is the greatest folly, and weakness, and baseness, in the world. From this fear have sprung all the generous resolutions, and patient sufferings of the saints and martyrs of God: because they durst not sin against Him, therefore they durst be imprisoned, and impoverished and tortured and die for Him. Thus the prophet sets carnal and godly fear as opposite, and the one expelling the other, Isa. viii. 12, 13. And our Saviour, Luke xii. 4, ‘Fear not them which kill the body, but fear Him’ &c. Fear not, but fear: and therefore fear, that you may not fear”), 18.] knowing (being aware: this argument enhances the duty of godly fear by the con-

sideration of the inestimable price at which they were redeemed. This consideration is urged through vv. 18—21) that not (emphatic) with corruptible things (φθαρτοῖς subst.; not, as Luther, agreeing with ἀργυρῷ ἢ χρυσίῳ), silver or gold (notice ἀργυρίῳ ἢ χρυσίῳ, not ἀργύρῳ ἢ χρυσῷ. The diminutive forms stand generally (not always, cf. Palm and Rost in χρυσίον) for the coined or wrought metal: and such a sense would be applicable here), were ye redeemed (bought out of, by the payment of a λύτρον, presently to be specified: see reff., and cf. ἀγοράζεσθαι, 1 Cor. vi. 20; vii. 23; ἐξαγοράζεσθαι, Gal. iii. 13) out of your vain conversation (ματαίας ἀναστρ., “vana vivendi ratio, quæ, ubi tempus præterit, nil reliqui fructus habet.” Beng.) delivered to you from your fathers (“unus Pater imitandus ver. 17: idem antitheton, Matt. xxiii. 9.” Bengel. This again makes it probable that the persons here more especially addressed are Gentile Christians. The Apostle, himself a Jew, would hardly speak of the vain ungodly lives of Jews as πατροπαραδότα, without more explanation. Benson, in loc., imagines that there is an allusion to the Jewish practice of paying down money as a ransom for life, Exod. xxi. 30; xxx. 11—16: Num. iii. 44—51; xviii. 15: but there does not seem any ground for this view here: the words following on ἐλυτρώθητε do not give countenance to it, but rather favour the view that it is the buying out of captivity which is in the Apostle’s mind: see below),— 19.] but with precious (τιμῇ is not, as Huther, in opposition to φθαρτοῖς; nor does it signify “im-perishable,” but simply and generally ‘precious,’ ‘of worth’) blood, as of a lamb blameless and spotless (see Exod. xii. 5: Levit. xxii. 20), (even the blood) of Christ (this I believe to be the more natural construction. The other, adopted by E. V., De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, and many Commentators, “but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb”

h = Rom. viii. 20^h ^hπροεγνωσμένου μὲν ⁱπρὸ ⁱκαταβολῆς ⁱκόσμου, ^kφανερ-
 20. xi. 2 (Acts
 xxvi. 5.
 2 Pet. iii. 17)
 only t. Wisd.
 vi. 13. viii. 8.
 xviii. 6 only.
 i John xvii. 24.
 Eph. i. 4
 only. (ἀπό,
 Heb. iv. 3
 reff.)
 k Heb. ix. 26 reff.
 o = Acts xx. 21. xxiv. 15. xxvi. 18.
 1 Heb. i. 1 reff.
 m Acts iii. 16.
 p Heb. xi. 19 reff.
 n constr., here only. see Acts xvi. 15.
 q James iv. 8 reff.

ABCKL
 PN a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m o
 13

20. προεγνωσμένου C¹: ανεγνωσμένου N¹. rec εσχάτων, with KL[P] rel vulg
 sah [æth arm Did.] Thl (Ec: txt ABCN d 13. 36 syrr copt Cyr[-p₁]. του χρονου
 N¹. ημας A k.
 21. rec (for πιστους) πιστευοντας, with CKL[P]N rel [syrr] Thl (Ec: πιστευσαντας
 13: txt AB vulg Vocat. εγειροντα N¹).

&c., is of course legitimate; and in that case τιμίω being prefixed for emphasis, is explained by the ὡς ἀμυνού clause inserted between it and χριστοῦ. We have a somewhat similar arrangement in Heb. xii. 27, *δηλοῖ τῶν σαλευομένων τὴν μετάθεσιν, ὡς πεποιημένων*. But I prefer the other, as bringing forward the τιμίω ἀματι in contrast to the φθαρτοῖς, ἀργ. ἢ χρυσ. and then explaining the τιμίω by a climax finding its highest point in χριστοῦ. The question, with what particular lamb Christ is here compared, will be found discussed in the main on John i. 29. Our reply here however will be somewhat modified by the consideration, that the figure of buying out of the ματαία ἀναστροφή seems to contain an allusion to the bringing up out of Egypt, and the προεγνωσμένου following, to the taking up of the paschal lamb beforehand, cf. Exod. xii. 3, 6. And thus I believe Wiesinger and Hofmann are right in maintaining here the reference to the paschal lamb. "As Israel's redemption from Egypt required the blood of the paschal lamb, so the redemption of those brought out of heathendom required the blood of Christ, the predestination of whom from eternity is compared with the taking up of the lamb on the tenth day of the month." Hofmann, *Schriftb.* ii. 1. 326. See, for a further discussion of this point, Wiesinger's note here: and Hofmann, *Schriftb.* ii. 1. 194 ff.): 20.] The preciousness and completeness of this redemption is further enhanced by God's foreordination of it, and His bringing it to glorious completion in His due time. Who (viz. χριστός, as shewn by the αὐτόν and αὐτῷ below) hath been fore-ordained indeed (see on ver. 2) before the foundation of the world (see reff. The same thought is foremost in the Apostle's speech in Acts ii. 23, iii. 18), but manifested (brought out of the κρυπτόν of God's purposes into the φανερόν of Incarnation and historical world-fact. The same word occurs in ch. v. 4 of the yet future

manifestation of Christ at His second coming) at the end of the times (cf. ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων, Heb. i. 1, and note there: and for this substantive sense of ἐσχάτου, Acts i. 8; xiii. 47. This φανέρωσις of Christ, as Wiesinger remarks, marks this as the end of the times, and this last time shall only endure so long, as this φανέρωσις requires) for your sakes (an additional and weighty intensification of their obligation) 21.] who are through Him (surely not only, as Wies., through His manifestation; but through Him personally, made to you all that He is made as the medium of your faith in God: the resurrection and glory being included. In fact τὸν ἐλείραντα κ.τ.λ. is an expegegesis of δι' αὐτοῦ) believers on God (a similar specification is found at ver. 4, εἰς ὑμᾶς τοὺς κ.τ.λ.) who raised Him from the dead, and gave Him glory ("That we are redeemed from our vain conversation, is owing to the blood of Christ: but that we have faith and hope in God, is brought about by God having raised Christ from the dead, and given Him glory." Hofm. *Schriftb.* ii. 1, p. 383. Wies. remarks that the δόξα of ver. 11 are here separately specified), so that your faith and hope are (not, as Syr., Vulg., Ec., Luth., Calv., Beza, Est., al., and E. V., "that your faith and hope might be," nor, as Aretius (in Huth.), "so that your faith and hope ought to be:" but simply announcing a matter of fact. Your faith rests on Christ's resurrection—it was God who raised Him: your hope, on Christ's glorification: it is God who has given Him that glory. Closely accordant with this is St. Peter's first public speech in the Acts, ii. 22 ff., where all that has happened to Christ is referred to God as the doer of it) on (resting on and in) God. 22—25.] Third exhortation, to LOVE OF ONE ANOTHER, from the consideration of their new birth by the word of God. 22.] Having purified (i. e. 'seeing that ye have purified:' the part. carries with it

εν τῇ ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας εἰς φιλαδελφίαν ἂν-
 υπόκριτον, ἔκ καρδίας ἀλλήλους ἀγαπήσατε ἕκτενως,
 23 x ἀναγεγεννημένοι οὐκ ἐκ σπορᾶς φθαρτῆς ἀλλὰ
 ἀφθάρτου, διὰ λόγου ὧντος θεοῦ καὶ μένοντος. 24 c διότι

v = Rom. vi. 17. Mark xii. 30, 33 al.

12 only. (see Luke xxii. 44. Acts xxvi. 7. ch. iv. 5.)
 only. 4 Kings xix. 29. 1 Macc. x. 30 only.
 3 ref.

w Acts xii. 5 only. Joel i. 14.

x ver. 18.

x ver. 3 only†.

a ver. 4 ref.

r ver. 14.

s Rom. ii. 8.

Gal. v. 7.

t Rom. xii. 10.

1 Thess. iv. 9.

ch. ii. 17.

iii. 8. 2 Pet. i.

7 bis only†.

u James iii. 17

reff.

y here

b ver.

22. rec aft ἀληθείας ins δια πνευματος, with KL[P] rel spec Thl Ec Gild Vig: om
 ABCN 13 vulg syrr copt arm[-usc Clem₁]. rec ins καθαρὰς bef καρδίας, with CKL
 [P]N¹ rel tol(and harl) [-syrr copt arm Antch₂] Thl Ec: om AB vulg Gild.—καρδ.
 ἀληθινῆς N³.

23. for σπορας, φθορας ACN. rec aft μενοντος ins εις τον αιωνα, with KL[P] rel
 vulg Syr Thl Ec: om ABCN 13 fuld(and demid [harl]) syr copt arm Did₁ Cyr₄ Jer₁.

an inferential force as to the exhortation, and besides, assumes that as a fact to which it covertly exhorts. "Luther has rendered it, not exactly, but according to the sense: machet euch . . . und . . ." Huther. ἀγνίζειν, of moral purification, as in ref.) your souls (the ψυχαί, as the centres of personality, though here described as purified by the persons themselves, yet are not so except by a process in which the whole person is employed: the habit of obedience) in (the course of: the region, in which the purification takes place) your obedience of ('to,' so that τῆς ἀλ. is gen. objective. It might be, obedience brought about by the truth, gen. subjective: but not so simply. 'The truth' is that of the Gospel of Christ in its largest sense, not merely as Calv., "regula, quam nobis Dominus in evangelio præscribit:" and ὑπακοῇ τῆς ἀληθείας nearly = ὑπ. (τῆς) πίστεως, Rom. i. 5 and elsewhere. Compare St. Peter's own saying, Acts xv. 9, τῇ πίστει καθαρῖσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν) the truth (see above), unto ('with a view to,' 'in the direction of,' it might be with or without intention: the legitimate tendency of that purification, which ought to have been going on in your souls, was toward) unfeigned (reff.) brotherly love (love of Christians towards one another: see reff.), love one another from the heart earnestly (καρδία is the seat of the affections: let the love come straight and pure from thence, not short of it, from any secondary purpose as its origin. ἕκτενως is proscribed by Phrynichus, p. 311, where see Lobeck's note. But the adj. is not, as sometimes stated, a word of later Greek: we have ἕκτενης φίλος in Æsch. Suppl. 990. 'Intente' exactly gives the sense: with the energies on the stretch):

23.] Ground of the exhortation, carried up further than the act of ἡγωνιῆσαι above, to the state of the new life of which that was an act; even to the beginning of that new life in their regeneration by the

divine word. And the begetting cause of this new birth being God's living and imperishable word, from that fact come in new considerations, enforcing that pure love which belongs not to a transitory and shifting but to an eternal and abiding state. Being born again, not of (out of, as origin) corruptible seed (σπορά, not in its strict and proper sense, 'sowing' (ref. 4 Kings), but in its looser one of seed. And the seed spoken of is not, as Huther, that of plants; but the semen humanum, as the sequel shews), but incorruptible, by means of (not ἐκ this time. The word of God is not the begetting principle itself, but only that by which the principle works: as it were the coccus or grain which is the involucre and vehicle of the mysterious germinating power. We are not regenerated ἐκ but διὰ λόγου. But on the other hand, the word itself is no mere perishing vehicle; no mere sacramental symbol, lost in the using: but it lives by and with the divine principle of life which it conveys and expands, and abides for ever. The ἐκ of origination rests in God Himself, the Father, who begat us of his own will: the διὰ of instrumentality moves on and abides for ever) the (the definite art. is necessary in English, for the very reason for which it is omitted in Greek: viz. to prevent the λόγου from becoming concrete, and keep it to its widest general and abstract reference) word of God, living and abiding (ὧντος is thrown forward, as an emphatic predicate, before θεοῦ. That the two participles belong to λόγου, not to θεοῦ, is decisively shewn by the sequel, where the abiding nature, not of God, but of the word of God, is set forth. Many, however, have taken them with θεοῦ; so vulg. ("per verbum Dei vivi"), (not Ec. as commonly cited, for he says, on this verse, εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα δὲ μένει αὐτὸ διαβεβαιούται), Beza (who however prints "per verbum Dei vivum et permanentis,"

d Matt. xxiv.
22. John
xvii. 2 al.
Isa xl. 6.
e James i. 10,
11 (reff.).
f = Rom. x. 8.
g Heb. vi. 5 eff.
Heb. vii. 24
reff.

^d πᾶσα σὰρξ ὡς ^e χόρτος, καὶ πᾶσα δόξα αὐτῆς ὡς ^e ἄνθος
^e χόρτου· ^e ἐξηράνθη ὁ ^e χόρτος, καὶ τὸ ^e ἄνθος [αὐτοῦ]
^e ἐξέπεσεν· ²⁵ τὸ δὲ ^f ῥῆμα κυρίου ^g μένει ^h εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
τούτου δέ ἐστιν τὸ ⁱ ῥῆμα τὸ ^h εὐαγγελισθὲν ⁱ εἰς ὑμᾶς.

ABCKL
P^a b c
d f g h j
k l m a
13

II. ¹ ^k Ἀποθέμενοι οὖν πᾶσαν ^k κακίαν καὶ πάντα δόλον
καὶ ^l ὑποκρίσεις καὶ ^m φθόνους καὶ πάσας ⁿ καταλαλίας,
pass., = ch.
iv. 6. Luke
xvi. 16 Gal.
i. 31 only.
1 Matt. xxiii. 28. Mark xii. 15. Luke xii. 1. Gal. ii. 13. 1 Tim. iv. 2 only t. 2 Macc. vi. 25 only. m Matt.
xxvii. 18 || Mk. Rom. i. 29. Gal. v. 21 Phil i. 15. 1 Tim. vi. 4. Tit. iii. 3. James iv. 5 only t. Wisd. vi.
23 (25). 1 Macc. vii. 16 only. n 2 Cor. xii. 20 only t. Wisd. i. 11 only. (Λείψ., ver. 12.) k = James i. 21 (reff.).

24. om 1st ^ως AN³ [^ωσαι N¹] a 13. 36 am¹ (with harl) syrr [æth] (Orig¹) Thl Zeno.
ins ^h bef δόξα N¹. rec (for αὐτῆς) ἀνθρώπου, with [KLP] rel Chr² Æc :
αὐτου N¹; txt ABCN³ a 13. 36 vulg syrr copt æth Orig¹ Did¹ Zeno Bede. om
αὐτου ABN a c 13 am [and fuld] syrr arm Orig¹ Did¹ Æc Bede¹; ins CKL[P] rel [vulg]
(and demid harl tol) copt æth.

25. om τὸ ρῆμα τὸ Α.

CHAP. II. 1. ὑποκρίσιν B Syr copt Aug [Clem¹ Orig-int, Gild], -σεις or -σειν N³.
φονους B. πᾶσαν καταλαλίαν N¹ [copt]: om πάσας A Syr æth Clem¹ [Orig-int]
Aug Gild.

sid), Calv. (altern., preferring this), Aretius, Grot. (expressly, alleging for it Dan. vi. 26, Theod., ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστὶν θεὸς ὧν καὶ μένων εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας), al.)

24.] Because (Scripture proof that the word of God lives and abides. "Locum Jes. xl. 6 f. citat ad probationem utriusque membri, hoc est ut constet, quam fluxa et misera sit prima hominis nativitas, et quanta regenerationis gratia." Calv.) all flesh (= man in his life of σῶμα and ψυχὴ only: "homo ex vetere generatione," as Bengel) is as (ὡς is neither in Heb. nor in LXX) grass, and all glory of it ("quicquid ex carne veluti flos ex gramine suo efflorescit," Wies.) as flower of grass. The grass was dried up (the aor.; the fact being related as in a tale; so in James i. 11. In more idiomatic English, we should say "hath dried up"), and the flower (thereof) fell (is fallen, see above) away:

25.] but the word (the change from λόγος to ῥῆμα may be on account of the citation. Yet it is not easy to see why it would have been more difficult to change ῥῆμα to λόγος than τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν to κυρίου. ῥῆμα is rather the word uttered, the 'dictum': λόγος, the word, uttered or unuttered, single or manifold, concrete or abstract) of the Lord (LXX, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν: changed here probably on account of the application which follows, as De W.) remaineth for ever. And (the δέ applies what has gone before: the contrast being between the general truth and the particular identification) this (predicate, logically considered, not subject, as Wies., al.: "The word which was &c. is this very ῥῆμα here spoken of") is the word which was (Angl. has been) preached to you (in the declaration of the gospel. εἰς ὑμᾶς,

not merely the dative commodi ὑμῖν, but as addressed to you and diffused among you: see reff. The logical inference to be drawn is, 'and consequently the word preached to you is imperishable and eternal, and demands of you that you earnestly and intently follow up that new life which by it has been implanted in you.' Hence the connexion of ch. ii. 1—3).

CHAP. II. 1—10.] Exhortations to nourish and perfect this new life, under the image, a. of newborn babes (1—3), β. of God's spiritual temple and priesthood (4—10).

1.] Laying aside (aor., 'once for all': 'having laid aside') therefore (on the connexion, see above, ch. i. ult.) all (manner of) malice (κακία here proper; "nocendi cupiditas," as Hemming (in Huther): not as Aretius, ib., the genus, of which the following are species. This cannot be well, on account of πάντα δόλον below, which shews that clause to be parallel, not subordinate, to this) and all guile (cf. ver. 22; ch. iii. 10: John i. 48; and ἄδολον below) and hypocrisies (closely connected with δόλον, and therefore not requiring πάσας, which is supplied from πάντα preceding. Δόλος is the abiding disposition, ὑποκρίσεις are the acts of personation and deception which are some of its manifestations) and envies (again embraced under δόλον, but not perhaps so closely connected with it. The guileless disposition knows not envy), and all slanderings (ref. 2 Cor. The verb, but not the subst., is found in classical Greek. Aug., cited by Gerhard, says, "Malitia malo delectatur alieno: invidia bono cruciatur alieno: dolus duplicat cor: adulatio duplicat linguam: detrectatio vulnerat famam"), 2.] as newborn

2 ὡς ὁ ἀρτιγεννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα
 ἔπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῆτε εἰς σωτηρίαν,
 3 ἔπειρ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος. 4 πρὸς
 ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα, ὑπο ἀνθρώπων μὲν

61. 2 Macc. vi. 10 only. q Rom. xii. 1 only t. Eus. H. E. i. l. r here only t. (-ws, Wisd. vii. 13.) s 1 Cor. iii. 2. ix. 7. Heb. v. 12, 13 only. Gen. xviii. 8. t & constr. 2 Cor. ix. 14. Phil. i. 8. ii. 24. (Rom. i. 11. 2 Cor. v. 2. 1 Thess. iii. 6, 7. 2 Tim. i. 4. James iv. 5.) Ps. cxviii. 173. u = ch. i. 22 al. fr. v transi., 1 Cor. iii. 6, 7. 2 Cor. ix. 10. Gen. xvii. 20. pass. (mid.) 2 Cor. x. 15. Col. i. 6, 10. Exod. i. 7. w so Eph. ii. 21. iv. 15. x Rom. viii. 9. 1 Cor. xv. 2 = 1. c. Matt. xi. 30. Luke (v. 39) vi. 35. Rom. ii. 4. (1 Cor. xv. 33.) Eph. iv. 32 only. a = Heb. iv. 16 (note). constr., here only. 1 Kings xiv. 36 al. b = ch. i. 3 reff. Ps. cxvii. 22. Matt. xxi. 42.

2. ἀρτιγεννητα A [Cyr₂]. ins και bef ἄδολον a d g 13 am (with tol) syrr arm
 Orig⁻int₁(om₅) Cyr₁ Aug. rec om εἰς σωτηρίαν, with L c d f k l Thl-comm Ec
 ins ABCK[P]N rel [syrr copt æth arm] Clem, Cyr[-p] [Orig⁻int₁] Aug Ruf.

3. for εἰπερ, εἰ ABN¹ Syr Clem₁: εἰσπερ (sic) 13. for χρηστος, χριστος or χς
 KL d f m 13 Clem₁.

4. for υπο, απο C: υμ¹ B.

babes (so the Rabbis, of their neophytes: see Wetst. h. l.), long after (ἐπι- gives, not intensity, but direction) the (the art. confines the reference to the gospel alone) spiritual (I thus render λογικόν, for want of a better and more distinctive word. Its sense is as in ref. Rom., to distinguish the γάλα spoken of from mere σαρκικὸν γάλα, and to shew that it is spoken figuratively and spiritually: "Lac illud animi, non corporis, lac mente hauriendum." Our English is too poor in psychological distinctions to be able to express it by any appropriate adjective: "reasonable" (vulg.) is decidedly wrong, as E. V. in Rom.; and "of the word," as E. V., here after Beza, is just as bad) guileless (not 'unadulterated,' in contrast to less pure human teachings (cf. δολοῦν τὸν λόγον, 2 Cor. iv. 2): but, in contrast to δόλος above, 'that is without guile,' has no by-ends, no one purpose but to nourish and benefit the soul) milk (not here in contrast, as in 1 Cor. iii. 2 and Heb. v. 12, 13, to strong meat: but simply in reference to its nourishing qualities), that on (as τετραμμένος ἐν, 'fed on,' see Winer, § 48. α (3). d, note [3, p. 485, Moulton's edn.]) ye may grow (properly passive: be nourished up) unto salvation (the growth is the measure of the fulness of that—not only rescue from destruction, but—positive blessedness, which is implied in σωτηρία; see on the word above, ch. i. 5): 3.] if, that is (wenn ander^s of the German. The περ conditions the εἰ, see reff. and notes there: and Æsch. Ag. 28, εἴπερ Ἰλίου πόλιν ἐδάλωκεν, ὥς δ' φρυκτὸς ἀγ- γέλλων πρέπει [if so be expresses the same, viz. that the necessary condition of the above exhortation is assumed as having place in the readers]), ye tasted (have tasted. The infant once put to the breast desires it again: the Apostle appeals to this their first taste as an incentive to

subsequent ones) that (the formula, from the well-known and beautiful Ps. xxxiv. the Lord ("quod subicitur: ad quem accedentes, non simpliciter ad Deum refertur, sed ipsum designat qualis patefactus est in persona Christi." Calv.) is good (reff. Perhaps the simplest meaning of χρηστός, as applied to meats and drinks, is here intended: as vulg., "dulcis:" see Palm and Rost, χρηστός, l. a). 4, 5.] Exhortation to come to Christ the chosen stone, and be built up into a spiritual temple unto God. 4.] To whom (i. e. τὸν κύριον) approaching (pres., representing the daily habit of the Christian life, not something to be done once for all. προσέρχσθαι is elsewhere in the N. T. always with a dat. Its signification here is, the approach made by faith, when the Christian closely realizes the presence and seeks the communion of his Lord), a (or, "the:" the omission of the art. seems to be very frequent in this Epistle, where yet a definite reference is undeniable) stone ("Petrus a petra Christo sic denominatur metaphora petra^s delectatur, ac suo exemplo docet omnes debere esse petros, h. e., vivos lapides supra Christum fide edificatos." Gerhard, in Wies. The allusion is to Ps. cxviii. 22 and Isa. xxviii. 16. Obs. that no ὡς must be supplied before λίθον, as is done in E. V. al.: Christ is the stone: we do not come to Him as we come to a stone) living (ζῶντα points not only to the figure being realized in a higher department of being than its natural one, but also to the fact of the Lord being alive from the dead. It would be unnecessary, were not the idea broached by Steiger, to protest against any allusion being intended to "saxum vivum" (Æn. i. 171: Ov. Met. vii. 714) as distinguished from broken stones), by men indeed rejected (in Ps. l. c. ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες), but in the sight

c here bis Matt. xxi. 42
 d, from Psa. cxvii. 22.
 Luke ix. 22.
 Mk. xvii. 25.
 Heb. xii. 17 only. Jer. vi. 30.
 d James i. 17 reff. e see ver. 6
 from i. c. = 1 Thess. v. 11. see 1 Cor. iii. 9. Eph. ii. 21 al.
 3, 4. Eph. i. 3. [v. 19] Col. i. 9 iii. 16.
 only Exod. xix. 6 only. (see Luke i. 8, 9.)
 vi. 2. viii. 12 only f.
 f = Rom. vi. 11. 2 Cor. vi. 9. Gal. ii. 19.
 h see Heb. ii. 6 reff.
 k = 1 Thess. v. 11 Eph. ii. 22
 m = Heb. vii. 27 reff.
 n Rom. xv. 16, 31 2 Cor. x

^c ἀποδοκιμασμένον ^d παρὰ δὲ θεῶ ^e ἐκλεκτόν, ^e ἔντιμον, ^{ABCKL} ^{PN a b c} ^{d f g h j} ^{k l m o} ¹³
⁵ καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λίθοι ^f ζῶντες ^g οἰκοδομείσθαι ^h οἶκος
ⁱ πνευματικός, ^k εἰς ^l ἱεράτευμα ἄγιον, ^m ἀνενέγκαι ⁱ πνευμα-
 τικὰς ⁿ θυσίας ⁿ εὐπροσδέκτους ^{θεῶ} διὰ ^{Θησού} Ἰησοῦ ^{χριστοῦ}.

5. for λίθοι ζῶντες, λίθος οντες ^{N¹}. ^{εποικοδομείσθαι} A²C^N b d o 36 vulg Cyr[-p₄]
 Procop, Bede. for πνευματικός, πνεύματος ^{N¹}. rec om εις, with KL[P] rel vulg
 syr Clem Orig, Thl Ec Bede: ins ABC^N 36 to copt æth arm Orig[-int₁] Eus, Procopi
 Hil₁ [Ambr]. ^{ανενεγκας} ^{N¹} [ενεγκαι 13]. om πνευματικός ^N [Syr-ms].
 rec ins τω bef θεω, with KL[P]^{N³} rel Clem, Orig, Thl Ec: om ABC^N arm. (13 def.)

of God (with God. "Deo iudice, coram Deo") chosen (not merely "eximius," but selected, chosen out), had in honour (see below on ver. 6), 5.] be ye also as living (see above) stones built up (it is disputed whether οἰκοδομείσθαι is indicative or imperative. Much is to be said both ways. Wiesinger, who is the ablest recent advocate for the indicative, maintains that the passage is expegetical of the preceding *ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ αὐξηθῇτε*, shewing how love to the world, seeking in the word the Lord Himself and His goodness, of itself leads to the completion set forth in ver. 5. But I cannot help feeling that this view of expegesis of *ἵνα ἐν αὐτ. αὐξ.* is much weakened by the fact that *πρὸς ὃν* must be referred to *κύριος*, which is already separated from *ἵνα κ.τ.λ.* by *εἰπερ ἐγεύσασθε κ.τ.λ.* And other weightier reasons are behind. On the indicative view, the pres. part. *προσερχόμενοι* could hardly have been used, but it would surely have been *προσελθόντες*. This is felt by Luther, who renders it *zu welchẽm ihr gekommen seyd*. Again, the connexion with the foregoing by a participle, proceeding on to an imperative, exactly corresponds to the former hortatory sentences, ch. i. 13, 14, 22, and ver. 1. Finally, the long procession of mere predications, on this view, would be tame and almost tautological, in comparison with the powerful gathering up with the *οὖν*, ver. 7, of the high and holy state on which the preceding exhortation depends, as contrasted with that of the unbelieving. I therefore decide for the imperative, against Syr. (Etheridge: "you also as living stones are builded"), Estius, Grot., Beng., al., and Wiesinger, and with Ec., Syr. (as commonly quoted), Beza, Aret., Benson, Steiger, De Wette, Huther) a spiritual house (οἶκος = *vaos*, 1 Cor. iii. 16: Eph. ii. 21: as before, the stones are called *living*, and the house *spiritual*, not merely to signify that they are not dead stones, and the house not a material one, but on account of the life which

Christians derive from Christ, the living Stone, and of the service which they render in virtue of being a body dwelt in by the Holy Spirit) for (see var. readd.) an holy priesthood (abstract, office of priesthood, including in itself the individual priests: see ref. Exod. Being God's spiritual temple, they form an holy priesthood to Him, approaching and serving before Him in virtue of that Living and Holy One, whose mystic Body they are, and in whom the Father is well pleased. And they need no other by whom to approach God: being all priests, they require not, nor admit of, any distinct body of men among themselves specially called priests, nearer to God than themselves. No where is this more clearly declared by inference, than here) to offer up (*ἀναφέρειν*, not occurring in St. Paul, nor in the classics, but (reff.) in Heb. and St. James, is the regular LXX word for offering up sacrifice. The aor. is here used, because no habitual offering, as in rite or festival, is meant, but the one, once-for-all, devotion of the body, as in Rom. xii. 1, to God as His. On the infin. of the purpose, see Winer, § 44. 1) spiritual sacrifices (cf. especially Heb. xiii. 15, 16. Spiritual, because as the temple, as the priests, as the God, so the offering. It is this, rather than any distinction from the O. T. sacrifices, that is pointed at in *πνευματικός*) acceptable (reff.) to God through Jesus Christ (these last words may be joined, either, 1. with *εὐπροσδέκτους*, or, 2. with *ἀνενέγκαι*. This latter has for it the analogy of Heb. xiii. 15, *δὲ αὐτοῦ οὖν ἀναφέρωμεν κ.τ.λ.*, and is preferred by Grot., Aret., De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger: and I think reasonably. The introduction of *διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ* as a mere appendage of *εὐπροσδέκτους* would not satisfy the weighty character of the words, may would seem to put them in the wrong place, seeing that not merely the acceptability, but the very existence, and possibility of offering, of those sacrifices depends on the mediation of the great High Priest).

6 ο διότι περιέχει ἐν γραφῇ α' Ἰδὸν τίθημι ἐν Σιών λίθον ο = ch. i. 16, 24. Acts xiii. 25 (Luke v. 9)
 ἁκρογωνιαῖον, ἑκλεκτόν, ἔντιμον, καὶ ὁ πιστεύων ἔπ' αὐτῷ οὐ μὴ κατασχυνηθῇ. 7 ὑμῖν οὖν ἡ τιμὴ τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ὑπαιτιοῦσιν δέ, λίθος δὲ ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας, καὶ λίθος προσκόμματος καὶ πέτρα σκανδάλου, 8 οὐ
 xx. 16 al. fr.) = Luke xiii. 35. l. c. t ver. 4. Luke vii. 2. xiv. 8. Phil. ii. 29 only. l. c. 1 Kings xxvi. 21. u Luke xxiv. 25. Rom. ix. 33 & x. 11 (from l. c. AN). 1 Tim. i. 16. v = Rom. as above, and v. 5. 1 Cor. i. 27 al. w dat. commodi, 2 Cor. v. 13. Rom. xiv. 6 al. Winer, § 31. 4. b. x = John iv. 44. Rom. ii. 7. Col. ii. 23 al. y = Acts xiv. 2. Rom. x. 21 (from Isa. lxx. 2). xi. 30. ver. 8. ch. iii. 1, 20. iv. 17. Deut. i. 26. b Matt xix. 5. xxi 42 || (from l. c.) al. c = Matt. xxi. 42 ||, and Acts iv. 11 (from l. c.) only. d as above (c). Matt. vi. 5. Acts xvi. 26. Rev. vii. 1. xx. 8 only. e Isa. viii. 14. Rom. ix. 32, 33. f Rom. as above, & xiv. 13, 20. 1 Cor. viii. 9 only. Isa. xxix. 21. g Rom. ix. 33 from l. c. only. h = Matt. xviii. 7 al. Ps. cv. 34. s ver. 4. (Matt. only). 2 al. see ref. to Jos. in note. q Isa. xxviii. 16. r Eph. ii. 20 only. l. c. only. 4 reff.

6. rec (for διότι) διο και, with (13?) Ec: διο b 19. 68: txt ABCKL[P]N rel vulg syrr copt Thl Aug Bede. (13 illegible?) rec ins τη bef γραφή, with KL[P] rel Thl Ec: η (for εν) C [a d h] vulg lat-fr: txt ABN k 13. εκλεκτον bef ακρωγων. B m [(Syr) copt arm Cyr₁]. αυτον N¹ [d].

7. ημιν N¹, but υ is written over appy by origl scribe. for απειθουσιν, απιστουςιν BCN a. (13 def.) rec λιθον [1st] (to conform to LXX and Matt, where there is no var read), with C²(appy) KL[P]N¹ rel Thl: txt AB C¹(appy) N² c Ec. (13 def.) πετραν N.

8. for οι, σοι C¹ a m 36. (13 def.)

aft οι ins και N².

6.] The exhortation of the previous verses is substantiated in its form and its assertions by O. T. prophecy. Because (q. d. the aforesaid is so, on the ground of Scripture) it is contained (reff.: and for the impersonal sense, Jos. Antt. xi. 4. 7, καθὼς ἐν αὐτῇ (τῇ ἐπιστολῇ) περιέχει. Hence περιχῆ, the contents or argument of a book or portion of a book; in later Greek) in Scripture (γραφῇ, in its technical sense, anathous: not so found in the Gospels, but Rom. i. 2; xvi. 26: 2 Pet. i. 20), Behold, I place in Zion a chief corner-stone, chosen, had in honour (the citation is a free one: τίθημι ἐν Σιών representing ἐμβάλλω εἰς τὰ θεμέλια Σιών, —the epithet πολυτελῆ being omitted, and ἐκλεκτόν and ἀκρογωνιαῖον transposed) and he that believeth on Him (or, 'it': ἐπ' αὐτῷ is not in the LXX-B., but is found in AN) shall not be ashamed (it is remarkable, that St. Paul in citing the same prophecy, Rom. ix. 33, has in common with St. Peter the two divergences from the LXX, the τίθημι ἐν Σιών, and the insertion (?) of ἐπ' αὐτῷ. On ἀκρογωνιαῖον, see ref. Eph. note. Here, whatever may be the case there, can hardly be any idea of the 'lapis summangularis' joining the two walls, Jewish and Gentile, together, as some (e. g. Ec.) have thought).

7, 8.] Appropriation of the honour implied in the last clause to believers: and per contra, to unbelievers, of another and opposite effect of the exaltation of this corner-stone. 7.] To you (dat. commodi) then (inference from the ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ

κ.τ.λ.) is the honour (the τιμὴ belonging to the Stone itself (ἐντιμον above), with which you are united in the building: the honour implied in the οὐ μὴ κατασχυνηθῇ said of those who believe on Him. There can be, I think, no doubt that these two commonly divergent accounts given of the word τιμὴ ought to be combined in one. That the result of the οὐ μὴ κατασχυνηθῇ is what the Apostle means to state, is evident by the οὖν and τοῖς πιστεύουσιν: that the form in which this is stated is ὑμῖν ἡ τιμὴ, is evidently owing to the occurrence of ἐντιμον above. It is as plainly altogether beside the purpose, with Erasmus, Luth., Calv., Aret., Bengel, al., to understand 'Christ,' or 'the Stone,' as the subject, and render as E. V., "He is precious," making ἡ τιμὴ predicate instead of subject) who believe: but to the disobedient (not, the unbelieving: see Heb. iii. 18, note. Unbelief is the root of ἀπειθεια: but it is the manner of Scripture, to follow it out into disobedience, its invariable effect, when spoken of in contrast to πίστις. The dat. is not one of reference, but incommodi. Then what follows is in the form of another quotation, or rather combination of quotations: the first from Ps. cxviii. 22), the stone which the builders rejected, this has become for a (has been made into a) head corner-stone (this is true with regard to believers also: but to them it is grace and glory, to these it is terror and destruction), and a stone of stumbling and rock of offence (second quotation from Isa. viii. 14. Here again, St. Paul in Rom. ix. 33 has taken the

i Matt. iv. 6. || L. ⁱπροσκοπτοῦσιν τῷ λόγῳ ^γἀπειθοῦντες, ^kεἰς δὲ καὶ ^kἐτέ-
 (from Ps. xc.
 12). vii. 27.
 John xi. 9,
 10. Rom. ix
 32. xiv. 21
 only. Prov.
 iii. 23.
 k Acts xiii. 47,
 from Isa.
 xlix. 6. AN. 1 Thess. v. 9. 1 Tim. i. 12. 1 Isa. xliii. 20. m ch. i. 6 reff. n Exod. xix. 6.
 o = here (Luke vii. 25) only. p ver. 5 only. l. c. only. see note. q of the Jews, Luke vii. 5. xxi. 6.
 2. John xi. 48—52. xviii. 35 al. r Eph. i. 14. 1 Thess. v. 9. 2 Thess. x. 39 only. 2 Chron.
 xiv. 13. Mal. iii. 17 only. (Isa. xliii. 21) s = 2 Pet. i. 2 (5 bis. Phil. iv. 8) only. Isa. xliii. 21 xli.
 8, 12. lxiii. 7. t here only. = Ps. ix. 14. — διαγγ., Isa. xlii. 12. δηγγέσθαι, xliii. 21.)
 u so Psa. cvi. 14. v 1 Cor. i. 9. Col. iii. 15. 2 Thess. ii. 14. 1 Tim. vi. 12. ver. 21. ch. i. 10.

ἀπιστοῦντες B [vulg].

same words, differing from the LXX, but agreeing with the Hebrew. This stumbling is not mere mental offence, which, e. g. they take at the preaching of the Cross; but the "stumbling upon the dark mountains" of Jer. xiii. 16, see Prov. iv. 19: Dan. xi. 19: the eternal disgrace and ruin which forms the contrast to *τιμὴ* above. Cf. on *πέτρα σκανδάλου* Matt. xvi. 23, note [the very expression carries a reminiscence of Peter's own days of unbelief, when he was an offence, — he, *Πέτρος*, — to his Lord]]. 8.] who stumble, being disobedient to the word (τῷ λόγῳ belongs to ἀπειθοῦντες, not as E. V. after vulg., Erasm., Luth., Beza, Estius, al., to *προσκοπτοῦσιν*, which is doubly objectionable, in, 1. making ἀπειθοῦντες a mere tautology from ἀπειθοῦσιν before: 2. giving a place not prominent enough to τῷ λόγῳ, whereas on the other rendering it takes its proper place, as being the means of growth to the Christian, and rejected by the disobedient: 3. confining the sense of 'stumbling' (see above) to a mere subjective one: 4. opposing the analogy of ch. iii. 1 and iv. 17. Cf. Wolf, in loc.: "Quī impingunt, nempe, in lapidem illum angularem, verbo non credentes (obedientes?): quo ipso et offensio ipsa et ejus causa indicatur"), for which (thing, fact, viz. the *προσκοπτεῖν*, τῷ λόγῳ ἀπειθοῦσιν, their whole moral course of delinquency and the *πρόσκομμα* at the end of it) they were also (καί, besides that they reach it, there is another consideration) appointed (set where they are, or were; viz. by Him who τίθησιν, above, the stone of stumbling. This exposition is certain, notwithstanding the protests of Ec., Did., al. Nor can I see how Bengel can escape, with his *διττολογία*, "*Positi sunt* respondet τῷ *pono* ver. 6; sed cum differentia. Nam Deus Christum et electos active dicitur *ponere*; infideles dicuntur *poni*, passive." What inference would he deduce from this? Would he take themselves as the agents, as Ec., Did., "Ad non credendum a semetipsis sunt positi," thus passing over καί, and making the clause a vapid tautology? Or would he say with Aretius, "Non Deus certe, sed

Satan tales posuit," thus making in the world's moral arrangement, Satan a co-ordinate power with God?). 9, 10.] Contrast, in a glorious description of the office, privilege, and function, of the enlightened and adopted people of God. 9.] But ye (emphatic) are a chosen generation (not, as De Wette, "the chosen generation;" though this is implied, it is not in the words, nor does it correspond with the indefinite predicates which follow. On the expression, cf. ref. Isa., τὸ γένος μου τὸ ἐκλεκτόν. γένος betokens a common origin and unity of related life: but perhaps Wiesinger goes too far in pressing the idea here), a kingly priesthood (ἱεράτευμα as above, see note. The expression is from the LXX of Exod. xix. 6. Cf. Rev. i. 6, ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς βασιλείαν ἱερῆς τῷ θεῷ, and v. 10. In the N. T. church these two elements, the kingship and the priesthood, are united in every individual believer, as in our great Head, Jesus Christ, who alone unites them in the O. T. church; the two coexisting, but never, except in the case of Melchisedek His foretype, united in the same Person), an holy nation (also from Exod. xix. 6, LXX; God's declaration at Sinai respecting Israel), a people for acquisition (i. e. peculiarly God's own, as interpreted by what follows in the place of Isaiah referred to, as well as here. There it stands, λαὸν μου ὃν περιποιήσασθην τὰς ἀρετὰς μου δηγγέσθαι. See, on the word, ref. 1 Thess. note. In the place of Exodus which was before quoted, ch. xix. 5, we read ἐσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν. See also Deut. vii. 6. (Ec. says, περιποιήσιν ἡμᾶς καλεῖ διὰ τὸ περιποιήσασθαι ἡμᾶς τὸν θεόν, as in Acts xx. 28, τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου), that ye may tell out (ἐξαγγ., not = ἀναγγ. The prep. gives the sense of publishing forth) the virtues (i. e. gracious dealings, excellent and glorious attributes: see Isa. above, and in reff. Philo repeatedly uses ἀρεταί in this sense: e. g. De Mut. Nom. § 34, vol. i. p. 606, πολλὰ δὲ ἄγνοια νομίζειν τὰς θεοῦ ἀρετὰς τὰς ἀβρεπεῖς καὶ παγωπάτας χω-

ABCKL
 P a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m o
 13

ν εἰς τὸ ^ω θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς· ¹⁰ οἱ [×] ποτὲ ^γ οὐ λαός, ^ω Matt. xxi. 42 || Mk.,
 νῦν δὲ ^z λαὸς θεοῦ, οἱ οὐκ ^a ἡληθμένοι, νῦν δὲ ^a ἐληθύντες. from Ps.
 cxvii. 23.

¹¹ ^b Ἀγαπητοί, ^c παρακαλῶ ὡς ^{de} παροίκους καὶ ^e παρ- John ix. 30.
 ἐπιδήμους ^g ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ^h σαρκικῶν ⁱ ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἵ- Rev. xv. 1,
 3 only.

^{23.} (see Rom. x. 19, from Deut. xxxii. 21.)

^{v. 7.} Rom. xi. 30, 31. 1 Cor. vii. 25. 2 Cor. iv. 1.

^c = Heb. xiii. 19 al. fr. ^f Heb. xi. 13 reff.

¹⁴ compl. v. ἀπό, Acts xv. 30. 1 Thess. iv. 3. v. 23.

^{i. 12.} x. 4 only. 2 Chron. xxxii. 8 compl.

^{14.} iv. 2, 3 2 Pet. ii. 18. 1 John ii. 16.

^z Heb. iv. 9 reff.

¹ Tim. i. 3, 19 only.

^g w. gen., Acts xv. 29.

ⁱ = Rom. xiii. 14.

^a l. c. A. pass., Matt.

^b Heb. xi. 9 reff.

¹ Tim. iv. 3. Jer. vii.

¹ Cor. iii. 3. ix. 11. 2 Cor.

Gal. v. 16. Eph. ii. 3. ch. i.

11. ἀπεχεσθε ACL[P] c² f h j¹ o syrr copt æth Did₁ Cyr₁ [Cypri] Zeno Leo.
 add απο C¹ 27 Did₁.

ρῆσαι ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπου δύνασθαι . . . ἀκράτους μὲν γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὰς τοῦ θεοῦ ἀρετὰς: see other passages in Loesner) of Him (God: the Father) who called you out of darkness ("tenebræ ignorantiae, errorum, peccatorum, miseriarum, adeoque totum diaboli regnum," Gerh.) to (not exactly "into:" εἰς with καλέσαντος gives more the aim of the call, than its local result: to, i. e. to attain unto and be partakers of: to walk in and by) His wonderful light (this expression here can hardly mean the light of our Christian life only; but must import that light of God's own Presence and Being, after which our walking in light is to be fashioned: the light to which St. John alludes, when he says, ἐὰν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ περιπατῶμεν, ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτί. Had not this been intended, surely neither εἰς nor αὐτοῦ would have been used. "It is wonderful," says De Wette, "just as to one coming out of long darkness the light of day would be wonderful." The figure of the corner-stone has not quite passed away from the Apostle's mind; in the end of the prophecy concerning which we read, Ps. cxvii. 23 (Matt. xxi. 42), παρὰ κυρίου ἐγένετο αὕτη, καὶ ἔστιν θαυμαστὴ ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν): 10.] who (contrast between their former and present states) were once no people (the Apostle is again citing, or rather clothing that which he has to write in, O. T. words. In Hosea ii. 23 A, we read ἐλέσω τὴν οἶκ ἡληθμένην, καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ οὐ λαὸν μου εἰ σύ), but (are) now the people of God (these words, as Wies. maintains, apply most properly to Gentile Christians, although spoken in the prophecy of Jews. St. Paul thus uses them, Rom. ix. 25; and it is not impossible that that passage may have been in St. Peter's mind), who were unpitied (of God: the οὐκ here and above, not merely negatives, but contraries: not "who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy," as E. V., indicating a mere change of time in order of progress, but who were unpitied, objects

of aversion and wrath), but now compassionated (the aor. part. has a fine and delicate force which cannot be given in a version: q. d. who were men who (have received no pity), but now men who (received pity), viz. when God called you by Christ).

11—IV. 6.] Exhortations to walk christianly and worthily towards and among those without who speak and act in a hostile manner. Hitherto we have seen them exhorted to walk worthily of their calling as distinguished from their own former walk: now the Apostle exhorts them to glorify God before an ungodly and persecuting world.

11 12.] Ver. 11, negative, exhorts to abstain from fleshly lusts: ver. 12, positive, to cause the unconverted Gentiles around, by their fair Christian walk, to glorify God.

11.] Beloved (as this word is only found once again in this Epistle, ch. iv. 12, we may apply to it Wiesinger's remark, "The seldomer our Apostle uses this endearing term, the weightier it is where it does occur as the opening of a hortatory discourse"), I exhort you as sojourners (see ref. Eph. and note) and strangers (see on ch. i. 1. This primary and literal meaning of the word is probably the uppermost one here, seeing that the Apostle is speaking of behaviour among the Gentiles. Still, from the more general reference of this first exhortation, the other and wider reference, "quia filii Dei, ubicunque terrarum agant, mundi sunt hospites" (Calv.), must not be left out of sight. These words, παροίκ. κ. παρεπίδ., belong, not to παρακαλῶ, as Huther, al., but to ἀπέχεσθαι. They form the ground why the readers should abstain, not why the Writer should exhort. In νοουθετεῖτε ὡς ἀδελφόν, 2 Thess. iii. 15, we have the other case) to abstain (or, with the reading -σθε, abstain) from the carnal lusts (= αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι τῆς σαρκός, reff. Eph. and 2 Pet.; αἱ κοσμικαὶ ἐπιθυμίαι, Titus ii. 12. Here, it is, from the context, the walking and acting in the indulgence of these lusts which the Apostle is forbidding.

κ = here only. see James iv. 1 (also Luke ix. 14. 1 Cor. ix. 7. 1 Tim. x. 3. 1 Tim. i. 18. 2 Tim. i. 4). Isa. xix. 7. 1 ch. i. 15 reff. m = ver. 16. ch. iv. 8. Heb. vii. 24. Act. ii. 44. n = Rom. ii. 1. xiv. 22. o James iv. 11 (reff.). ch. in. 16 only. here bis. (John xviii. 30 rec.) ch. (in. 16 rec.) iv. 15 only. Prov. xii. 4. xiv. 18 only. (ποσειν, ch. in. 17.) q Heb. x. 24 reff. r ch. ii. 2 only t. Ps ix. 34 (14) Symm. Demosth. 168 13. Polyb. v. 63. 6 al. s = Matt. v. 16. ix. 8 al. t = Luke xix 44 (Acts i. 20. 1 Tim. iii. 1) only. Job x. 12. Isa. x. 3 Jer. vi. 15. u Heb. xii. 9 reff. v Acts xvii. 25. Rom. vi. 19. 1 Cor. ii. 13. iv. 3. x. 13. James iii. 7 only. Num. v. 6. w see note & Mark xvi. 15. Col. i. 23 al.

ABCKL
P^a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

12. for 1st υμων, υμιν Ν. εχοντες καλην bef εν τοις εθνεσιν KL[P] rel [Syr copt] Clem, Ec Polyc-int Cyprr: om εχοντες B: txt ACN (a) m [13] 36 [vulg æth Clem, Thl]. rec εποπτευσαντες, with AKL[P] rel [Clem.]: txt BCN a j m 36 [vulg syr] Thl Ec [Cyprr]. δεξασουτρεμουσιν (see 2 Pet ii. 10) Ν¹.
13. rec aft υποταγ. ins ουν, with KL[P] rel vulg[-ed] syr Thl Ec Bede: om ABCN m 13 [am(and fuld demid tol) coptt æth arm] Did, Cassiodi. κτισει bef ανθρωπ C m syr coptt [Eus.] Did: om ανθρωπ. Ν¹.

See them enumerated in Gal. v. 19—21), the which (αἵτινες, not = αἱ, but gathers up into a class the ἐπιθυμίας and asserts it of all of them that they &c.: thus rendering a reason, 'quippe quæ.' With αἱ, it might have been taken, "from those fleshly lusts, which" &c.) war (ref. James and Rom. vii. 23. "Non modo impediunt, sed oppugnant: grande verbum." Bengel) against the soul (ψυχῇ, the man's personal immortal part, as opposed to his body, his μέλη in which the ἐπιθυμίας στρατεύονται, is held in suspension between influences from above and influences from beneath: drawn up and saved, or drawn down and ruined. And among its adversaries are these fleshly lusts, warring against it to its ruin): 12.] Positive

result of this abstinence, and its important fruit: having (we have the same disjunction of the construction in Eph. iv. 1, 2, παρακαλῶ . . . ὑμᾶς . . . ἀνεχόμενοι. It serves to give vividness to the description, taking the participle out from under the παρακαλῶ, and depicting, as it were, the condition recommended, as actually existing. It is so eminently, though not under exactly the same circumstances as to construction, in the beautiful procession of participles and adjectives in Rom. xii. 9—19) your behaviour among the Gentiles comely (as over against the μάταια ἀναστροφή of the Gentiles, ch. i. 18. Cf. ch. iii. 16), that (aim of the preceding) in the matter in which (so ἐν ᾧ in reff.: not, 'while,' for that would not apply to δοξάσωσιν below: both could not be going on together: nor "whereas," E. V., "pro eo quod," Beza, for which sense of ἐν ᾧ there is no precedent. The sense is, 'that that conduct, which was to them an occasion of speaking against you as evil-doers, may by your good works become to them an

occasion of glorifying God.' And 'that, in which,' will be in fact your whole Christian life) they speak against you as evil-doers (often the Christians would be compelled to diverge from heathen customs and even to break human laws, and thus would incur the imputation of malefactors), they may, on the ground of your good works, being spectators of them (contrast to the ignorance assumed in the ἀγνοσία τῶν ἀφρόνων ἀνθρώπων below, ver. 15. On the word, see reff.: and cf. ἐπέπτης, an eye-witness, 2 Pet. i. 16), glorify God in (the) day of visitation (i. e., the day* when God visits,—ἐπισκέπτεται, Luke i. 68, 78: Acts xv. 14,—mankind with His offers of mercy and grace: cf. also reff. Luke, where our Lord says of Jerusalem, οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου. The word has been variously understood: the Fathers generally (cf. Suicer in voc.), Lyra, Erasm., Beza, De Wette, al. explain it as above: Ec., Wolf, Bengel, al. think that the day of inquisition before earthly magistrates is meant (ἡμέραν δὲ ἐπισκοπῆς τὴν κατὰ κόσμον ἐξέτασιν καλεῖ ἐξετάσεως γὰρ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τοῦ βίου ἡμῶν γενομένης, εἰτα πρὸς τὸ ἐναντίον τῆς ὑπολήψεως τῶν πραγμάτων εὕρισκομένων αὐτοὶ τε πρὸς οἷς αἰσχύνονται ἐπανορθοῦνται, καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάζεται. Ec.). Bede, al. understand it of the day of judgment. But the former sense is far preferable on account of usage, and for its fitness in the context). 13—17.] Exhortation to subjection to secular rule.

13.] Be subjected (aor. pass. with a quasismiddle sense, given by the aorist coupled with the fact of the command: be in a condition of having been subjected: on the medial signification of aorists passive in N. T., see on ch. v. 6) to every human institution ("quod creat et condit homo,"

διὰ τὸν κύριον εἴτε βασιλεῖ ὡς ^x ὑπερέχοντι ¹⁴ εἴτε ^z = Rom. xiii. 1 (Phil ii. 3. iii. 8 iv. 7) only. Gen. xli 40. = Matt. x. 18. Mark xiii. 94 L. elsw. of Rom. gov't, exc. Matt ii. 6. Epiph. here only. Sir. xlii. 14 only, but in bad sense. (ποῖτα, ch. iv. 19.) c = Matt i. 18. d Rom xii. 2. Heb. x. 36. e = ver. 20, ch. iii. 6, 17. 3 John 11. (Num. x. 32 al.) Tobit xii. 13 B (not AN). f Matt xxii. 12, 34. Mark i. 25 L. iv. 39. (1 Cor vii. 9 v. r.) 1 Tim. v. 18 only. Deut. xxv. 4 only. g Luke xi. 40. Rom. ii. 20 al. Ps. xciii. 8. h 1 Cor. xv. 34 only. Job xxv. 16. Wisd. xxi. 1 only.

14. rec aft εκδικησιν ins μεν, with C(appy) [P] rel syr-w-ast [Damasc.] Thl Ec: om ABKLN d g k l m 13 vulg spec [Syr copt arm Antch₁].

15. αγαθοποιουντες C: -ποιειν 13. add υμας C b m o Thl [syrr]; και 13. φιμουιν N¹.

Luth. Such, and not "every human creature," as Syr., Erasm., Estius, Pott, De Wette, is the meaning. The latter would stultify what follows: for it is not to the king as a man, but to the king as a human institution, that we are to be subject. And so Ec., κτίσιν ἀνθρωπίνην τὰς ἀρχὰς λέγει τὰς χειροτονητὰς ὑπὸ τῶν βασιλέων, ἡ καὶ αὐτοὺς τοὺς βασιλεῖς, καθότι καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἐτάχθησαν ἡτοῦ ἐτέθησαν. It is no objection to this, that all powers are ordained of God: for that consideration does not come into notice in these words, but in those which follow, διὰ τ. κύριον. Here, it is the *lower side* of such institutions, the fact of their being ordained and upheld by men, that is brought into sight) for the Lord's sake (i.e. Christ's: κύριος with St. Peter, except in O.T. citations, is always our Lord. And here there is additional reason, for that He, the Head of all principality and power, is yet in us his members subject to them, until the day when all shall be put under His feet): whether to king (general,—but, from the nature of the case as regarded those to whom the Epistle is addressed, here the Roman Emperor) as supereminent ("qui ita imperat, ut ab aliis hominibus ipsi non imperetur," Gerh.), 14.] or to governors ("ἡγεμόνες praesides provinciarum, qui a Cæsare mittebantur in provincias," Gerh.) as to men sent (in the habit of being sent,—sent from time to time: the pres. part. describes the genus: the particular ἡγεμόνες would be described as πεμφθέντες) through him (the king, not κύριον, as some, and Calvin very positively, "qui pronomen ad regem referunt multum falluntur." But there can be little doubt that he is wrong. For first the analogy of the clauses, ὡς ὑπερέχοντι . . . ὡς δι' αὐτοῦ πεμπομένοις, shews that the grounds of obedience in each case, all being alike διὰ κύριον, belong to the actually existing rights of power in that case. The king is supreme, in his

own right: governors rule by delegation from the king, 'mittuntur' δι' αὐτοῦ. Then, the right understanding of διὰ κύριον, as applying to all, forbids this view. For thus we should obey the king as ὑπερέχων, no mention of the Lord being made, whereas rulers are to be obeyed as sent by the Lord. Finally, the prep. διὰ, as distinguished from ὑπό, designates rather the subordinate than the original sender. A governor could surely not be said to be sent διὰ κυρίου for (to bring about) vengeance on (as in ref.: ἐκδίκησις, being a 'vox media,' has another meaning, that of "avenging of," in Luke xviii. 7, 8. Ec., taking it in this latter meaning, gives a convenient limitation to the duty, which was the furthest possible from the mind of the Apostle: εἰδείε καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ Πέτρος τίσι καὶ πόλοις ἀρχουσιν ὑποτάσσασθαι δεῖ, ὅτι τοῖς τὸ δίκαιον ἐκδικοῦσιν) evil-doers, and praise of well-doers.

15.] For (ground of ὑποτάγητε; correlative with, but not going so far as, the purpose announced in ver. 12) so (after this manner, in this direction and wise: viz. as follows, αγαθοποιουντας φιμουιν κ.τ.λ.) is ('se trouuve,' κεῖται) the will (thing willed, concrete result of the will) of God, that doing good (the anathous participle carries the reason with it: by doing good: "with well-doing," E. V.) ye (necessarily understood) put to silence the ignorance ("Locutio quam usurpat, 'obstruere ignorantiam,' quamvis per novitatem dura sit, sensum tamen non obscurat." Calv. On the word φιμῶω, see ref.; and Palm and Rost's Lex. ἀγνωσία,

see the instructive parallel, ref. 1 Cor., is not simply ignorance of this or that fact, but a state of lack of knowledge or understanding, habitual ignorance. This state is here introduced as speaking, "having (as Wiesinger) ever its mouth open rather than its eyes," ready to cry out upon any mere appearance of things as misunderstood by it) of the foolish men (above

i here only.
Exod. xxvi.
14. 2 Kings
xvii. 19.

k = ver. 12
reff.

l ver. 1.

m 1 Cor. x. 29.
Gal. v. 13 al.

n = 1 Cor. vii.
22. Eph. vi.
6.

o Eph. vi. 2 (from Exod. xx. 12). 1 Tim. v. 3 only in Epp.

q Luke xvi. 13. Acts x. 7. Rom. xiv. 4 only. Gen. ix. 25, 26.

s = here & past. Epp. (1 Tim. vi. 1, 2 al2.) only. (see 2 Pet. ii. 1 reff.) Prov. vi. 7.

p ch. v. 9 only +. 1 Macc. xii. 10, 17 only.

r ver. 13. particip., Eph. v. 21 (& εν).

ABCKL
P^a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

καὶ μὴ ὡς ⁱ ἐπικάλυμμα ^k ἔχοντες τῆς ^l κακίας τὴν
ἐλευθερίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς θεοῦ ⁿ δοῦλοι. ¹⁷ πάντας ^o τιμή-
σατε, τὴν ^p ἀδελφότητα ἀγαπάτε, τὸν θεὸν φοβείσθε, τὸν
βασιλέα ^o τιμᾶτε. ¹⁸ Οἱ ^q οἰκέται, ^r ὑποτασσόμενοι ἐν
παντὶ φόβῳ τοῖς ^s δεσπόταις, οὐ μόνον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ

16. rec δουλοὶ βεθ. σου, with AL[P] rel vulg spec Thl Ec: txt BCKN m arm [Damasc.].

17. παντὲς N. ἀγαπήσατε KL g h k l m.

18. εν παντι φοβω beθ υποτασσ. N. aft δεσπ. ins υμων N [harl(and tol) Syr copt].

designated: those viz. who καταλαλοῦσιν ὁμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν; not, "of foolish men" in general, as E. V.).

16.] The connexion is somewhat doubtful. Chrys. (in Cramer's Catena), Ec., Bengel, Gerh., De Wette, join ὡς ἐλεύθεροι with ὑποτάγητε above, ver. 13: Bede, Luther, Calv., Hammond, Wiesinger, with ἀγαθοποιούντας, ver. 15: Steiger, Huther, with the following, ver. 17. This latter seems quite untenable, as carrying no application on from ver. 16 to ver. 17. No one would think of pleading his freedom as an excuse for not honouring all, or for not loving the brethren, or for not fearing God: or indeed for not, in some sense, *honouring* the King. But in a matter of subjection, such ἐλευθερία might be and often is made a cloak for disobedience. Connecting then ὡς ἐλεύθ. with what has preceded, which of the other connexions are we to take? That with ὑποτάγητε seems too distant: it may certainly be said that ver. 17 brings in again the general duty in its most simple form: but even thus we can hardly account for the parenthetical ver. 15, so unparenthetical in its aspect and construction. Whereas if we join ὡς ἐλεύθ. to ver. 15, we obtain, as Wiesinger well argues, an epexegetis which that verse seems to need,—for it is almost a truism that we are to accomplish the φιμοῦν by ἀγαθοποιεῖν, unless some explanation be given of the particular circumstances under which this is to take place. I regard then ver. 16 as an epexegetis of ver. 15, not carrying on the construction with an accus. but with a nom. as already in ver. 12, and indeed even more naturally here, because not the act consequent on ἀγαθοποιεῖν, as there on ἀπέχεσθαι, is specified, but the antecedent state and Christian mode of ἀγαθοποιεῖν. As free (children of God, His family and people, His kingly priesthood: not merely free from the law, or free from sin, or free from earthly subjection, but generally and abstractedly free—Christ's freed men), and not as (ὡς belongs to ἔχοντες, not to ἐπι-

κάλυμμα) having (cf. above, ver. 12) your freedom (for) a veil (reff.) of your evil intent (the τῆς, hypothetical: of the evil intent which using your freedom as a veil would necessarily presuppose), but as God's (emphatic) servants (and therefore bound to submit yourselves to that which God ordains).

17.] A pithy general statement (πάντας τιμῆσατε, see below) of the whole department of Christian duty of which the Apostle is now speaking: then a note of transition, by the three following commands, to the next paragraph, where he severs the general into the special duties. Give honour to all men (i. e. by the force of the aor. imperat., to each man according as the case, which requires it, arises, q. d. 'in every case render promptly every man's due': = ἀπόδοτε πᾶσιν τὰς ὀφείλδς, Rom. xiii. 7. So that the distinction between this and τιμᾶτε below is a clear one: see there. And by this force of the aor., this first precept assumes a place of general and wide-reaching reference, which then is severed by the three following present imperatives into three great branches, before the relations of ordinary life are introduced ver. 18, with participial forms). Love (as your habit of mind and act, pres.) the brotherhood (the aggregate of οἱ ἀδελφοί: see ref. and compare ἱερὰ πνεῦμα above, ver. 9), fear God, honour (both these latter as continuing habits, frames of mind and courses of action) the king. 18—25.] Exhortation to servants to be obedient to their masters.

18.] Ye servants (οἰκέτης, a domestic servant: a milder designation than δοῦλος. Possibly, as Steiger supposes, it may be here used to include the 'liberti' who still remained in their master's house), [by being] in subjection (the part. carries on, immediately, the πάντας τιμῆσατε above; but also belongs, at a greater distance, to the whole of the last paragraph, as a general designation of the habitual conduct, in and by which they were to shew forth an honest conversation among the Gentiles) in all fear (ἐν παντὶ

^t ἐπεικέσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ^u σκολιοῖς. ¹⁹ ^v τοῦτο γὰρ ^t Phil. iv. 5.
^w χάρις, εἰ διὰ ^x συνειδήσιν θεοῦ ^y ὑποφέρει. τὶς ^z λύπας ¹ Tim. iii. 3.
 πάσχωι ^a ἀδίκως. ²⁰ ^b ποῖον γὰρ ^c κλέος εἰ ἁμαρτάνοντες ^u Luke iii. 5 only.
 καὶ ^d κολαφίζόμενοι ^e ὑπομενεῖτε; ἀλλ' ^f ἐὶ ἀγαθοποιούντες ^u Luke iii. 5 only.
 40. Phil. ii. 15 only. Deut. xxxii. 5. v so Rom. xiv. 13. 2 Cor. ii. 1. 2 Pet. iii. 8. w = (see
 note.) Luke vi. 32. Sir. xx. 16. x gen obj, Heb. x. 2. (Rom. xiii. 5 al.) y 1 Cor. x. 27.
 1. 2 Tim. iii. 11 only. Job ii. 10. Prov vi. 33. z plur., here only. Prov xv. 13. see Phil. ii. 27.
 a here only. Ps. xxxiii. 19 al. b = Matt. xxi. 23 al. fr. c here only. Job xxxvii. 22. xxx.
 8 only. d Matt. xxvi. 67 || Mk. 1 Cor. iv. 11. 2 Cor. xii. 7 only t. e James v. 11 refl.
 f ver. 15.

19. aft *charis* ins *para tw thew* C a c o Syr syr-w-ast [arm] Damasc, Thl, *para thew* J 13.
 36 [Damasc-ms] Anton. for *theou, αγαθην* C a b c o 36 syrr [arin] Anton₂ Thl:
θεου αγαθην A¹ 13.

20. *κολαζομενοι* N³ [P a].

υπομενετε [1st] N³ a c m o vulg spec Anton₂.

φῶβ provides, by its wide generality, for the case by and by to be specially commented on. φῶβος, not merely the reverence of an inferior, but the awe of one in subjection) to your masters; not only to the good (kind) and considerate (see note, ref. Phil.: those who make reasonable allowances, and exact no more), but also to the perverse (σκολιός = ὑπ, ref. Deut.: crooked, in deviating from right and justice, see note on ref. Phil. These masters are, as Gerh., "sævi et intractabiles, duri ac morosi"). 19, 20.] Reason for being subject to the perverse: that it is well pleasing to God when we suffer for well-doing. 19.] For this is thank-worthy (as in ref. Luke, εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστί; i.e. what recognition at God's hand in the day when He will come, and His reward with Him (= τίνα μισθὸν ἔχετε; Matt. v. 46)? It is said of something, to do or suffer which is out of, beyond, the ordinary course of what might have been expected. The meaning attempted by Wiesinger after Steiger, "this is grace," i.e. a mark of divine grace, does not suit ver. 20, χάρις παρά, not θεοῦ, but θεῷ: and is condemned by the passage in St. Luke. The idea that it means "gratiam divinam concilians," Wahl, leading on to "hoc est opus supererogationis," Lyra, is theologically inadmissible, besides doing violence to the construction. The E. V. has hit the meaning very well. Cf. Calvin: "Idem valet nomen gratiæ quod laudis. Intelligi enim nullam gratiam vel laudem conciliari nobis coram Deo, si pœnam sustinemus quam nostris delictis simus promeriti: sed qui patienter ferunt injurias, eos laude dignos esse, et opus facere Deo acceptum"), if (εἰ ὑποφέρει τις = τὸ ὑποφέρειν τινά, forms an apposition to and expegegesis of τοῦτο: see for the infin. 2 Cor. ii. 1, vii. 11, and for instances of ἔτι, ὅνα, &c. Winer, § 23. 5). We have ἐάν after τοῦτο in 1 John ii. 8) on account of consciousness of God (realization in a

man's inner being, of God's presence and relation to himself: cf. συνείδ. ἁμαρτιῶν Heb. x. 2. Calov. says perhaps too much: "quia conscius est id Deum velle et Deo gratum esse." Better Calvin, "Hoc enim valet conscientia Dei, dum quis non hominum, sed Dei respectu officio suo fungitur") any one endures (as a superimposed burden, see refl., but here induced perhaps by the idea of ὑποταγή which is dominant throughout: so De Wette) tribulations ("res tristitiam afferentes," Wahl: cf. λυπηθέντες, ch. i. 6), suffering wrongfully (ἀδίκως here emphatic, as carrying the transition to the next step of the argument). 20.] For (proof of the foregoing by assuming (interrogatively) the refutation of the contrary) what kind of (ὡς für ein, Wies. But the qualitative force of ποῖος in an interrogation of this kind must not be pressed; it is of the slightest tinge imaginable: cf. the similar questions above from St. Matt. and St. Luke) glory (is it) (the word κλέος is perfectly general, and must not (as Bengel) be supplied with παρά θεῷ. What credit is due . . . ? = τί περισσὸν ποιεῖτε; Matt. v. 47) if doing wrong and being buffeted (the participles are in close logical connexion, and both of them describe enduring habit, not the occurrence merely of one such case, not ἁμαρτήσαντες κ. κολαφίζόμενοι. "When ye be buffeted for your faults," E. V., is somewhat too wide: "When ye do wrong and are buffeted for it" would express the Greek more closely. κολαφίζ., refl.: here perhaps in the literal sense, as Bengel, "pœna servorum, eaque subita") ye shall endure it (ὑπομενεῖτε, not, as De Wette, only "the reluctant dull endurance of a criminal who cannot avoid his punishment:" this mars the hypothesis, which requires that the same kind of endurance should belong to both its sides, the only difference being in suffering justly and unjustly. So that ὑπομενεῖτε must carry the sense of ὑπομονή, patient endurance: as E. V., "ye shall take it patiently")?

g ver. 9 reff.
h hete only r.
i here only r.
2 Macc ii.
28 only
Polyce ad
Phil 3, 8,
p. 1012
Clem. ad Cor.
33, p. 275.
k Mark xvi 20.
l Tim. v. 10.
24 only. Job
xxxi 7.
1 Rom iv. 12. 2 Cor xii 18 only†. Sir. xxi 6.
4, 8, 9 only. 3 Kings xvi 19 (Isa lvi 9.)
10. Rev. xvi. 5. o pass., 1 Cor ix 12 only†
ch. iii 9. -ρος, 1 Cor vi. 10) p here only +
Eph. vi. 9.)

και πάσχοντες * ὑπομενεῖτε, ὃ τοῦτο γὰρ ὡ χάρις παρὰ θεῷ.
21 εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ εἰ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ χριστὸς ἐπάθεν ὑπὲρ
ὑμῶν, ὑμῖν ἡ ὑπολιμπάνων ἡ ὑπογραμμὸν ἵνα κ' ἐπακολου-
θήσῃτε τοῖς ἰχθεσιν αὐτοῦ, 22 δς ἡ ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔποίη-
σεν οὐδὲ ἠερέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, 23 δς ὁ λοι-
δορούμενος οὐκ ἂν τελοιδόρει, πασχων οὐκ ἠεπέλει,
m = John viii 34. 2 Cor xi. 7. James v 15 1 John iii.
n = Matt i 18 Luke xvi 18 Acts viii 40 Rom vii.
act, John ix 28. Acts xxiii. 4. Deut xxxiii. 8 (ρία,
q Acts iv. 17 only Gen. xxi. 42 (-λή,

ABCKL
P^h a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

om 2nd υπομενετε C : υπομενετε m o vulg spec [Anton₂]. rec om 2nd γαρ, with
BCKL[P]N rel vulg spec [syrr coptt aeth arm Damasc-ms]: ins A k 13 Thl Ec Tert.
ins τω bef θεω A a c d h k m 36 Thl.

21. om και A vulg-mss syr [(sah)]. ins o bef χριστος N o. for επαθεν,
απεπαθεν N [Syr arm Damasc, Ambr, Fulg Quæst]. for υπερ, περι A. Steph
ημων ημιν, with d Syr copt [Damasc.] Aug: ημων υμιν KL[P] a f h j l o 13. 36 [vulg-
ed] fuld¹ Thl Tert, Cypri: txt ABCN rel am(with demid fuld² harl tol) syr sah aeth
[Damasc-ms] Ec Ambr.

23. for αντελοιδ., ελοιδορει N¹ [maledicebat vulg Did-int.].

but if well-doing and suffering (for it) (these last words are amply justified by the logical connexion of the participles, see above) ye shall endure it (it is glory) (with the reading τοῦτο γάρ below, it becomes necessary to supply, mentally at least, some such words): for this is thank-worthy (see above) with (in the estimation of: see Luke ii. 52) God.

21.] For (proof that undeserved suffering is χάρις παρὰ θεῷ, by the instance of Christ's sufferings, which were our example) to this (state, viz. the endurance of wrongful sufferings) ye were called: because (ground of the assertion εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε) Christ also (the καὶ applies to the ἐπάθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, the words ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν carrying with them the ἀγαθοποιῶν, as explained below, ver. 24) suffered for you, leaving behind for you (emphatic repetition from the former ὑμῶν. Tischendorf's reasoning, edn. 7, that ἡμῶν, ὑμῶν was probably the original reading, and has given rise to ἡμῶν ἡμῖν and ὑμῶν ὑμῖν, may be met by the above consideration in favour of the more ancient reading. [In edn. 8 Tisch. reads as in text.] ὑπολιμπάνα is a late form of ὑπολείπω. Themist. Orat. x. p. 139 D, is the only place quoted for this sense: Dion. Hal. i. 23 uses the 2 aor. in an intransitive sense, of streams failing,—τὰ δ' ὑπελίμπανε θέρους, τὰ δ' εἰς τέλος ἀπεσβέννυτο. On the pres. part. here, Bengel remarks, "in abitu ad Patrem." It gives the abiding intent of the single fact ἐπάθεν: and might be rendered 'ut relinqueret') a copy (ὑπογραμμός, a pattern to write or paint by: technically, ὑπογραμμοὶ παιδικοὶ were formulæ given by writing-masters to their pupils, containing all the letters of the alphabet.

Clem. Strom. v. 8. 50, p. 675 P., who gives examples of them) that ye should follow upon (ἐπακολουθεῖν, follow close upon, the ἐπί denoting close application to: it is a word commonly used of following behind another) His footsteps (so in reff.):

22.] Further expansion of this example of Christ, making it plain that He ἀγαθοποιῶν καὶ πάσχων ἐπέμεινεν:—who never did (the aor. gives the force, as distinguished from the imperf. ἐποίει, of "never in a single instance") sin (the words are almost a citation from Isa. liii. 9, A[N^{3a}], ἀνομίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ) nor yet (climax: not only did He never sin in act, but not even. . .) was guile ever found ("non deprehendebatur fraudulenta locutus," Wiesinger: cf. Winer, § 65. 8, on this sense of εὐρίσκειν) in His mouth: 23.] who when reviled, reviled not again (a proof of his ὑπομονή. Isa. liii. 7 is before the Apostle), when suffering threatened not (both these, imperfects, denoting constant habit. The order is again that of climax: from λοιδορούμενος to πάσχων, from οὐκ ἂν τελοιδόρει to οὐκ ἠεπέλει): but (see on this particular use of δέ as a stronger contrast than ἀλλά, on Heb. ii. 6. It is nearly our 'yea, rather: removing the thing previously negated altogether out of our field of view, and substituting something totally different for it) delivered (them) (see below) up (what? Most Commentators supply ἐαντὸν [so E. V.], or 'causam suam,' both of which seem out of place and hardly justified by the usage of the verb. Rather would I supply an object out of the λοιδορούμενος and πάσχων foregoing, either, with Huther and Wiesinger,

τ παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ ^s κρίνουντι ^t δικάως, ²⁴ ὃς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ^r see Matt v. 25.
 ἡμῶν αὐτὸς ^u ἀνήνεγκεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ^v ξύλον, ^s ch. i. 17.
 ἵνα ταῖς ^w ἁμαρτίαις ^x ἀπογενόμενοι τῇ ^w δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσωμεν, ^t Luke xxiii. 41.
^y οὐ τῷ ^z μώλωπι ^y [αὐτοῦ] ἰάθητε. ²⁵ ἦτε γὰρ ὡς ^z πρό- ¹ Cor. xv. 34.
 βατα ^z πλανώμενοι, ἀλλ' ^a ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ^b ποι- ¹ Thess. ii. 10.
 ver 5.) Isa. lvi. (11) 12. ^v = Acts v. 30. x. 39. Gal. iii. 3, from Deut. xxi. 23. ^r see Matt v. 25.
 Rom. vi. 2, 11. Gal. ii. 19. ^x here only. ^t Herod. ii. 85. Thucyd. ii. 34. ^s ch. i. 17.
 Matt. iii. 12. Acts xv. 17, from Amos ix. 12. Rev. iii. 8 al. ^y constr. ^u = Heb. ix. 28
 a = here only. (see John xii. 40.) Isa. xlv. 22. Joel ii. 12. ^b Heb. xiii. 20 reff. ^z here only. Isa. lvi. 5, 6.
 only. (see

for δε, τε C.

24. ὡμῶν B. om εν N¹. aft ἁμαρτιας ins ὡμῶν A æth. συνζήσωμεν C.
 om 2nd αὐτου ABCK rel: ins L[P]N¹(N^s disapproving) b² f g h j k l Thl Ec.
 25. om ητε γαρ B. rec πλανώμενα, with CKL[P] rel Thl Ec: txt ABN.
 αλλα B. επεστρεψατε C [a (c)]: επιστραφητε [P]N.

"His reproaches and sufferings," or, which seems to me better, "those who inflicted them:" perhaps not without reference to "Father, forgive them: for they know not what they do") to Him that judgeth (pres., whose office it is to judge) righteously (i. e. the Father: designated in ref. as ὁ ἀπορωπολήμπτως κρίνων. Calv. says well, "Qui sibi ad expetendam vindictam indulgent, non iudicis officium Deo concedunt, sed quodam modo facere volunt suum carnificem"). 24.] who Himself (now the ἀγαθοποιῶν reaches its height. He was not only negatively innocent, ver. 22, but suffered in the pursuance of the noblest purpose of love, and that love towards us: by which fact His example is further brought home and endeared to us) bore our sins (but in the pregnant sense of "bore to sacrifice," "carried and offered up:" see notes on James ii. 21, Ἀβραάμ . . . ἀνεέγκας Ἰσαὰκ . . . ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον: see Levit. xiv. 20; Heb. vii. 27. It is a word belonging to sacrifice, and not to be dissociated from it. In Isa. liii. 12, αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνένεγκεν, (Heb. ix. 28,) we have the sense of bearing on Himself more prominent: and by that passage our rendering here must be regulated: always remembering that the other sense lies behind) in His (own) (this is almost required by the repetition of αὐτοῦ after αὐτός, when it might have been well omitted, if no emphasis had been intended) body on the tree (constr. pragn., "took them to the tree and offered them up on it;" as the above sense of ἀνήνεγκεν necessitates. Cf. Vitrina in Luther: "Vix uno verbo ἔμφασις vocis ἀναφέρειν exprimi potest. Nota ferre et offerre. Primodocere voluit Petrus, Christum portasse peccata nostra, in quantum illa ipsi erant imposita. Secundo, ita tulisse peccata nostra, ut ea secum obtulerit in altari. Respicit ad animantes, quibus peccata primo imponebantur, quique deinceps peccatis onusti offerbantur. Sed in quam aram ξύλον αἰτ

Petrus, lignum, h. e., crucem"); tha (purpose of that great and crowning suffering of the Lord) having died (not, as some Commentators, "having past away," being removed to a distance "longefacti a peccatis," Grot.), but literally, "having died:" so Herod. ii. 85, 136, μηδ' ἄλλον μηδένα τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἀπογενόμενον θάψαι: v. 4, vi. 58, and other examples in Raphael and Wetstein) to our sins (reff.), we should live to righteousness (the same contrast is found, but with another image, of being freed from, and become servants to, in Rom. vi. 18. In ib. ver. 11, where the same figure of death and life is used, it is νεκροὺς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ), by whose stripe ye were healed (μώλωψ, the weal left by a stripe. From Isa. liii. 5, τῷ μώλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν. "Paradoxon apostolicum: vibice sanati estis. Est autem μώλωψ, vibex, frequens in corpore servili, Sir. xxiii. 10." Bengel). 25.] For (justification of the last assertion by another allusion to Isa. liii.) ye were straying like sheep (so in ref. Isa., πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν): but ye have returned (not, "have been converted:" the 2 aor. pass. ἐπεστράφην occurs often in a middle sense, and it is impossible to press the passive: cf. Matt. (ix. 22) x. 13; Mark v. 30. Wiesinger's reason for doing so, that this word corresponds to ἰάθητε, is hardly tenable: it may with just as much plausibility be alleged that it corresponds to ἦτε πλανώμενοι now unto the Shepherd (cf. ch. v. 4, and the prophecies in Isa. xl. 11; Ezek. xxxiv. 23, xxxvii. 24, also John x. 11) and Bishop (there may be a reference to Ezek. xxxiv. 11, ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐκζητήσω τὰ πρόβατά μου καὶ ἐπισκόφημαι αὐτά (not to ref. Job, as some): but the most likely account of the expression is, that the Apostle transfers the well-known name of the elders of the churches, ἐπίσκοποι, to the great Head of the Church, of whom they were all the servants and representatives. On

c Acts xx. 28. μένα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. III. 1 Ὁμοίως, ABCKL
FN a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13
Phil. i. 1. [αἱ] γυναικες, ὑποτασσόμεναι τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν, ἵνα
1 Tim. iii. 2. καὶ εἴ τις ἐπειθούσιν τῷ λόγῳ, διὰ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν
Tit. i. 7 only. ἡ ἀναστροφῆς ἅνευ λόγου κερδηθήσονται, 2 ἐποπτεύου-
Job xx. 29. σατες τὴν ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνὴν ἀναστροφήν ὑμῶν. 3 ὃν
d Heb. xii. 9. ref.
e 2nd pers., Luke vi. 41.
f ch. ii. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 14.
g ch. i. 15 ref. h Matt. x. 29. ch. iv. 9 only. Amos ii. 5. i = 1 Cor. 1 ch. u. 12
1 Tim. ii. 11. k = Matt. xviii. 15. 1 Cor. ix. 19 & + ind fut., Rev. iii. 9 ref. j = 1 Cor. 1 ch. u. 12
i. 17. m = Tit. ii. 5. 2 Cor. xi. 2. Prov. xix. 3.

CHAP. III. 1. om αι ABN¹: ins CKL[P]N³ rel Thl Ec. εἰ bef και CK b m o :
om και B a copt arm Ps-Ath[-int.] Fulg: txt AL[P]N rel vulg Clem, Aug Bede.—
οιτινες, omg εἰ, a c. rec κερδηθήσονται, with a b' j o [Damasc-ed]: txt A B(sic, see
table) CKL[P]N rel 36(sic) Clem, [Damasc-ms] Thl Ec.

2. ἐΠΟΠΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ N¹ a.

the name and office, see notes, Acts xx. 17, 28; Phil. i. 1 of your souls (so in ch. i. 9, 22, and in ver. 11).

CHAP. III. 1—7.] *Exhortations in regard to the married state:* and (1—6) *to wives:* (7) *to husbands.* 1.] *In like manner* (i.e. after the same general principle, enounced in ch. ii. 13, as the οἰκέται in their relation) *wives* (γυν., as οἱ οἰκέται, ch. ii. 18, οἱ ἄνδρες, ver. 7, is vocative. This is decisively shewn by ὑμῶν below, as in ver. 7. By the context γυναικες is shewn to be wives) [by being] *in subjection* to (the participle, as in ch. ii. 18: carrying on the general πάντας τιμήσατε) *your own husbands* (ἰδίοις gives point to the obligation, but is without any distinctive emphasis: see the parallel place, Eph. v. 22, and note), *that even if* (καὶ εἰ puts into climax the hypothesis: εἰ καί, only that which follows the καί, i.e. the fact assumed: see for the full elucidation of this, 1 Cor. vii. 21 note, and Winer, § 53. 7, Hermann on Viger, p. 832, Klotz, Devar. ii. 519 f., Hartung i. p. 139; the views of Hermann and Klotz differing slightly from the above and Hartung, but coming to the same in the end. In this place, as De Wette remarks, καὶ εἰ assumes as possible, the apparently exceptional case which may seem to justify the wives' disobedience: εἰ καί would concede that the fact was so and direct notice to the fact itself) *any* (husbands) *are disobedient to the word* (in a state of unbelieving disobedience; most probably, though this is not directly nor necessarily assumed, heathens), *they shall be won* (see ref.: converted to faith and obedience: made a gain for Christian love, and for Christ Himself. Cf. Leighton: "A soul converted is gained to itself, gained to the pastor, or friend, or wife, or husband who sought it, and gained to Jesus Christ: added to His treasury, who thought not His own precious blood too dear to lay out for this gain." On ἵνα with an indic. fut., see Winer, § 41. δ.

1. b: and cf. ref.) *without word* (without the wives preaching to them, or exhorting them, but simply by your Christian behaviour. The grammarians call this way of speaking, in which a word (λόγου) is intentionally used in two different senses in the same sentence, *antanaclasis*. The other rendering, 'without the word,' is not indeed, as Wiesinger, precluded by the absence of the article, for λόγου, *indefinite*, might just as well, with the exclusive preposition ἄνευ, refer to the Gospel,—but on account of the general improbability of such a saying, seeing that faith is grounded on hearing, and hearing on the word of God. Besides which, the wives' conversation, being a shewing forth of obedience to the word, could not be said to produce its effect ἄνευ (τοῦ) λόγου. Ec. proposes a curious alternative rendering: ἄνευ λόγου, ἥτοι σχολάζοντος παντὸς λόγου καὶ πάσης ἀντιλογίας ἥ (then follows the interpretation as given above, but very well put) ὡς τῆς διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιδείξεως κυριωτέρας οὔσης τῆς διὰ τῶν λόγων περιεργίας. ἔφωνον γὰρ ἔργον κρείσσον ἀπράκτου λόγου) *by means of the behaviour of their wives,*

2.] *when they behold* (lit. "having beheld," the time of the ἐΠΟΠΤΕΥΟΝΤΕΣ is slightly antecedent to that of κερδηθήσονται, but not enough to justify the use of the past. part. in English. On the verb, see ref.) *your chaste behaviour* (ἀγνήν, in the largest sense, not with its proper reference only: modest and pure) *coupled with fear* (so the E. V., admirably: conducted, led, maintained, in a spirit of reverence to your husbands, cf. Eph. v. 33, ἥ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φόβηται τὸν ἄνδρα. The connexion of words is τὴν ἐν φόβῳ | ἀγνήν ἀναστροφῆν, not, as Huther, τὴν | ἐν φόβῳ ἀγνήν | ἀναστροφῆν).

3.] *Of whom* (the wives; you, who are addressed) *let* (the adornment) *be* (much better so, supplying the word from κόσμος expressed below, than either, 1. as E. V. al. taking

ἔστω οὐχ ὁ ἑξωθεν ἑμπλοκῆς τριχῶν καὶ περιθέσεως χρυσιῶν ἢ ἐνδύσεως ἱματίων κόσμος, ἀλλ' ὁ κρυπτὸς τῆς καρδίας ἄνθρωπος ἐν τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ τοῦ πραεὸς καὶ ἡσύχιου πνεύματος, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ πολυτελής. οὕτως γὰρ ποτὲ καὶ αἱ ἁγία γυναῖκες αἱ ἐλπίζουσαι εἰς θεὸν ἐκόσμου ἐαυτάς, ὑποτασσόμεναι

6. xx. 33. 1 Tim. ii. 9 al. s here only. Job xli. 4 (5) only. t = here only. 2 Kings i. 24. u = Rom ii. 29. 1 Cor. xiv. 25. v see ch. i. 22 Rom. ii. 15, 29. 1 Cor. iv. 5 al. w so Rom. vii. 22. 2 Cor. iv. 16. Eph. iii. 16. x = Luke iv. 14. Rom. ii. 29. 1 Cor. iv. 21. y ch. i. 4 reff. constr., Rom. viii. 3 Phil. iv. 5. Winer, § 34. 2. τὸ πᾶν τῆς πολιτείας, Thuc. i. 68. τὸ τ. θεῶν εὐμενές, Demosth. p. 20 a. z Matt. v. 5. xi. 29. xxi. 5 (from Zech. ix. 9) only. xxxvi. 11. a 1 Tim. ii. 2 only. Isa. lxvi. 2 only. b = 1 Cor. iv. 21 Gal. vi. 1 c subjective, Luke xvi. 15. 1 Tim. ii. 3 v. 4 al. fr. Ps. cxiv. 8. d Mark xiv. 3. 1 Tim. ii. 9 only. Prov. i. 13 al. e ch. ii. 10. f 2 Cor. i. 10. John v. 45 only. Ps. cxlv. 15. Isa. ii. 5 bis, see ch. i. 13 reff. g Matt. xii. 44 || L. 1 Tim. ii. 9. Rev. xxi. 2 al. Ezek. xvi. 13 reff. h ver. li.

3. om τριχῶν Carm Clem., ins η bef περιθεσεως C vulg spec Syr Ps-Ath[-int,] Cypr.

4. om τω Ν¹ [εν τω φθάρτω Α¹]. πραεως BKLN c f m 13 [Damasc-ms₂]. om και Ν¹. ηνυχιος (sic) N. transp πρ. and ησυχ. B vulg spec copt Ps-Ath, Aug Ambr.

5. εκοσμου ἐαυτας bef αι ἐλπίζουσαι επι τον θεον Ν. rec (for εις) επι, with KL[P]N rel Œc: txt ABC a c d 13. 36 Damasc₁ Thl. rec ins τον bef θεου, with N rel 86 Œc: om ABCKL[P] b d m o 13 Damasc₁ Thl.

the word κόσμος expressed below as the subject, and supplying it after ἑξωθεν, which however comes to the same in sense, or, 2. as Huther, taking ὧν ἔστω as complete in itself, "let whose business be;" which is against not only probable construction, but the analogy of 1 Tim. v. 9, which see) not the outward adornment (ὃ ἑξωθεν κόσμος belong together, the intermediate words merely serving to define the κόσμος as that most usually adopted by women) of braiding of hair (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 9, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν, and Ellicott's note there) and putting round (the head, as diadems, or the arm, as bracelets, or the leg, as anklets, or the finger, as rings, or generally, hanging the body round with) of golden ornaments (χρυσίον, see ch. i. 7, 18, and note at the latter place) or of putting on of dresses ("the sex which began first our engagement to the necessity of clothing, having still a peculiar propensity to be curious in that, to improve the necessity to an advantage." Leighton. The three verbal substantives, as Bengel, "innuunt operam comendi multa tempora absumentem"): 4.] but (rather let their adornment be) the hidden man of the heart (= ὃ ἔσω[θεν] ἄνθρωπος, see reff. Here, as Wies. well argues, it is not, as in ref. Rom., merely the inner man as distinguished from the outer man, which unbelievers have as well as believers: and that for this reason, that the κρυπτὸς ἄνθρωπος is not here that which is to be adorned, but is itself the adornment: and consequently is of necessity the regenerate life itself in its freshness and beauty. And this is designated as being τῆς καρδίας, a gen. of apposition,—consisting in the heart, changed,

and lovely with Christian affections and graces), in (standing in, as its condition and element. No art. is needed before ἐν, because this clause is further descriptive, not of ἄνθρωπος, but of κόσμος) the incorruptible (ornament) (τῷ ἀφθάρτῳ, a concrete adj. used by preference over the abstract noun, apparently as contrasted with the concretes just mentioned) of the meek and quiet spirit ("mansuetus, qui non turbat: tranquillus, qui turbas aliorum fert placide. Ad illud refer ver. 5 fin.: ad hoc, ver. 6 fin." Bengel) which (viz. the meek and quiet spirit: not, as Grot. al., the whole preceding, ἀλλ' . . . πνεύματος, nor, as Bengel and Steiger, τὸ ἀφθαρτον. The art. before πραεὶς marks the antecedent to the ὃ) is in the sight of God ("qui interna, non externa spectat," Bengel) of great price (reff.: the word used for costly ointment and raiment). 5.] For (enforcing of the same by example) in this manner (i. e. with the ornament of a meek and quiet spirit) formerly also (as well as you, if you obey) the holy women (ἁγίαί, as in Luke i. 70; Acts iii. 21; Eph. iii. 5; women of blessed note in the sacred history as servants of God), who hoped (ἐλπίζουσαι, part. of the imperfect, according to Winer, § 45. 1: but is it not rather the indefinite pres. part. defining the quality or office, as ὁ σπείρων, ὁ πειράζων?) in God (i. e. whose hope was directed towards, and rested in, God. Bengel remarks, "vera sanctitas, spes in Deum: est hoc epitheton pars subjecti"), adorned themselves, being in subjection to their own husbands (this clause describes the state in which the adornment was put on, to which it belonged: being thus in subjection, they were adorned with the meek

τῶς ^h ἰδίους ^h ἀνδράσιν, ⁶ ὡς Σάρρα ⁱ ὑπήκουσεν τῷ Ἀβραάμ, ^{ABCKL} ^{PN} ^{a b c} ^d ^{g h j} ^{k l m} ^o ¹³
ⁱ = Heb xi. 8 reff. = aor., as Gal. iv. 9.
^k ^{GEN} ^{xviii} ¹² ⁱ ^{Cot.} ^{ix.} ²⁰ ⁱ ^{Gal.} ^{iv.} ³¹ ^m ^{ch} ^{ii.} ¹⁵ ⁿ ^{here} ^{only}.
¹ ^{Mac.} ^{iii.} ²⁵ ¹ ^{Mac.} ^{iii.} ²⁵ ^{Ed-vat.} [πτόη (?), ABE] only. (-είσθαι, Luke xxi. 9.) ^o here only. = Sir. xxv. 8, 16.
^p = 2 Pet. i. 5, 6.

6. *υπηκουεν* B(sic : see table) m vulg spec Syr æth[?] Aug, Fulg.

7. *om oi B.* for *συνοικουντες κατα γνωσιν, συνομιλουντες* N¹.

rec συγκαλη-

and quiet spirit which belongs to it):

6.] *As* (e. g.) *Sarah obeyed* (aor. It refers to her whole course of obedience considered as a completed whole: cf. reff., and John xvii. 4) *Abraham calling him lord* (ref.: *ὁ δὲ κύριός μου πρεσβύτερος*): of *whom ye have become* (i. e. by your implanting through faith into the family of faithful Abraham. The aor. properly refers back to the precise time when they were so made; but cannot be so expressed in English) *children*, if (the connexion of the following participles is variously taken. The worst way is with Bengel, Ernesti, al. to suppose them in apposition with *υποτασσόμεναι* above, ὡς . . . τέκνα being in a parenthesis: for there is nothing in either of the participles which finds any historical justification in the history of the holy women. Didymus, al., understand them of the manner in which ye are to become Sarah's children: Harless, Wies., al., of the sign by which your having so become is to be known: but it is perhaps better to take them as the condition on which: and so most Commentators and virtually the E. V. "as long as," rendering literally the *dum* of Beza) *ye do good, and are not afraid of any sudden fear* (to what do these words allude? As in reff., they appear to be a citation from Prov.: where it is said to him that obeys the counsels of wisdom, οὐ φοβηθήσῃ πτόησιν ἐπελθοῦσαν, οὐδὲ ὁρμᾶς ἀσεβῶν ἐπερχομένας. This passage, the coincidence with which can hardly be fortuitous, seems to point to the objective rather than the subjective sense of *πτόησις*, so that *φοβεῖσθαι πτόησιν* is not = *φοβεῖσθαι φόβον*, but *πτόησις* is some external cause of terror. And such a meaning would suit very well with the context, in which as in ver. 14, the Apostle is often encouraging his readers to bear affliction and persecution cheerfully. So that we may interpret *πτόησιν* with Est., "quod dum facitis, non est quod metuatis quidquam mali: velut, ne maritis vestris displiceatis, si minus corruptæ inceditis: aut ne serviliter vos tractent, si faciles ad obsequium vos præbeatis; ut solet sexus muliebri vanis pavoribus esse obnoxius. Sed et si forte natis estis maritis iniquiores, silentio potius ac patientia, quam multis

verbis studeate eorum animos lenire." Cf. Luke xxi. 9; xxiv 37. Huther quotes from Stephanus an extraordinary explanation, "jubentur mulieres officium facere etiam cum nullas eas metus constrigit, i. e. sponte et ultro." And Ec., interpreting *ἀγαθοποιῶσαι* of doing good deeds of benevolence, understands this of the wives not being afraid of the account which their (unbelieving) husbands would require of them: *ἐλεήμονας αὐτὰς εἶναι παραίνει, μηδὲν ὑποβλεπομένας τὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνδρῶν αὐτῶν διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλογισμὸν*. See Winer, § 32. 2. δ, who however interprets *πτόησιν* subjectively). With regard to the much-disputed question whether by the preceding injunction all ornament of dress is forbidden, or only the making such ornament *the adorning*, it may safely be left to the Christian wisdom of believing women, to be not unwise, but understanding what the will of the Lord is, in this as in other similar matters. Within the limits of propriety and decorum, the common usage is the rule. There is sin in singularity, both as ministering to pride in ourselves, and as giving offence to others and discommending our holy religion. As Leighton well says, "There may be in some an affected pride in the meanness of apparel; and in others, under either neat or rich attire, a very humble unaffected mind . . . 'Magnus qui fictilibus utitur tanquam argento; nec ille minor qui argento tanquam fictilibus,' says Seneca: Great is he who enjoys his earthenware as if it were plate, and not less great is the man to whom all his plate is no more than earthenware."

7.] *Duty of husbands to their wives*. *Ye husbands in like manner* (*ὁμοίως*, not as Est., Grot., Steiger, al., '*vicissim*,' but referring back to the πάντας τιμήσατε ch. ii. 17: cf. *τιμήν* below. This has not been seen, owing to inattention to the aor. there: even Huther, who interprets *ὁμοίως* rightly, that there is a certain *τιμή* due to the wife, as to the husband and the master before, does not connect the idea with the general precept under which all these are ranged) *dwelling* (*συνοικεῖν* is referred by the older expositors (e. g. Jerome contra Jov. i. 7, vol. ii. p. 248, Aug. in Ps. cxlvi., vol. iv. pt. ii.,

^α σκεύει τῷ ^γ γυναικεῖ, ^ς ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν ὡς καὶ ^ι συγ-
κληρονόμοις ^α χάριτος ^ν ζωῆς, ^ω εἰς τὸ μὴ ^ε ἐγκόπτεσθαι
τὰς προσευχὰς ὑμῶν.

⁸ ^γ Τὸ δὲ τέλος πάντες ^ζ ὁμόφρονες, ^α συμπαθεῖς, ^β φιλ-
only. w. τιμ., Jos. Antt. i. 7 1 t Rom. viii. 17. Eph. iii. 6 Heb. xi. 9 only t. (-μεῖν, Sir.
xxii. 26.) u = ch. i. 13. v = James i. 12 ref. w = Heb. ii. 17
ref x Acts xiv. 4 Rom. xv. 22. Gal. v. 7 1 Thess. ii. 18 only t. Dan. ix. 26 Theod.-Ald. only
y = here only. Xen. Cyrop. i. 4. 1. z here only (see Rom. xii. 16) t. ἐννέα κοῦρας ὁμόφρονος,
Hes. Theogon. 60 ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχοντας, Theognis 81. a here only t. Jos Antt. xix.
7 3. (-θεῖν, Heb. iv. 15. x. 34.) b here only t. 2 Macc. xv. 14 only. (-φία, ch. i. 22.)

ρονομοι, with ACKL[P] rel syr Jer₁: -μοις **N**¹: txt B^N³ m o [13] vulg spec Syr [copt
(appy)] aeth arm Thl **Θ**c Aug Ambr Cassiod. ins ποικιλῆς hef χαρίτος (see ch iv.
10) A²C²**N** a c Jer. rec εκκοπτεσθαι, with C²KL rel Thl₂, ut non interdicantur syr:
txt AB[P] d j k l, evk. **N** c, ut ne impediatur vulg spec [Ambr Aug] Jer. (C¹ uncert.)
ταῖς προσευχαῖς B, impingatis in orationibus vestris Syr [(copt)].

8. (B has φιλαδελφοι, not φυλ., see table.)

al.) to the 'tori conjugal consuetudo' but for this there seems no reason, as the word is often used of the whole conjugal life: so Kypke here, "*coniubio juncti vivunt*: ad totum respicit vitæ consortium, in quo justo copulati matrimonio vitam transigunt. Est hæc frequentior vocis notio, quæ apud Græcos antiquiores, ni fallor, sola occurrit. Demosth. in Neæram, p. 534, scopum τοῦ συνοικεῖν esse dicit, ut liberi gignantur legitimi et ingenui, et ab hoc distinguit τὸ ἐταῖρας καὶ παλλακὰς ἔχειν" according to knowledge (in an intelligent and reasonable manner, well aware of the ἀσθένεια spoken of below: see ref.) with the feminine as with the weaker vessel (γυναικεῖς is an adj. not a subst. as Wahl: see ref. For σκευός, instrument, applied to the wife, see ref. 1 Thess. Here the man is a σκευός also; both being God's instruments in His beneficent work of the multiplication of mankind. The higher use of the word as a vessel of grace, or of wrath, does not preclude the lower one which is most obvious here, where the married relation is the subject of consideration. On ἀσθενεστέρω, Bengel says, "comparativus: etiam vir habet infirmitatem;" and so Steiger: but this is plainly not so: the word 'weaker' being used as comparing with something which is stronger, viz. the man. Some, as Luth., Calv., Beza, Est., Grot., Hamm., E. V., join these words, ὡς ἀσθενεστ. κ.τ.λ., with ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν. But this mars the parallelism and the sense. For the Apostle prescribes two things: 1. consideration for the wife, as of the weaker sex: 2. honour for the wife, as a fellow-heir of the grace of life. **Θ**c. carries on the same idea, of not exacting too rigid accounts, as on ver. 6: τοῦτέστιν, αἰσθήσιν λαμβάνοντες τῆς τοῦ θύλεος κορυφότητος καὶ τοῦ εὐπαραφόρου ἐν πᾶσι, καὶ εἰς μικροψυχίαν εὐολίσθου, μακρόθυμοι γίνεσθε πρὸς αὐτάς, μὴ λόγον ἀπαιτοῦντες πικρῶς τῶν κατὰ

τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῶν εἰς ταμιεῖαν παρακατατιθέντων. But for this there does not seem any reason), giving (ἀπονέμειν, to apporportion, see ref.) honour as to those who are also (besides being your wives) fellow-inheritors (with you) of the grace of life (i. e. God's gracious gift of life eternal: ch. i. 4, 13 suffice to clear the meaning, the former explaining κληρον., the latter, χάρις. So that χάρις ζωῆς must not be weakened into χάρις ζωσα with Erasmus, nor into χάρις ζωοποιούσα with Grot. The reading συγκληρονόμοι, which it is now proved that B has not [Tischdf. however, though he assigns the s to B¹(appy), does not think it quite free from doubt], seems to have arisen from the mistaken joining of ὡς ἀσθ. κ.τ.λ. with ἀπονέμοντες τιμὴν: see var. readd.): in order that your prayers be not hindered (ἐγκόπτειν, ἐμποδίζειν, διακαλύειν, Hesych. The hindrance meant seems to be, that which would be occasioned by the man not giving his wife proper honour as a fellow-heir of the grace of life; in which case the peculiar promise of advantage in social united prayer would be lost: cf. Matt. xviii. 19. According to this view, the united prayers of man and wife are meant. And so most of the Commentators. Cf. Schol.-Matth., ὁ γὰρ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν θόρυβος τῶν κατὰ θεὸν ἔργων ἐμποδίων: and Lyra, "Cum vir et uxor non sunt bene concordēs, minus possunt orationi vacare, et eorum orationes sunt minus exaudibiles." De Wette understands it of losing the confidence requisite for (mutual?) prayer; Wiesinger, of the prayers of the husband alone. If ἐκκόπτεσθαι be read, it must be "be not cut off," see Rom. xi. 22, 24; 2 Cor. xi. 12).

8, 9.] General summary exhortations to mutual forbearance and love.

8.] Finally (τὸ τέλος, adverbial accusative, as μακρὰν, μέτην, ἀκμήν, τὴν ἀρχήν, John viii. 25, δωρεάν, &c. See Winer, § 32. 6. **Θ**c. gives the connexion well: τί χρὴ ἰδιόλο-

c Eph. iv 32 only +
d here only.
Prov xxix 23.
[Plat Mor. p. 386 e.]
e = Rom xii. 17. 1 Thess. v. 15.
f here bis.
1 Tim. v. 14 only.
Prov. x 18. (c-¹ειν).
ch ii 23.
g 2 Cor ii. 7. Gal ii. 7 only + 3 Marc iii 22.
k = Heb vi 7:reff. 1 Heb 1 4 reff.
12 1 Tim i 7 2 Tim iii. 12. James ii 20
l. c. and xxxix. 14. q = John iii. 3 Luke ii. 26 xvi 22. Heb. xi. 5.
xii. 1. s act., here only. constr. w από, here only. Ps xxxiv. 8. gen., ch iv. 1 (w. particip. Heb. x 2 reff.) t = Heb. xii. 16 reff. u constr., Luke iv. 42. xiv. 16. Acts x. 47 al.
v ch. ii 1, 22 al.

ἀδελφοί, ^c εὖσπλαγχοί, ^d ταπεινόφρονες, ⁹ μὴ ^e ἀποδοδόν-
τες ^e κακὸν ἀντὶ ^e κακοῦ ἢ ^f λοιδορίαν ἀντὶ ^f λοιδορίας, ^{ABCKL}
^{PS a b c}
^{d f g h j}
^{k l m o}
¹³
εὐλογούντες, ὅτι εἰς τοῦτο ⁱ ἐκλήθητε
ἵνα ^k εὐλογίαν ^l κληρονομήσητε. ¹⁰ ὁ γὰρ ⁿ θέλων ^o ζῶην
^p ἀγαπᾶν καὶ ^q ἰδεῖν ^r ἡμέρας ἀγαθὰς ^s παυσάτω τὴν γλῶσ-
σαν ^t ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ^u χεῖλῃ ^v τοῦ μὴ λαλήσαι ^v δόλον,

rec (for ταπεινόφρονες) φιλοφρονες, with K[P] rel: φιλοφ. ταπεινοφ. L vulg-ed (and some mss) Thl Ec: txt ABCX a c d g j 13 am (with demid [fuld]) syrr [arm] copt Clem, Antch₁.

9. rec ins εἰδοτες bef οτι, with L[P] rel syr-mg Thl Ec: om ABCX 13 vulg [spec] syrr copt [æth arm] Antch₂ Damasc₁.

10. ημερας bef ιδεν C a c h [vulg-ed]. rec aft γλωσσαν ins αυτου, with KL[P]X rel vulg syrr copt [æth arm Thl Ec]: om ABC 13 [Anton₁]. ins τα bef χεῖλη C₁. rec aft χεῖλη ins αυτου, with L[P] rel [vulg Syr copt æth arm Thl Ec]: om ABCKX a 13 fuld syr.

γεῖσθαι; ἀπλῶς πᾶσι φημί· τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο πᾶσιν ὁ σκοπὸς ἀφορᾶ τῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ τοῦτο νόμος πᾶσιν ἀγάπης), all (being) (the adjectival construction still carried on [from ch. ii. 17]) of one mind (reff.), sympathizing (συμπάθεια ὁ πρὸς τοὺς κακῶς πάσχοντας ὡς καὶ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ἔλεος, Ec. But the meaning is not confined to cases of sorrow: the χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων is also included), loving the brethren, compassionate (in classical Greek, of strong courage, lit. "of strong bowels," as in Hippocr. p. 89 o (Huther); here, and in ref., as Bengel, "misericordes erga afflictos"), humble-minded (the word forms a note of transition to the next verse: humility being essential both to true gentleness of love and to true patience under injuries);

9.] not giving back [to others] evil for evil, or reproach for reproach ("non malum pro malo in factis injuriis, nec maledictum pro maledicto in verbis contentiosis." Lyra), nay rather (the δέ sharpens the contrast more than ἀλλά: see above, on ch. ii. 23) on the contrary, blessing (scil., the evil doer or speaker. The word blessing, in E. V., is liable to be, and generally is, mistaken for the substantive εὐλογία): because to this end (viz. that which follows with ἵνα, as in ch. iv. 6: not as Ec., Grot., Calv., Steiger, De Wette, al., that which has gone before, which would leave a very lame connexion of the sentence: see below) ye were called (by God), that ye might inherit blessing ("qui celestia regnum aliquando hereditare debent, illi sunt benedicti ac filii benedictionis, non solum passive sed etiam active, benedictionem spiritualem a Deo per fidem recipientes et vicissim aliis

ex caritate benedicentes." Gerhard. And this is obviously the right connexion; for, as Wies. remarks, it is not in order to inherit a blessing that we must bless; but because our portion is, blessing: and the reasoning is much as in Eph. iv. 32, χαρίζομενοι ἑαυτοῖς καθὼς καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐν χριστῷ ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν). 10.] For (the above exhortations are impressed by a citation from Ps. xxxiv. (xxxiii. LXX) 13—17. That the citation cannot, as De Wette maintains, apply directly to the last written words, is plain, by the verb κληρονομήσητε, necessarily referring to the future life, whereas the blessings promised in the Psalm as necessarily refer to the present. So that we must connect the citation mainly with the εὐλογούντες, and if we take in the intermediate clause, it must be only secondarily, as connecting, generally, blessing with blessing) he who desireth to love life (the citation is curiously divergent from the LXX, and very difficult to understand. The LXX have, τίς ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος ὁ θέλων ζῶην, ἀγαπᾶν ἡμέρας ἰδεῖν ἀγαθὰς; Here all is plain: whereas θέλων ζῶην ἀγαπᾶν is hardly intelligible. Commentators have endeavoured to make it so by introducing some foreign idea into one or other of the verbs: thus the 'glossa interlinearis,' De Wette, al., "qui vult ostendere, se dilectionem habere:" Bengel and Steiger, "qui vult ita vivere, ut ipsum non tædeat vitæ." Huther, understanding ζῶη of the future life, "He that will love life," seeing that the love of life, in this sense, is dependent on a certain moral relation of man and is impossible without love. But if we are to take the words as they stand, and not rather regard them as another way

11 ὃ ἐκκλινάτω δὲ ἵ ἀπὸ κακοῦ καὶ ποιησάτω ἀγαθόν, ἡ ζητη- γ = (intr.)
Rom. xvi. 17.
Ps. xxxvi.
27 (Rom.
iii. 12 (from
Ps. xiii. 3)
only.]
σάτω εἰρήνην καὶ ἂ διωξάτω αὐτήν. 12 ὅτι ἂ ὀφθαλμοὶ
κυρίου ἂ ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ὅτα αὐτοῦ ἂ εἰς ἂ δέξιν αὐτῶν,
πρὸς ὄψον δὲ κυρίου ἐπὶ ἂ ποιοῦντας ἂ κακά. 13 καὶ τίς ὁ ἂ
ἂ κακώσων ὑμᾶς, ἐὰν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἂ ζήλωται γέννησθε;
14 ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ ἂ πᾶσχοιτε διὰ ἂ δικαιοσύνην, μακάριοι.

γ = (intr.)
Rom. xvi. 17.
Ps. xxxvi.
27 (Rom.
iii. 12 (from
Ps. xiii. 3)
only.]
δ = w. gen., Deut. xi. 12. acc., but in bad sense, Amos ix. 8.
e Heb. v. 7 reff. f John xviii. 20. g Acts vii. 6 (from Gen. xv.
13), 19. h = Rom. ix. 30. i opt. elsw. only in parenth., as 1 Cor. xv. 37. ver. 17. k = Matt. v. 10.
xii 14 al. d see Matt. v. 35. e Heb. v. 7 reff. f John xviii. 20. g Acts vii. 6 (from Gen. xv.
13), 19. h = Rom. ix. 30. i opt. elsw. only in parenth., as 1 Cor. xv. 37. ver. 17. k = Matt. v. 10.
13 al 2 Macc. iv. 2.

11. rec om δε, with C²KL[P]N rel vulg (with am¹ [demid]) Syr copt [arm Anton,] Thl Ec: ins ABC¹ a c m am² (and [fuld] harl tol) syr [æth].

12. rec ins oi bef ὀφθαλμοί, with C² j 36 Ec: om ABC¹KL[P]N rel [arm] Thl. ins την bef δεξιν C.

13. (B has ei, not ean as Muraltio; see table.) rec (for ζήλωται) μιμηται, with KL[P] rel Ec: txt ABCN a c d 13 vulg [syr copt æth arm] (Clem.) Damasc, Thl. γενοισθε B; γεγενεσθαι N¹.

14. for ἀλλ' ei, ei δε AN³ 13: ἀλλὰ ei N¹ [ἀλλὰ καὶ ei P]. aft μακάριοι ins εσται

of expressing the same as in the Psalm, it may well be, "He that loves life and wishes to continue to do so" and to see (reff.) good days, let him refrain (the LXX proceed in the 2nd person, παῖσον . . . σου.

The word itself, like the English one "refrain," implies a natural tendency towards that from which the abstention is to take place) his tongue ("primum notat, quæ linguæ vitia cavenda sint, nempe ne contumeliosi ac petulantes simus: deinde ne fraudulentici ac duplices. Hinc ad facta descendit, ne quem lædamus, vel ne cui inferamus damnum." Calv.) from evil, and lips, that they never speak (aor. referring to single occasions, or, better perhaps, to the whole life considered as one fact) deceit (i. e. speak one thing and mean another):

11.] moreover (the δε brings up a new particular, belonging to a different sphere of conduct) let him turn away from (in act, that is: see reff.) evil, and do good: let him seek peace, and pursue it (because it is not always to be found, and when not immediately found, may require diligent pursuit: cf. ref. Heb. and St. Paul's εἰ δυνατόν, τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν κ.τ.λ. Rom. xii. 18. The 'glossa interlinearis' is good: "inquirat pacem ut rem absconditam, et persequatur eam ut rem fugitivam").

12.] The citation continued, and a reason given for the foregoing conditions of prosperity. Because the eyes of the Lord (Jehovah) are (directed, in a favourable sense,—for good) upon righteous men ("inde vitam habent et dies bonos," Bengel), and His ears (inclined) unto their supplication: but the face of the Lord is (directed, in an unfavourable sense,—for wrath) upon men doing evil things.

13—IV. 6.] Exhortation to right behaviour towards the world in persecutions

which come upon them for righteousness' sake (13—17): and that by the example of Christ (18—22), whose suffering in the flesh, and by consequence whose purity and freedom from sin they are to imitate (iv. 1—6). 13.] And (connected with what preceded: seeing that God takes such care for the righteous, and that the result of that care will be a life worthy to be loved, and good days. Beza, Bengel, al., would make the καὶ only a 'formula interrogandi.' But the other is to me much more probable: and indeed, as De W. well says, even in cases where καὶ appears merely to introduce a question, it in reality always connects) who is he that shall harm you (not, as Wies., if I understand him, "that will have any mind to harm you" (nicht in dem Sinne daß Niemand ihnen etwas anhaben kann sondern in dem Sinne, daß ihnen Niemand Uebles wird thun wollen): many will have this: but your μακαριότης will be such as to turn off all their malice and make even suffering itself to be happiness) if ye be (by having become: aor.: but we cannot express this in English otherwise than by expressing its result, ye be) emulous [i. e. as in E. V. followers: the Rheims version has emulators, which if it were sufficiently English would be better] of that which is good (τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is first, for emphasis: "if it be that which is good, of which you are zealous?" Thus the contrast between κακώσων and τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is stronger. The adj. has been taken by some as masc.: but probably only on account of the apparent difficulty of μιμηταί (rec.) being joined with it. This latter reading has most likely come in from 3 John 11, μὴ μιμοῦ τὸ κακόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθόν)? 14.] Nay if even (see

m Mark iv. 41. τὸν δὲ ^m φόβον ⁿ αὐτῶν μὴ ^m φοβηθῆτε μηδὲ ^o ταραχθῆτε, ABCKL
 Luke ii. 9. 15 ^p κύριον δὲ τὸν ^p χριστὸν ^q ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς ^r καρδίαις P a b c
 Jonah i. 10. ὑμῶν. ^s ἔτοιμοι [δὲ] ἀεὶ ^s πρὸς ^t ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ d r f g h j
 Is. viii. 12, 13. αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς ^u λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος ἀλλὰ ^v μετὰ k l m o
 n indef. pron. ^w πραύτητος καὶ φόβου, ¹⁶ ^x συνείδησιν ἔχοντες ^x ἀγαθῶν, 13
 John viii. 44. o i. e. = Matt.
 Rom. ii. 26. ii. 3, xiv. 26. John xiv. 1. Esth iii. 15. p Col. iii. 24 q = Matt. vi. 9 Eccl. xx 8. Isa. xxix.
 Luke xxiii. 51. 23. Sir xxxiii. 4. r = ver. 4 reff. s Tit iii 1. t = Acts xxii 1. (xxvi 2) Phil 1.
 51. Winer, 7, 16. constr., 1 Cor. ix. 3. absol., 2 Cor. vii 11. 2 Tim. iv. 16 only +. Wisd. vi 10 only. u Heb. xiii. 17 reff.
 o i. e. = Matt. v = Heb. iv. 16 reff. w James i. 21 reff. x Heb. (ix 9) x. 22 reff.

N [arm]. om μηδε ταραχθε BL.

15. ^{rec} (for ^{χριστον} ^{θεον}, with KL[P] rel Thl ^{CEc}: om [τ. χρ.] ^{aeth} Promiss: txt ABCN a c 13 vulg syrr copt arm Clem₁. om 2nd δε BCN a b c o 13. 36 vulg [spec] copt arm Orig₃ Bede. ^{απαιτουντι} AN³ [Damasc-ms]. rec om ^{αλλα}, with KL[P] rel [spec] Syr ^{CEc}: ins ABCN a c 13 vulg syr copt arm Clem₁ Damasc₁ Thl.

on ^{ει} καί, above, ver. 1) ye chance to suffer ("levius verbum quam ^{κακοῦσθαι}." Beng. In fact the ^{πάθημα} need not be a ^{κακόν}, but may be an ^{ἀγαθόν}, and is, in the case supposed. The opt. after ^{ει} usually takes place when "illa quæ ponitur conditio, non revocatur ad veritatem, sed fingitur tantummodo cogitatione." Klotz, Devar. ii. p. 491) on account of righteousness (Wies. quotes Augustine's "martyrem facit non pœna sed causa." ^{δικαιοσ.} ^{δικαιοσ.}, that right and holy living to which you devote yourselves and which gives offence to the ungodly world. ^{διὰ} ^{δικ.} = ^{ἐνεκεν} ^{δικαιοσύνης} in our Lord's saying Matt. v. 10, and ^{ἐνεκεν} ^{ἐμοῦ}, ib. ver. 11), blessed are ye ("ne hoc quidem vitam beatam vobis aufert, immo potius auget." Beng.). But ("doct quomodo suscipienda sint adversa, ne beatitas imminuatur." Beng. The words are almost verbatim from Isa. viii. 12, 13) be not afraid of their terror (not, "afraid of," as E. V. ^{φόβον} is, as in l. c., subjective, and ^{φοβηθῆναι} ^{φόβον} merely as ^{χαλπεῖν} ^{χαράν} and the like. The command amounts to this, "be not affected in heart by the fear which they strive to inspire into you") nor be troubled ("sicut summum malorum quæ lex minatur est cor pavidum et formidine plenum, Lev. xxvi. 36, Dent. xxviii. 65, ita maximum bonorum quæ Christus nobis promeruit inque Evangelio offert, est cor de gratia Dei certum ac proinde in omnibus adversis et periculis tranquillum." Gerh.):

15.] ^{may} rather (the sharply adverbative ^{δέ}, see above on ch. ii. 23) sanctify (reff.) in your hearts (in the O. T. passage it is added, ^{καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται σου φόβος}. "This addition is not made here, but ^{ἐν ταῖς} ^{καρδ.} ^{ὑμῶν}, to bring out that the ^{ἀγιάσατε} must be perfected in the inner parts of a man and so keep him from all false fear. As if he would say, Care only for this, that your heart may be a temple of Christ, in which becoming honour may be given to Him as Lord; then will nothing further

disturb you: you have in Him all that you can need." Wiesinger) Christ as Lord (^{κύριον} is emphatically placed forward as predicate; and the expression ^{τὸν κύριον τῶν δυνάμεων αὐτῶν} (LXX-F., not A) changed in a Christian senso into ^{κύριον δὲ τὸν χριστὸν}): [but (so far from being afraid of men, be ever ready to give them a gentle and reverent answer when they enquire of your hope)], (being) (the same adjectival sentences as before) ready always for (^{έτοιμ.} ^{πρός}, ref. [i. e. to give]) an answer (an apologetic justification, in the primitive Christian sense. This was most commonly given before official persons and on trial, but in the present case is expressly extended to every person and occasion) to every man (^{παντί}, dat. aft. ^{ἀπολογίαν}, as in ref. 1 Cor.) that asketh of you a reason (a reasonable account) concerning the hope [that is] in you (^{ἐλπίς}, not as Calvin = ^{πίστις} = "spes hic per synecdochen pro fide capitur"), but as Luth.: "in persecutione oportet nos habere spem: si ratio spei exigitur, oportet nos habere verbum." And Bengel: "spes christianorum sæpe commovet alios ad percontandum"), but (^{ἀλλά} makes a contrast to the ^{έτοιμότης}—ready, but not over ready: see Luther, below) with meekness (see above on ver. 4) and fear (another antanacsis, after ^{μὴ φοβηθῆτε φόβον} above. This fear is not the fear of God exclusively, nor that of men, but the aspect of the mind as regards both: proper respect for man, and humble reverence of God. The case supposed would generally occur when some one invested with authority asked a reason: and the complexion of the answer to be given is taken from that circumstance. On the injunction, Luther says, speaking from his own experience at Worms and elsewhere, "Then must ye not answer with proud words and bring out the matter with a defiance and with violence as if ye would tear up trees, but with such fear and lowliness as if ye

ἵνα ὃ ἐν ᾧ καταλαλεῖσθε ^a καταισχυνθῶσιν οἱ ^b ἐπηρεάζοντες ὑμῶν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἐν χριστῷ ^c ἀναστροφὴν. ^{17 d} κρείττον γὰρ ^e ἀγαθοποιοῦντας εἰ ^f θέλοι τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ ^g πᾶσχειν ἢ ^h κακοποιοῦντας, ¹⁸ ὅτι καὶ χριστὸς ⁱ ἅπαξ ^j περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ^k ἔπαθεν ^l δίκαιος ὑπὲρ ^m ἀδίκων, ἵνα ἡμᾶς

y ch. ii. 12.
z James iv. 11
a = ch. ii. 7
b Luke vi. 28
(Matt. v. 44
v. r.) only t.
(-αστή, Ps. lvi. 3
Symm.)
c ch. i. 15 reff.
d = 1 Cor. vii. 9. Phil i. 23. 2 Pet. ii. 21. (Heb. i. 4 reff.) Prov. iii. 14. e ch. ii. 15 reff.
f opt., see ver. 14. g Mark iii. 4 || L. 3 John ii only. 2 Kings xxiv. 17 A. h = Heb. ix. 26, 27, 28. x. 2. Jude 3, 5. i Heb. x. 7, 8 al. fr. k absol. of Christ, Heb. ix. 26 reff. l 1 John ii. 1. m Matt. v. 45. Acts xxiv. 15.

16. Steph (for καταλαλεῖσθε) καταλαουσιν [arry from ch ii. 12], with ACK[P]N L^s d f h 13 [vulg], καταλουσιν j: elz καταλαῶσιν, with L rel Syr copt Thl Ec Bede₁: txt B a c 69. 137 syr Clem₁. rec adds ὑμῶν ὡς κακοποιῶν [also from ch ii. 12], with ACKL[P]N 13 fuld (and harl tol) Syr syr-w-ast copt [æth] Thl Ec Bede₁: om B a c 69. 137 vulg spec arm Clem₁. εν χριστω bef αγαθην (C)[KL] a b c o.—for αγαθην, αγνην C [syr-mg]. for εν χριστω, εις χν. N¹.

17. [αγαθοποιουντες and] κακοποιουντες C. rec θελει, with 13: om l 26: txt ABCKL[P]N rel Clem, Thl Ec. for η, ει N¹[L].

18. om και N [harl Cyr₁ Orig-int₁ Aug₁]. ins των bef αμαρτιων N¹(N³ disapproving). aft αμαρτιων ins ημων [C²(appy)] vulg-ed Syr Cyr₁ Aug₁; υπερ ημων [C¹(appy)] LN c 13. 36 [copt Did₁]; υπερ υμων A a b o [arm]: om BK[P] rel am tol [Cyr₁ Thl Ec]. for επαθεν, απεθανεν A[C]N a k 13 vulg syrr copt [æth arm] Cyr₁ Did₂ Sev₁ Cyr₁ Aug₁: txt BKL[P] rel Thl-comm Ec Aug₁. om ημας N¹: υμας B a b j m o syrr arm.

stood before God's tribunal . . . so must thou stand in fear, and not rest on thine own strength, but on the word and promise of Christ," Matt. x. 19 f. (in Wiesinger)):

16.] **having a good conscience** (viz. when you make your apology, "quia parum auctoritatis habet sermo absque vita, ideo fidei professioni bonam conscientiam adiungit." Calv. This is better, seeing that the same subject, that of behaviour under persecution, is afterwards carried on, ver. 17, than with De Wette and Steiger to regard these words as taking up the former part of ver. 15), **that in the matter in which** (ἐν ᾧ, see note on ch. ii. 12) **ye are spoken against** (see var. readd.) **they who traduce** (ref. Aristotle, Rhet. ii. 2, gives the idea of ἐπηρεασμός: ἔστιν ὁ ἐπηρεασμός ἐμποδισμός ταῖς βουλήσσειν, οὐχ ἵνα τι ἀντῷ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἐκείνῳ. If so, when applied to words, it will mean envious detraction) **your good** (ἀγαθός = καλός, ch. ii. 12) **conversation** (behaviour in life) **in Christ** (as Christians, —your whole life being in Christ, as its element: see 1 Cor. iv. 17; Col. ii. 6) **may be ashamed**.

17.] **For** (confirmation of the exhortation to a good conscience above: Ec., al., refer it to ver. 14, μακάριοι ἵστε) **it is better** (we have had a similar argument in ch. ii. 19, 20, from which passage the sense of κρείττον here is made clear: there it is said of the suffering for well-doing, that it is χάρις, that it is κλέος, that εἰς τοῦτο ἐκλήθητε. "Beatus," says Bengel, "in finitis modis:" "Hæc consolatio," says Calvin, "arcana potius meditatione, quam longo verborum circuitu

percipitur:" and Gerhard, "Occurrit tacitæ objectioni . . . Non adeo graviter . . . ferrem, si essem promeritus. Respondet Petrus, satius est te non esse meritum, ut benefaciens ac male audiens te verum Christianum probes" (mainly from Wiesinger)) to suffer (for) (see ch. ii. 20, and the connexion as given there) **doing well, if the will of God should will (it so)** (on the optative after εἰ, signifying "if perchance it should be so," see above on ver. 14. In the expression, εἰ θέλοι τὸ θέλημα, τὸ θέλημα is the divine Will itself, τὸ θέλειν is the putting forth of that Will in act: see Winer, § 65. 2. Luther (in Wies.) says beautifully, *Sehe du hin in Glaube und Liebe: kommt das Kreuz, so nimm es an: kommt es nicht, so such' es nicht*, than (for) **doing ill**: 18—

22.] **Establishment of the above position on the fact of Christ having Himself suffered, being righteous**, and through death, even in death vanquishing the power of death, entered into His glory at God's right hand:

18.] **because** (not 'for': it does not only render a reason, but lays down the reason why Christian suffering for well-doing is blessed) **Christ also** (as well as yourselves if ye be so called as to suffer) **suffered for sins** (the thought is somewhat similar to that in ch. ii. 21, but the intent of it different: there, it was as an example to us that the sufferings of Christ were adduced: here, it is as a proof of the blessedness and advantage of suffering for well-doing, that proof being closely applied to us by the fact that that suffering was undertaken on our behalf, and that

n = Luke ix. 41. ¹¹ *προσαγάγῃ τῷ θεῷ, ° θανατωθεὶς μὲν ὡς σαρκί, ὡς ζωοποι-* ABCKL
 Acta xvi. 20. *θεὶς δὲ ἵπνεύματι,* ¹⁹ *ἐν ᾧ καὶ τοῖς ἐν ὧς φυλακῇ ἵπνεύματι* P a b c
 Gen xliiii. 9 *(-αγωγῇ,* o Matt. x. 21 al⁵ in gosp. Rom vii 4 al³ (Paul) only. 2 Chron.
 Rom. v. 2. Eph. ii. 18. iii. 12) p dat. (1 Cor. vii. 28 2 Cor xii. 7. Gal v 13 Col. ii. 5) Gal iii 3. ch. iv. 1, 6. elsw. k l m o
 xliiii. 15. q 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36, 45 Rom. iv 17 vii 11. John v. 21. 4 Kings v 7. 13
 ἐν σ. or κατὰ σ. q 1 Cor. xv. 22, 36, 45 Rom. iv 17 vii 11. John v. 21. 4 Kings v 7. 13
 r = ch. iv. 6. 1 Cor. v 5 al. s = Rev. xx. 7. t = Heb. xii. 23 reff.

om τω θεῷ B: om τω C: τω πατρί b o. [om μὲν A¹(appy) Epiph.₅] rec ins
 τω bef πνεύματι, with g 13 Epiph.₂: om ABCKL[P]N rel [arm] Orig.₁ [Petr, Ath.]
 Epiph.₃ Did.₁ Cyr.₂

19. aft ἐν φυλακῇ ins κατακεκλεισμένοις C 8. 25 [harl tol] Ath.₁ Aug.₂ Ruf.₁

blessedness is our salvation. *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* I distinctly hold, with Wiesinger, to come in, as a point of comparison between Christ and ourselves, under the *καί*,—against most Commentators, among whom are De Wetten and Huther. Considering St. Peter's love of antanaclassis (using the same term in two meanings), of which we have already had several examples, e. g. vv. 9, 14, 15, I have no hesitation in applying the *παθεῖν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* the one time to Christ, the other to ourselves, though His suffering for sin, and ours, are two very different things. He, the sinless One, suffered *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*, for sins; as a sacrifice for sin, as a sinner, made sin for us, dying the death of a criminal: we, though not sinless, yet *ἀγαθοποιούμεντες*, are to suffer if God's will so will it, *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν*, for sins which we are supposed to have committed, and as sinners. To miss this, is to miss one of the cardinal points of the comparison) *once* ("from this *ἅπαξ*, through the *καί*," as has been beautifully said (Besser, in Wies.), "a beam of comforting light falls on the sufferings of Christians." He suffered *once*: His sufferings are summed up and passed away: He shall suffer no more. And we are suffering *ἅπαξ*: it shall be soon so thought of and looked back upon. For this reason doubtless, and not as Ec. to shew τὸ τοῦ παθόντος δραστήριον τε καὶ δυνατόν, nor as Pott, al., to contrast the sufferings of Christ as in Heb. x. 1, 2, with the often-repeated sacrifices of the O. T., is *ἅπαξ* inserted), a just person (*δικαίος* is purely predicative: not as E. V. 'the just,' which again loses the point of comparison) on behalf of unjust persons (this again, though the resembling tints are beginning somewhat to fade off, is another point of comparison: He suffered, just, righteous, *ὅτι ἐπ' ἀδικῶν*: He represented, He was offered for, the unjust, the unrighteous: and so we in our turn, though in a far less deep and proper meaning, when we, being *δίκαιοι* (ver. 12), suffer as *ἄδικοι*, though not in any propitiatory sense *ὅτι ἐπ' ἀδικῶν*. We have similar uncertainty and play of meaning where the same subject is treated Rom. vi. 10, 11, *τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἁπ-*

έθανεν . . . *ἥ τῷ θεῷ, οὕτως καὶ ὁμῆς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς μὲν εἶναι τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ*: where the two expressions, though they have a common meaning of small extent, are in their widest and most important references of necessity widely divergent), that (with this *ἵνα* we leave the comparison, as far as suffering is concerned, returning to it presently for a moment with the *θανατωθεὶς*, and pass up to the *μακαριότης* of His innocent suffering, and to that which makes it so glorious and precious to us, as the ground of all our blessedness in suffering) He might bring us near to God ("ut nos, qui abalienati fuimus, ipse abiens ad Patrem, secum una, justificatos adduceret in cœlum, ver. 22, per eosdem gradus quos ipse emensus est, exinanitionis et exaltationis. Ex hoc verbo Petrus, usque ad cap. iv. 6, penitus connectit Christi et fidelium iter sive processum (quo etiam ipse *sequebatur* Dominum, ex ejus prædicatione, Joh. xiii. 36) infidelitatem multorum et penam innectens." Bengel: who also remarks on τῷ θεῷ, "Deo id volenti. Plus notatur per dativum quam si diceretur *ad Deum*"), put to death (this participial clause conditions the *ἵνα προσαγάγῃ*, giving the manner of that bringing us near to God) *indeed in the flesh* (of this there can be no doubt, and in this assertion there is no difficulty. *σαρκί* is adverbial; it was thus, in this region, under these conditions, that the death on the cross was inflicted: His flesh, which was living flesh before, became dead flesh: Christ Jesus, the entire complex Person, consisting of body, soul, and spirit, was put to death *σαρκί*), but made alive (again) in the spirit (here there may seem to be difficulty: but the difficulty will vanish, if we guide ourselves simply and carefully by the former clause. "Quod ad carnem," the Lord was put to death: "quod ad spiritum," He was brought to life (for this, and not "remained alive," must be insisted on as the meaning of *ἐξωποιοήθη*). His flesh was the subject, recipient, vehicle, of inflicted death: His spirit was the subject, recipient, vehicle, of restored life. But here let us beware, and proceed cautiously.

^u πορευθεὶς ^u ἐκήρυξεν ^{30 v} ἀπειθήσασιν ^w ποτὲ ὅτε ^x ἀπεξεδέ- ^u Mark xvi. 15.
^v = ch. ii. 7, 8 reff. ^w = ver. 5. ^x Rom. viii. 19, 23, 25. 1 Cor. i. 7. Gal. v. 6. Phil. iii.
^{20.} Heb. ix. 28 only +. (see note.)

20. rec απαξ ἐξεδεχετο (from Erasmus' conjecture?), with Orig-ed₁ Ec-text-ed: απαξ ἐδεχετο [K?] in Amerbach's Basle ms (Delitzsch ii. 24): txt ABC K [appy] L [P] N² rec [vulg' syr copt] Orig₂ [and ms.] lat-f. (13 is defective, only ξεδεχετο being legible.)

What is asserted is not that the *flesh died* and the Spirit was *made alive*; but that 'quoad' the flesh the Lord died, 'quoad' the Spirit He was made alive. He, the God-man Christ Jesus, body and soul, ceased to live in the flesh, began to live in the Spirit; ceased to live a fleshly mortal life, began to live a spiritual resurrection life. His own Spirit never died, as the next verse shews us. "This is the meaning, that Christ by His sufferings was taken from the life which is flesh and blood, as a man on earth, living, walking, and standing in flesh and blood and He is now placed in another life and made alive according to the Spirit, has passed into a spiritual and supernatural life, which includes in itself the whole life which Christ now has in soul and body, so that He has no longer a fleshly but a spiritual body." Luther. And Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. l. 336, says, "It is the same who dies and the same who is again made alive, both times the whole Man Jesus, in body and soul. He ceases to live, in that *that*, which is to His Personality the medium of action, falls under death; and He begins again to live, in that He receives back this same for a medium of His action again. The life which fell under death was a fleshly life, that is, such a life as has its determination to the present condition of man's nature, to the externality of its mundane connexion. The life which was won back is a spiritual life, that is, such a life as has its determination from the Spirit, in which consists our inner connexion with God." It is impossible, throughout this difficult and most important passage, to report all the various shades of difference of opinion which even the greater expositors have given us. I shall indicate only those which are necessary to be mentioned as meanings to be distinguished from that which I advocate, or as errors likely to fall constantly under the eye of my readers. Of this latter class is the rendering of the E. V. here, "*by the Spirit*," which is wrong both grammatically and theologically: the explanation of Ec., Calov., n., *τουτέστιν ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τῆς θεότητος δυνάμει: ἀνέστη γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐχ ὡς ἀνθρώπος, ἀλλ' ὡς θεός*; and that of Grot. that *πνεύματι* = *ἐκ δυνάμεως θεοῦ*, 2 Cor. xiii. 4): 19.] in which (*viz.* *πνεύματι*, in the spirit, accord-

ing to which His new life was. ἐν *ἐ*, not simply *ἐ* this time: see below) **He also went and preached** (πορευθεὶς of a local transference here, just as below in ver. 22, πορευθεὶς εἰς οὐρανόν: and ἐκήρυξεν of a preaching good news, nearly = εὐηγγελίσαστο, as in all other places of the N. T.) **to the spirits in prison** (the disembodied spirits, which were kept shut up (Jude 6: 2 Pet. ii. 4) in the place of the departed awaiting the final judgment: in Schoel, as Syr.), 20.] **which were once disobedient** (this clause is a secondary and dependent one, descriptive of the spirits intended: that they were those of men who were formerly disobedient) **when** (ὅτε marks distinctively the time intended by the ποτέ) **the longsuffering of God was waiting** (and this marks the period of their disobedience, viz. those 120 years of Gen. vi. 3. ἀπεξεδέχετο, imperf.: the ἀπ- betokening the full time during which it was exercised. "Expectabat donec expectandi finis erat." Beng.) **in the days of Noah while the ark** (κιβωτοῦ anathous as the well-known name for the ark in the LXX) **was being prepared, in which** (pregn. constr., "by having entered into which:" not "into which," see below) **a few persons, that is eight souls** (individuals: ψυχαί, as being in the body: the distinction may be noted here, but is not always kept: the disembodied are ψυχαί in Rev. vi. 9, xx. 4) **were saved** (from drowning) **by water** (not, "into which a few, &c. got safe through the water," which was not the fact. The water is in the Apostle's view the *medium of saving*, inasmuch as it bore up the ark: cf. the next verse: or it may be, and so Bengel, Steiger, De Wette, Huther, "through (the) water"). So much for the exegesis of the detail of this passage; from which it will be seen that we have regarded it, in common with the majority of Commentators, as necessarily pointing to an event in our Lord's redemptive agency which happened, as regards time, in the order of the context here: and that that event was, His going (whether between His death and resurrection, or after the latter, will be presently discussed) to the place of custody of departed spirits, and there preaching to those spirits, which were formerly disobedient when God's longsuffering waited in the days of Noah.

γ = Rom. ii.
4 ix. 22.
2 Pet. iii. 15.

χέτο ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ὧ μακροθυμία ἐν ᾧ ἡμέραις ἡ Νῶε κατασκευα-

z Matt. xxiv. 37. Luke xvii. 26.

a = Heb. xi. 7 (reff.).

ARCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13

for η . . μακροθυμία, την . . μακροθυμίαν Ν (την is corrected, but not μακροθυμίαν)

Thus far I conceive our passage stands committed: and I do not believe it possible to make it say less, or other, than this. What was the intent of that preaching, and what its effect is not here revealed; the fact merely is stated. The statement of the fact, however, has been felt to be accompanied by such great difficulties, that other meanings have been sought for the passage than that which the words present at first sight. Expositors have endeavoured to remove the idea that the gospel was preached to the dead in Hades, either, 1. by denying the reference to our Lord's descent thither at all, or, 2. by admitting that, but supposing it to have had another purpose. I give, following the classification in Huther's note, an account of the principal upholders of these views. Under I., I place all those who deny any reference to Christ's descent into Hades, distinguishing the minor differences between them as to what κήρυγμα is there indicated.

I. 1. Augustine, Bede, Thos. Aquinas, Lyra, Hammond, Beza, Scaliger, Leighton, Horneius, Gerhard, al., and recently Hofmann, Schriftbeweis ii. 1. 335—341, maintain that the κήρυγμα was the preaching of righteousness by Noah to his contemporaries: that Noah thus preached not of himself, but by virtue of the Spirit of Christ inspiring him; and that thus his preaching was in fact a preaching by Christ in the Spirit. So, e.g. Augustine, Ep. 164 (99), vol. ii., suggests, that the "spiritus conclusi in carcere" may be "animæ quæ tunc erant in carne, atque ignorantiae tenebris velut carcere clauderantur." Also that Christ had not indeed come in the flesh, but from the beginning of the race came from time to time to convict the evil, to console the good, or to admonish both. For this He came not in flesh, but in spirit, i. e. in substantia Deitatis. But he qualifies this by asking, "Quid facit Filius sine Spiritu Sancto, vel sine Patre, cum inseparabilia sint omnia opera Trinitatis?" But this arbitrary interpretation of φυλακή = "caro, et ignorantiae tenebræ," is not common to all the supporters of this view. Beza represents a large class: "Christus . . . jam olim in diebus Noe . . . prædicavit spiritibus illis, qui nunc in carcere meritas dant poenas, utpote qui recta momenti Noe . . . parere olim recusarint." Thus Scaliger, Horneius, al.: and Hofmann, except that he joins ποτέ with πορευθείς ἐκέρυξεν, not with ἀπειθήσασιν. It must

be evident to every unprejudiced scholar, how alien such an interpretation is from the plain meaning and connexion of the words and clauses. Not a word is indicated by St. Peter on the very far-off lying allusion to the fact that the Spirit of Christ preached in Noah: not a word, here, on the fact that Noah himself preached to his contemporaries. Again, the same subject χριστός runs through the whole, without a hint, that we are dealing with historical matter of fact in ἐπαθεν, θανατωθείς, ζωοποιηθείς, and with recondite figure in πορευθείς ἐκέρυξεν. Again, whether we take the metaphorical φυλακή of Aug., which I suppose will find hardly any advocates, or the τοῖς νῦν ἐν φυλακῇ of Beza, al., it cannot surely be doubted that we are equally putting force on the Apostle's words, and that the τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν must describe the local condition of the πνεύματα at the time when the preaching took place. Moreover πορευθείς, as compared with ver. 22 (which Hofmann gets most lamely over, by saying that it presents no greater difficulty than the statement that Christ accompanied the Israelites through the wilderness in 1 Cor. x. 4: to which we may answer, If this were a plain statement involving such an application of the word, we might then discuss the intelligibility of it)—the part. ἀπειθήσασιν, marked off by the ποτέ as not belonging to the same time as the ἐκέρυξεν (which Hofmann shews he feels, by his impracticable attempt to connect ποτέ with ἐκέρυξεν), shew, as plainly as words can shew, that we are reading of some act of Christ which He then, at the time described, went and did, with reference to spirits who were, at some other time (ποτέ) specified (ὅτε), in a certain state (ἀπειθήσασιν). And, which has not been sufficiently noticed, a crowning objection to this view is the use of the word πνεύμασιν, connecting ἐν ᾧ (πνεύματι) our Lord's state, with the state of those to whom He preached: a word only used of men when departed out of this life (reff.).

I. 2. Several Commentators, principally Socinian, but also Vorst., Grot., Schöttgen, al., understand by τὰ ἐν φυλ. πν. either the Gentiles, or the Jews ("sub jugo legis existentes") and Gentiles ("sub potestate diabolica jacentes") so in both cases, Schöttg. and Amelius) together, and by ἐκέρυξεν the preaching of the Spirit of Christ by the Apostles. These expositors take the mention of the disobedient in Noah's time to

ζομένης ^b κιβωτοῦ, ^c εἰς ἣν ὀλλόγοι, ^d τουτέστιν ὁκτῶ ^e ψυχῶν ^b Heb. xi. 7
 c constr., see Luke iv. 44 d Heb. ii. 14 reff. e = Acts ii. 41. vii. 14. xxvii. 37. Exod. i. 5.
 reff.

[vulg-ed(with harl) Orig-int.], rec ὀλγα, with CKL[P] rel syr [Cyr, Damasc,]
 Thl Ec: txt ABN vulg Orig₁-int₂] Cypr₂ Aug₂ Vig Fulg Bede.

be merely by way of sample of the disobedient in all time, or, at least, in the time when the Apostle was writing. So Grot.: "adjungere voluit Petrus similitudinem a temporibus Noe, ut ostendat quanto res nunc melius per Christum quam tunc per Noen processerit." As Huther well says, "How this interpretation heaps on caprice upon caprice, need not be shewn." I will add, that its factors do not appear to attempt to justify it philologically, as indeed it is plain they cannot. Every word of every clause protests against it.

II. We now come to those who understand the passage of our Lord's descent into Hades, but, offended by the idea of the possibility of salvation being opened to spirits of the disobedient kept awaiting judgment, diverge from one another and from the 'prima facie' explanation.

II. 1. Flacius, Calov., Buddæus, Wolf, Aretius, al., understand τὰ ἐν φυλ. πν. of souls awaiting condemnation, but explain ἐκήρυξεν of announcing, not salvation, but condemnation. So Hollaz (in Huther),—"fuit prædicatio Christi in inferno non evangelica, quæ hominibus tantum in regno gratiæ annunciatur, sed legalis, elenctica, terribilis, eaque tum verbalis, qua ipsos æterna supplicia promeritos esse convincit, tum realis, qua immanem terrorem iis incussit." But, besides that κηρύσσειν, as remarked above, has, as applied to Christ and His Apostles, but the one meaning of preaching the good tidings of salvation,—besides the utter superfluity of such a 'concio damnatoria' to spirits already reserved to damnation,—what a context would such a meaning give, in the midst of a passage intended to convey consolation and encouragement by the blessed consequences of Christ's sufferings! See this well insisted on in Wiesinger's careful discussion of the opinions on our passage, p. 241.

II. 2. Some of the Fathers, as Iren. (iv. 27. 2, p. 264; v. 31. 1, p. 331; al.; see Stieren's Index, p. 1017), Tertullian, Hippolytus,—the Schoolmen, Zwingle, Calvin, al., explain ἐκήρυξεν rightly, of announcing salvation, but regard τὰ ἐν φυλ. πνεύματα as the spirits of the just, especially of the O. T. saints. The most extraordinary instance of this class of interpreters is Calvin, who explains φυλακή to mean "specula, sive ipse excubandi actus:" and the spirits in φυλακή are, according to him, those which

were in waiting for Christ's salvation: "piæ animæ in spei salutis promissæ intentæ, quasi eminus eam considerarent." Then he proceeds, "Postquam dixit, Christum se mortuis manifestasse, mox addit: *quum increduli fuissent olim*; quo significat, nihil nocuisse sanctis patribus quod impiorum multitudine pæne obruti fuerint:" and regards this consideration as one calculated to console the believers, few as they were in the midst of the ungodly world. And having thus interpreted, he ingenuously confesses, "Discrepat, fateor, ab hoc sensu Græca syntaxis; debuerat enim Petrus, si hoc vellet, genitivum absolutum ponere. Sed quia apostolis novum non est liberius casum unum ponere alterius loco, et videmus Petrum hic confuse multas res simul coacervare, nec vero aliter aptus sensus elici poterat: non dubitavi ita resolvere orationem implicitam, quo intelligerent lectores, alios vocari incredulos, quam quibus prædicatum fuisse evangelium dixit." A sentence to be well remembered for many reasons.

II. 3. Suarez, Estius, Bellarmine, Luther (on Hos. iv. 2, anno 1545, quoted in Bengel), Peter Martyr, Bengel, al., assume that the words refer, not to all the unbelievers of Noah's time, but only to those who repented at the last moment when the flood was upon them. "Probabile est," says Bengel, "nonnullos ex tanta multitudine, veniente pluvia, resipuisse: cumque non credidissent dum expectaret Deus, postea cum arca structa esset et pœna ingrueret, credere cœpisse: quibus postea Christus, eorumque similibus, se præconem gratiæ præstiterit."

II. 4. Athanasius, Ambrose, Erasmus, Calvin (Instit. ii. 16. 9), hold both kinds of prædication, the 'evangelica' to the spirits of the just, the 'damnatoria' to those of the disobedient.

One or two singular interpretations do not fall under any of the above classes: e.g. Marcion maintained that the preaching of Christ was to those whom the O. T. calls ungodly, but who were in reality better than the O. T. saints; Clem.-alex. (Strom. vi. 6, p. 762 P.), that they were the δίκαιοι κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, who were nevertheless imprisoned under idolatry.

It remains that we should enquire, whether this preaching to the imprisoned spirits by our Lord, took place between His death and His resurrection, or after the latter. The answer will very much

f Matt. xiv. 36. f διεσώθησαν δι' ὕδατος. 21 ὁ καὶ ὑμᾶς ἐ ἀντίτυπον νῦν
 Luke vi. 3.
 Acts xxiii. 42. xxviii. 43, 44. xxviii. 1, 4 only. Gen. xix. 19.

g Heb. ix. 24 only r.

ARCKL
 P a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m o
 13

21. elz (for δ) ϛ, with rel: om N¹ [æth]: txt ABCKL[P]N¹? Treg³ a c f h j k m
 13. 36 vulg [arm] Did, Cyr₂ Damasc, Thl Ec [Orig-int.] Cypr₂. rec ηuas, with
 CKL rel copt æth [Cyr₂ Damasc,] Thl Ec: txt AB[P]N b c m o vulg syrr arm Did,
 [Orig-int.] Cypr₂ Aug³ Fulg Vig Bede. νυν bef ἀντίτυπον N [vulg Damasc, Aug,
 Fulg]: om νυν a [Syr arm Cypr₂].

depend on the sense which we give to ἐν ϛ. The argument which Wiesinger so much insists on, that the clauses must come in chronological sequence, will not determine for us; because ἐν ϛ καὶ . . . might very well be a taking up again of πνεύματι, recapitulating some former act also done in the Spirit: qu. d. "put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the Spirit,—that Spirit in which also, ere He was made alive with the full resurrection life, He" &c. And this I incline to think the sense of the passage: ἐν ϛ referring not to the complex resurrection life, but properly and strictly to the Spirit, in which the Lord never ceased to be, even when His complex life of body and soul was dissolved. And Wiesinger is in fact assuming too much, when he says that "Christ (ωποιοῦντος πνεύματι" is the subject of the sentence: that subject is simply χριστός from ver. 18, of whatever period we understand this act. When again Wiesinger says that πορευθ. ἐκήρυξεν cannot be understood of the time intermediate, because in no case can we think of our Lord's state in death in dualistic wise, so that while His body was held by the bands of death, His Spirit should be carrying on the Messianic work,—I answer, why not? Surely the reply to the penitent thief implies a πορευθῆναι, and in that πορευθῆναι a joy and triumph sufficient to be the subject of a consoling promise at that terrible moment. And might not the reasoning be turned, with as much propriety? Might not we say that it is impossible to conceive of our Lord during that time as *other than* employed in the Spirit in which He continued, not to exist merely, but to live? That, granted that His dying words imply a special delivering of his Spirit into the hands of his Father, and by consequence, a resting of his Spirit in those Hands in the death-state,—yet must we not conceive of His Spirit as going thither, where "the righteous souls are in the hand of God?" And if so, who shall place a limit to His power or will to communicate with any departed spirits of whatever character? So that, while I would not say that the conditions of the passage are not satisfied by the supposition that the event happened after the Resurrection, I believe there can be no

reason for saying that they are not, on the other hypothesis. And I own, that the ἐν ϛ καὶ inclines me to this other. It seems most naturally to be taken as a resumptive explanation of πνεύματι with a view to something (ver. 21) which is to follow; and the ἐν, capable indeed of being otherwise explained, yet seems to favour this idea,—that the Lord was strictly speaking ἐν πνεύματι when that happened which is related.

From all then which has been said, it will be gathered, that with the great majority of Commentators, ancient and modern, I understand these words to say, that our Lord, in His disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce His work of redemption, preach salvation in fact, to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned,—whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimaginable by us, we cannot say. It is ours to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations as far as vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced: it is not purgatory, it is not universal restitution; but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice: the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it. And as we cannot say to what other cases this κήρυγμα may have applied, so it would be presumption in us to limit its occurrence or its efficacy. The reason of mentioning here these sinners, above other sinners, appears to be, their connexion with the type of baptism which follows. If so, who shall say, that the blessed act was confined to them? The literature of the foregoing passage is almost a library in itself. The principal Commentators have given accounts more or less complete, of the history of its interpretation. The most concise and comprehensive is that in De Wette's Handbuch. 21, 22.] The persons and the things compared must be

^h σώξει ⁱ βάπτισμα, οὐ σαρκὸς ^k ἀπόθεσις ^l ῥύπον, ἀλλὰ ^h pres., Acts ii. 47, 1 Cor. i. 18, xv. 2. ^m συνειδήσεως ^m ἀγαθῆς ⁿ ἐπερώτημα εἰς θεόν, δι' ^o ἀναστά- 2 Cor. ii. 15, ch. iv. 18, Eph. iv. 5 only.
 from Prov. xi. 31. i Matt. iii. 7 al. fr. gosp. & Acts. Epp., Rom. vi. 4
 k 2 Pet. i. 14 only. † here only Job xiv. 4. Isa. iv. 4. (παρία, James i. 21 -παρός, -παίνει, n here only (see note) †. Dan. iv. 14 (17) Theod.
 Rev. xxii. 11) m ver. 16.
 o = Acts i. 22. Phil. in, 10 al †

carefully borne in mind. The ὄλγοι in Noah's day were saved by water; we also are saved by water. The ἀντίτυπον to that water on which the ark floated, saving its inmates, is the water of baptism; but as ours is a spiritual, not a material rescue, so the ἀντίτυπον is not the washing of our flesh by that water,—the form in which it is applied to us, as the bearing up their ark was the form in which their water was applied to them,—but a far nobler thing, the clearness and purity of our inner consciousness towards God: and this saving power of the water of baptism in our case is by virtue of the resurrection and exaltation of Christ, into whose death and resurrection we are baptized. Thus by our very profession we are united to Him in sufferings as in glory. He through His innocent sufferings has glorified suffering and death, even in death working mercy, and now exalted as our Head above all principality and power. The course of thought is unusual, is startling, is mysterious; but it is not unaccountable, it is not arbitrary. From the mention of the spiritual nature of our Lord's resurrection life, arises the mention of His blessed employ even in that state of the pure spirit to which His sufferings brought Him: from that mention comes the connexion of a great type of that day of Noah with our share, by baptismal union with Christ, in His salvation and triumphs; by which thoughts the final point is reached, His utmost exaltation through suffering, our union with and following of Him. Having said thus much on the whole connexion, we can now go into the details. 21.] Which (viz. ὕδωρ: not βάπτισμα, which does not come in till the end of the clause: nor, the whole fact announced in ver. 20. The construction is somewhat involved by the close connexion of the thing signifying and the thing signified. The ὕδωρ to which ὁ refers is not, as Huther, al., the water of Noah's flood, but water, generally, the common term between the type and antitype) the antitype (of that) (ἀντίτυπον, adj. antitypal: the corresponding particular in both cases: the word does not contain in itself any solution of the question which of the two, the τύπος or that which is ἀντίτυπον to it, is the original: in ref., from the context, the τύπος is the

primitive, the ἀντίτυπον the representative: here, from the context, it is vice versa: this need not however be expressed, but left to be understood) is now saving (pres., the rescue not being as yet fully accomplished. We are as yet διασωζόμενοι δι' ὕδατος) you also (as well as them. Then this assertion having been made, follows the parenthetical explanation, that the method of saving in the ἀντίτυπον is not material, as in the type), even baptism (not, the water of baptism: the parenthesis following is a kind of protest against such a rendering:—but, water, in the form of baptism, become to us baptism. Water is the common term: water saves in both cases. It saved them, becoming to them a means of floating their ark and bearing them harmless: it saves us, becoming to us baptism: and that baptism not material, but spiritual); not putting away of the filth of the flesh (σαρκός, placed first for emphasis, see Winer, § 30. 3, Remark 4. b; removing the baptism spoken of altogether out of the realm of carnal washings: q. d. “not fleshly putting away of filth.” σαρκός cannot be the gen. subj. as Bengel, ‘carni adscribitur depositio sordium:’ it is the gen. possessive governed by ῥύπον. It is possible that the Apostle may have special reference to the unavailing nature of the Jewish washings, as Justin Martyr, Tryph. § 14, p. 114, τί γὰρ ὄφελος ἐκείνου τοῦ βαπτίσματος ὃ τὴν σάρκα καὶ μόνον τὸ σῶμα φαιδρύνει; βαπτίσθητε τὴν ψυχὴν), but enquiry of a good conscience after God * (i. e. the seeking after God in a good and pure conscience, which is the aim and end of the Christian baptismal life. This is the sense of the ἐπερωτᾶν εἰς, in the only place where it occurs in Scripture, viz. 2 Kings xi. 7 LXX, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν Δαυὶδ εἰς εἰρήνην Ἰωάβ, καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ εἰς εἰρήνην τοῦ πολέμου. On this view, συνειδ. ἀγ. is gen. subj.,—the enquiry which a good conscience makes. Very various have been the interpretations. Ec. goes wrong, in saying συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς τῆς εἰς θεόν, ἥτοι κατὰ θεόν: for εἰς θεόν must be by the requirement of the sentence be joined to ἐπερώτημα. His explanation of ἐπερώτημα is ἀρραβών, ἐνέχυρον, ἀπόδειξις. This is taking the juristic sense of ἐπερώτημα, which prevailed in Byzantine Greek, of a stipulation or contract. And so in the main, Aretius, al., and recently

p Heb. i. 3. *ref.* σῶς Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ²² ὅς ἐστιν ἑν δεξιᾷ [τοῦ] θεοῦ, ABCKL
PN a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13
q Acts i. 11. ἡ πορευθεὶς εἰς ὁὐρανόν, ὁ ὑποταγέντων αὐτῷ ἀγγέλων καὶ
r 1 Cor. xv. 27. ἡ 9 al.
28. Heb. xii. st ἔξουσιῶν καὶ ^{su} δυνάμεων.
s Eph i. 21. IV. ἡ Χριστοῦ οὖν ἡ παθόντος ἡ σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς τῇ
t = Eph iii. 10. ἡ 12 al. αὐτῇ ἡ ἔννοια ἡ ὁπλίσασθε, ὅτι ὁ ἡ παθὼν ἡ σαρκὶ ἡ πέπαυ-
u Matt. xxiv. 29 || Rom. xxi. v. 4. w Heb. iv. 12 only. Prov. v. 2 al. x here
viii. 38. Isa. only t. θράσος ὁπλίσασθαι, Soph. Electr. 991 (6). Jos. Antt. vi. 9. 4. y constr., (see ch. iii. 10 *ref.*) Josh.
xxiv. 4. vii. 26. πεπ. τῆς ὁργῆς, Lys. Or. 18, p. 297.

22. om του bef θεου BN¹.

CHAP. IV. 1. for παθόντος, αποθανόντος N¹ [Jer¹]. rec aft παθόντος ins υπε
ημων, with AKL[P]N³ rel syrr copt [(æth arm) Bas, Cyr-p] Ath³ Epiph, Did, Thdr, Thdr,
Jer¹ Aug¹; v. υμ. N¹ l m o [Syr] Thl: om BC vulg sah Ath³-3-mss Thdr [Damasc¹]
Ec-comm Ambr, Aug, Fulg, Bede. rec ins ev bef 2nd *σαρκι*, with K[P] rel vulg
Ec Aug¹: om ABCLN a c d h l [am(and fuld)] Thl Aug. (homæotel in 13.)

De Wette and Huther understand the word of the *questions asked in baptism*, ἀποτάσσει τῷ Σατανᾷ; ἀποτάσσομαι συντάσσει τῷ χριστῷ; συντάσσομαι: and make συνεῖδ. ἁγ. a gen. object., *pledge of a good conscience*, i. e. to maintain a good conscience. But there does not appear to be any justification in Scripture, or in the usage of the time, of this sense of the word ἐπερώτημα: and εἰς θεόν would hardly occur in this sense: we have in the similar case of διαθήκη, oftenest a dative following (2 Kings v. 3), then πρὸς (2 Kings iii. 13), μετὰ (2 Kings iii. 12), ἀνὰ μέσον (3 Kings v. 12); but never εἰς. Again, many understand, the *request* of a good conscience: so Bengel. "Salvat ergo nos rogatio bonæ conscientiæ, i. e. rogatio qua nos Deum compellamus cum bona conscientia, peccatis remissis et depositis, cf. ver. 16, et Hebr. x. 22. Hæc rogatio in baptismo datur et in omnibus fidei, precum, vitæque christianæ actibus exerceatur." This same meaning of ἐπερώτημα is taken in the main by Wiesinger, making however συνεῖδ. a gen. object., "*prayer* (or, desire) to God for a good conscience:" so also Seb. Schmidt, Hofmann, Weiss. The objection to all these is, that they do not justify the expression as applied to the saving force of baptism: as indeed neither entirely does the meaning which I have given above: but where *all* explanations were unsatisfactory, I thought it best to adopt one which strictly keeps to the Scripture usage of the words, being at the same time full as good as any of the others in its contextual application),—by means of the resurrection of Jesus Christ (with what are these words to be joined? Grot., with others, connects them with the immediately preceding: "hæc bonæ conscientiæ sponso venit ex fide de resurrectione Christi." So also Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 2, p. 167, saying, "By means of the resurrection of Christ, as the

removal of sin once for all for all mankind, it is, that in baptism the prayer for a good conscience is directed to God." But as Wies. objects, it is surely allotting too insignificant a part to these words, to make them merely assign the method in which the prayer is heard. Most Commentators have joined them with σώσει, regarding the intervening sentence as parenthetical. Thus taken, the words refer back to ζωοποιεῖς πνεύματι in ver. 18, conducting on the course of thought with regard to Christ and to ourselves: His resurrection, and entrance into His kingdom, giving us, by Him, a living part in Him, and entrance also into His kingdom by means of His appointed sacrament of Holy Baptism, spiritually received. Steiger endeavours to combine both connexions, but this evidently cannot be: 22.] who is on the right hand of God (Ps. cx. 1), having gone (cf. πορευθεὶς above, ver. 19) to heaven (i. e. into the place of angels and supramundane powers, but distinguished from them by being Himself at God's right hand. On the whole subject of Christ's exaltation, see Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 1, pp. 370—407), angels and authorities and powers (the whole heavenly hierarchy, as in Col. ii. 10—15) being subjected to Him. And thus is announced the glorious completion of the result of Christ's voluntary and innocent sufferings: glorious for Himself, and glorious for us, who are by baptism united to Him. And now the practical inference for us follows.

CHAP. IV. 1—6.] *Exhortation, after the forecited example of Christ's sufferings, to entire separation from the ungodly Gentile world.* This passage closes the set of exhortations which began at ch. ii. 11, with reference to behaviour towards the heathen world around: and with ch. iv. 7, begins a new and concluding set, no longer regarding the world without. 1.] Christ then having suffered in the flesh

ται ἁμαρτίας, ² εἰς τὸ μηκέτι ἀνθρώπων ^a ἐπιθυμίαις, ἀλλὰ ^z Heb. ii. 17
 θελήματι θεοῦ τὸν ^b ἐπίλοιπον ^c ἐν σαρκί ^d βιώσαι ^e χρόνον. ^a = ch. ii. 11
³ ἄρκετος γὰρ ^b ὁ ^c παρεληλυθὼς χρόνος τὸ ^d βούλημα ^b here only.
 10. τ. ἔπ. χρ., Isocr. p. 39, A. 9. c ch. iii. 4 reff. d here only. Job xxix. 18.
 e as above (d). Prov. vii. 2. Wisd. xii. 23. Sir. xl. 28 only. f Matt. vi. 34. x. 25 only + Deut.
 xx. 2 Aq. g = Matt. xiv. 15. Acts xxvii. 9. Gen. xli. 53. h Acts xxvii. 43. Rom.
 ix. 19 only + 2 Macc. xv. 5 only. Jos. Antt. ii. 14. 4. Demosth. p. 1109 15.

αμαρτίας BN^s vulg Syr æth.

2. ἀνθρώπων (for -ων) N¹. "ex ἀνθρώπων . . . a C(=N¹) θῷ correctum est." Tischdfl.

3. rec aft ἀρκετος γὰρ ins ημιν, with CKL[P] rel Ἐc Jer.; υμιν N¹(N³ disapproving)
 a b c h o copt [æth] Thl Aug.; om AB d vulg syrr arm Clem, Aug., παρεληλυθας
 N¹ f [13]. rec aft χρονος ins του βιου, with KL[P] rel Thl Ἐc: bef o παρ., m:
 om ABCN a h 13 vulg syrr copt æth arm Clem, Aug Jer Cassiod. rec (for βουλημα)
 θελημα, with KL[P] rel Ἐc: txt ABCN a d j 13. 36 Clem, Thl.

(see on σαρκί above, ch. iii. 18. This conclusion takes up again the *ὅτι καὶ χριστὸς ἐπαθεν* there, which led to the enlarging on the result of those His sufferings as regarded both Himself and us), **do ye also arm yourselves** with (put on as armour) **the same mind** (intent, resolution; scil., to suffer in the flesh, as He did. That this is the sense, is shewn, it appears to me, decisively by καὶ ὑμεῖς and τὴν αὐτήν. Those who, as Calv., Beza, Gerh., Beng., Erasm. Schmid, Wiesinger, al., take ἐννοια for 'thought,' and render the following *ὅτι, 'that,'* can give no adequate interpretation either to καὶ ὑμεῖς or to τὴν αὐτήν. The sentence, for them, stands as if it were ταύτην ἐννοιαν ὁπλίσασθε, *ὅτι*. . . And when obtained, the expression, meaning only 'remember, that,' is surely mere rhetorical inflation. Wiesinger denies that ἐννοια ever means "intent" or "resolution;" and refers to Passow to justify his denial. But in Palm and Rost's edn., the meaning *Gefinnung* is given, and borne out by Eur. Hel. 1026, *ἰκετεύετε*. . . . "Ἦρας δὲ τὴν ἐννοιαν ἐν ταύτῳ μένειν, ἣν ἐς σὲ καὶ σὸν πόσιν ἔχει σωτηρίας: Isocr., p. 112 D,—οὐ γὰρ (οἱ θεοὶ) αὐτόχειρες οὐτε τῶν ἀγαθῶν οὐτε τῶν κακῶν γίγνονται τῶν συμβαινόντων αὐτοῖς (τοῖς ἀνθρώποις), ἀλλ' ἐκάστοις τοιαύτην ἐννοιαν ἐμποιοῦσιν, ὥστε δι' ἀλήλου ἡμῖν ἐκάτερα παραγγινεσθαι τούτων: Diodor. Sic. ii. 30 says of the Chaldeans, that they regard the planets as ἐκμηνεύοντες τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐννοιαν (var. εἰνοιαν). The meaning then is, "arm yourselves also with the same purpose as that which was in Christ"; because (the *ὅτι* assigns a reason for the expression τὴν αὐτήν ἐννοιαν ὁπλίσασθε: "and ye will need this arming, because, the course of suffering according to the flesh which ye have to undergo ending in an entire freedom from sin, your warfare with sin must be begun and carried on from this time forward") **he that hath suffered in the flesh is made to cease from sin** (if

actively expressed, the sentence, as Huther remarks, would be τὸ πάσχειν (rather τὸ παθεῖν) πέπαυκεν αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίας: he is, by the very fact of having thus suffered, brought to an end with sin—has no more to do with it: and by an inference, the suffering in the flesh, and the being made to cease from sin, are commensurate in their progress. Commonly, πέπαιται is taken in a middle sense, and παθόν made = πάσχω: but neither of these is justifiable. On the sense see Rom. vi. 7, *ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας*. Here too there is surely throughout, though Weiss denies it, a presupposition of our being united to the sufferings of Christ, and not merely, 'quoad' ourselves, πάσχωμεν σαρκί, but by virtue of union with Him, τῷ παθόντι, παθόντες and so divorced from all sin. That this sentence itself is general, and not to be understood *in itself* of Christ, is plain: equally plain, that He is the person hinted at in the background, and with reference to whom the general truth is adduced. The general assertion itself, here and in Rom. i. c., is enthymematic, resting on the fact that the flesh is the element of sin, and he that has mortified it by suffering has in the same proportion got rid of sin): 2.] **with a view** (εἰς τό depends on ὁπλίσασθε, the intermediate general sentence being parenthetical) **no longer** (μηκέτι, subjective) **by the lusts of men** (as your rule: what is called the normal dative: not, as Wies. al., = δικαιοσύνη ζήσωμεν, ch. ii. 24: cf. Rom. vi. 10—13: this βιώσαι κ.τ.λ. is a very different matter from ζῆν in those places. ἀνθρώπων, put forward for contemptuous emphasis, as opposed to θεοῦ, which gains more majesty by not being thus put forward. What the lusts are, is shewn in ver. 3), **but by the will of God** (according to that which God wills, as your rule) **to live** (the 2 aor. βιώσαι is more common) **the rest of your time in the flesh** (cf. τὸν τῆς παροικίας ὑμῶν χρόνον, ch. i. 17. Observe ἐν σαρκί here not σαρκί,—of the

James i. 3 reff. τῶν ἐθνῶν ⁱκατειργάσθαι, ^kπεπορευμένους ἐν ^lἀσελ-
 k w. φ. Luke
 i. 6 2 Pet. ii.
 10 1 Kings
 viii 5. dat.
 Acts ix. 31 al.
 1 Mark vii. 22.
 Rom. xiii. 13.
 2 Cor. xii. 21
 al. + Wsd. xiv. 26 only. m here only +. Xen. Ec. i. 22 Ael. V. H. iii. 14. (-γεν. Deut. xxi. 20. Isa. lvi.
 12 F. Ald. compl. [the ver. is not found in the uncial MSS. j.] n Rom. xiii. 13. Gal. v. 21 only +. Wsd.
 xiv. 23. 2 Macc. vi. 4 only. o here only. Gen. xix. 3. xl. 20. p Acts x. 28 only +. 2 Macc.
 vii. 1 al. Jos. B. J. iv. 9. 10. Xen. Mem. i. 1. 9 (-ιστα). q 1 Cor. x. 14. Gal. v. 20. Col. iii. 5 only +.
 r constr., ch. i. 6. s = ver. 12. see Acts x. 20. Heb. xii. 2 (reff.). w ἐπί, Jos. Antt. i. 1. 2. Polyb. ii.
 27. 4. διά id. i. 49. 7. κατά, i. 33. l. dat., i. 23. 5 al. absol., iii. 49. 1. t = here (Mark vi. 33. Acts ii.
 11) only. Ps. xlix. 18. Demosth. 214. 7. u Eph. v. 18. Tit. i. 6 only. Prov. xxviii. 7. 2 Macc. iv. 6
 only. (-τος, Prov. vii. 11. -τως, Luke xv. 13.) v here only +.

rec κατεργασσθαι, with KL[P] rel Ec: κατειργασσθαι, but ασ appy erased, C: txt
 ABN a Clem₁ Thl. [πορευομενους N] ονοιφλυγιοις B⁽¹⁾: οιοφρυγιοις N¹.
 αθεμιταις C.

actual matter-of-fact element, in which we corporeally live and move for a certain time).

3.] For (follows on τὸν ἐπὶ λοιπὸν χρόνον: "I say, the rest of the time, for the past time surely" &c.) sufficient is the past time ("μείωσις. Nam ne pristina quidem tempora debere peccatis teri. Fastidium peccati apud resipiscentes." Bengel) to have wrought out (κατεργάζομαι cannot always be pressed in the sense of "to work out to an end," as distinguished from ἐργάζομαι: but this sense may fairly be pressed on here. The perf. implies that the course is closed and done, and looked back on as a standing and accomplished fact) the will of the Gentiles (that which the Gentiles βούλονται, would have you do. In ref. Rom. it is used of God. The N. T. line of demarcation between θέλω and βούλομαι appears to be but slender: and slenderer still that between their derivatives. We may perhaps say here, that the θέλημα, used of God, carries with it more of authority and "willing," βούλημα, used of man, more of persuasion, and wishing (cf. 1 Tim. vi. 9): so that the βούλημα is that which we may be overpersuaded into following, the θέλημα that which we are bound to obey. τῶν ἐθνῶν, used not of any national distinction, but of heathens as distinguished from Christians, shews that the majority of the readers of the Epistle had been Gentiles, among these ἔθνη, themselves. Cf. a very similar passage in Isocr. Panegy. p. 75 D: ἄξιον δ' ἐπὶ τῆς νῦν ἡλικίας ποιήσασθαι τὴν στρατείαν, ἵν' οἱ τῶν συμφορῶν κοινωνήσαντες, οὗτοι καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύσωσι καὶ μὴ πάντα τὸν χρόνον δυστυχοῦντες διαγῶσιν. ἱκανὸς γὰρ ὁ παρεληλυθὸς, ἐν ᾧ τί τῶν δεινῶν οὐ γέγονεν;), walking as ye have done (the perf. part. connects with κατειργάσθαι: the absence of the art. gives it the slight inferential force which justifies the former assertion) in lasciviousnesses

(outbreaks of ἀσέλγεια), lusts (here perhaps not general, as in ver. 2, but particular, lusts of uncleanness), wine-bibblings (οἶνοφλυγία ἐστὶν ἐπιθυμία οἶνον ἀπληστος, Andronicus Rhodius, περὶ παθῶν, p. 6. But from the other examples of its use in Wetst., it seems to express not only the desire, but its indulgence), revellings (see for a full explanation of κῶμοι, the word in Palm and Rost), drinking-bouts (Appian says of Sertorius, Bell. Civ. i. p. 700 (Wetst.), τὰ πολλὰ ἦν ἐπὶ τρυφῆς, γυναιξὶ καὶ κῶμοις καὶ πότοις σχολάζων. Suidas gives, ποτὸς τὸ πινόμενον, γυναιξὶ δὲ τὸ συμπόσιον), and nefarious ("quibus sanctissimum Dei jus violatur," Beng.) idolatries (I may remark as against the view that this Epistle was written to Jews, that this passage cannot be explained on that supposition. The Jews certainly never went so far into Gentile abominations as to justify its assertions): 4.] at which ([wherein, viz. at] your having done with such practices, implied in the κατειργάσθαι and πεπορευμένους above: then the gen. absolute following further explains the ἐν ᾧ. ἐν, as the element in which their ζῆν is versed. The aim of this verse is well given by Gerhard: "monuit hæc προθεραπεία ipsorum animos, ne perversis et præposteris illis impiorum judiciis ac blasphemis sermonibus turbentur, multo vero minus ad pristinorum vitiorum societatem sese pertrahi patiantur." They must give offence to their former companions: for this there is no help) they are astonished (think it strange, as E. V. see reff.), that you run not (the μὴ puts the reader on their footing: "when they notice that you run not") with them (συντρέχει, 'turmatim,' 'avide,' Bengel) to (eis, of the direction and purpose of the confluence) the same slough (of ἀνάχυσις, Strabo iii. p. 206 A, says, λέγονται δὲ ἀναχύσεις αἱ πληροῦνται τῇ θαλάττῃ κοιλάδες ἐν ταῖς πλημυρίαι:

^w βλασφημοῦντες, ⁵ οἱ ^x ἀποδώσουσιν ^x λόγον τῷ ^{y2} ἐτοίμως ^w ἔχοντι ^b κρίναι ^b ζώντας καὶ ^b νεκρούς. ⁶ εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ^w καὶ νεκροὶ ^d εὐηγγελίσθη, ἵνα κριθῶσιν μὲν ^e κατὰ ^e ἀνθρώ- ^w πους ^f σαρκί, ζώσιν δὲ ^g κατὰ ^g θεὸν ^f πνεύματι. ^w absol., Acts xiii. 45. x. xiii. 6. 2 Macc. x. 34. x Heb. xiii. 17 reff. y Acts xxi. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 14 only. Dan. 9. 26. 2 Cor. vii. 27. 2 Cor. 11. 15. 1 Tim. v. 25. b 2 Tim. i. 1. see Acts x. 42. Rom. xiv. 9. d constr., Rom. i. 15. Gal. i. 8. i. 13. pass., ch. i. 25 reff. f ch iii. 18. g Rom. vii. 27. 2 Cor. vii. 9—11. Eph. iv. 24 only.

4. for βλασφημοῦντες, καὶ βλασφημοῦσιν CN¹ 27. 29 (æth).

5. om οἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον N¹. for τῷ, οἱ N¹ (corr'd eadem manu). for ^w ἔχοντι, κρίναι, κρινοντι B C¹ (perhaps) a 69. 137 : txt AC²KL[P]N rel.

6. ζήσωσι N³.

æstuaries: and so ἀναχ. = 'sentina,' a sink, or slough, or puddle: and this is the meaning taken by Huther and Wiesinger. But Suidas interprets it Βαλκεία, ἐκλυσίς; and ἀνακεχυμένος,—ἀνεμμένος, κεχαυνωμένος, ἀνετός. Hence Gerhard takes it for 'virium exsolutio, mollities.' De Wette follows Grotius: 'profusio,' which in its etymology, though not in its ordinary acceptation, exactly answers to ἀνάχυσις. On the whole the local meaning is I think to be preferred, on account of the figure in συντρεχόντων) of profligacy (ἀ, σάειν: see note on ref. Eph.), speaking evil of you ('jactantes convicia in vos superbæ, singularitatis, occultæ impietatis,' &c. Bengel. The early apologists testify abundantly to the fact):

5.] who (your blasphemers. The consideration is propounded for the comfort and stay of Christians unjustly slandered) shall render account (reff.) to Him that is ready (reff.) to judge (aor.: once for all, decisively) living and dead.

6.] For (assigns a reason for the κρίναι νεκροῖς just mentioned) to this end (viz. that enunciated by the ἵνα which follows: see ref. John; ch. iii. 9) to dead men also (as well as to living, which is the ordinary case: καὶ carrying with it a climax,—"even to the dead") was the gospel preached (when, and by Whom, see below), that they might indeed be judged (aor.) according to men as regards the flesh, but might live on (pres.) according to God as regards the spirit. In examining into the meaning of this difficult verse, one thing may be laid down at the outset, as certain on any sure principles of exegesis: and thereby a whole class of interpretations removed out of our way. Seeing that γὰρ binds vv. 5 and 6 logically together, and that καὶ νεκροὶ distinctly takes up the νεκροῖς before in this logical connexion, all interpretations must be false which do not give νεκροῖς in ver. 6 the same meaning as νεκροῖς in ver. 5: i. e. that of *dead men*, literally and simply so called: men who have died, and are in their graves. This at once rid us

of all the Commentators who interpret this second νεκροῖς of the *dead in trespasses and sins*, so Aug., Cyril, Ec. (only as an altern., and he blames the interpretation, saying that οἱ παλαιοὶ τῶν πατέρων so explained it, οὐδὲν φροντισάντες τῆς συνεχείας τῶν ἑνω, οὐδ' ὅτι αἰτιολογικῶς εἰρημένων δεῖ πρὸς τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ ἀναφέρεισθαι. He himself interprets it of the descent of our Lord into Hades), Bede, Erasmus, Luther, Whitby, Gerhard, al., as well as those who to gain this meaning here, distort νεκροῖς in ver. 5 from its constant reference in that connexion, to mean the *spiritually dead*, or the *Gentiles*, as e. g. Severus in Cramer's Catena, Huss, Benson, Macknight. A second principle which we may lay down is this: that νεκροῖς in ver. 6 must be kept as wide in its reference as νεκροῖς in ver. 5: i. e., that it must not be interpreted as applying merely to the blasphemers of the Christians who should have died before the judgment, or merely to such blasphemed Christians themselves as shall have then died, or merely to the spirits in prison of ch. iii. 19, but must be treated as a general assertion in the literal meaning of νεκροῖς. The want of the article does not justify any limitation of this word: for the art. is also wanting before νεκροῖς in ver. 5, which indisputably is universal in its reference. At the same time, seeing that νεκροῖς asserts that which it asserts of the *genus*, the *ground* of so doing may be the occurrence of it with reference to certain fore-mentioned instances, though those instances themselves are not the subjects here. So that we cannot remove from consideration these last-mentioned interpretations, but must deal with them serially. First then comes that of Hofmann (Schriftb. ii. 1. 339—341), al., that the Apostle comforts his readers in persecution and slander, by the thought that bodily death would not exempt their adversaries from the divine judgment. In this case νεκροῖς would mean "*now dead*," and εὐηγγελίσθη would point to the time

h = Matt. xxiv.
6, 14. 1 Cor.
xv. 24.
viii. 35. Rom. xii. 3.

7 Πάντων δὲ τὸ ἡ τέλος ἡγγικεν· ἰσφρανήσατε οὖν ABKLP
1 = Matt. iii. 2. Rom. xii. 12. Heb. x. 25. James v. 8 al. j Mark v. 15. Luke
2 Cor. v. 13. Tit. ii. 6 only τ. N a b c d
e g h j k
l m o i s

when the gospel was preached to them, before they died. This of itself is a very weighty objection. Such a divulsion of the verb from its object by an intervening change of state and time was precisely that against which we protested in τοῖς ἐν φυλακῇ πνεύμασιν ἐκήρυξεν above, ch. iii. 19. But even granting that this might be so, other as great objections remain. For how does it consist with the ἐτοίμως ἔχειν above, that the Apostle should assume the deaths of these persecutors as a matter of course, to happen before the Lord's coming to judgment? Again, even granting such assumption, the number of their persecutors who would be amenable to punishment would thus be confined to those to whom the Gospel had been preached: any who might never have heard it would, by this reasoning, escape such judgment. Again, even supposing that all such objections were removed, the point established would be an utterly unworthy one. For who ever thought, that the fact of death before the Lord's coming would exempt any man from judgment? And to what purpose would it be, to speak to the readers in so marked a manner of their *dead* persecutors, in the midst of exhortations concerning their behaviour amidst their living ones? Next, we have the view (Calv., al.) that the particular case, on which the general νεκροῖς is founded, is that of such *persecuted Christians* as should de cease before the Lord's coming. To this the first of the before-raised objections, that νεκροῖς must mean '*now dead*,' and ἐπηγγ. refer to a *former* preaching when they were alive, applies in full force. And this I should hold to be fatal to it. It must be confessed, that it agrees better with the context than the last: for while that finds no assignable contextual justification, it might be said in this case, that for this very reason was the Gospel preached to those among you who have suffered death at the hands of persecutors,—even hereunto were they called,—that they might indeed be judged, condemned, by human persecution, as regards the flesh, but notwithstanding might live eternally with God as regards the spirit. Still I conceive we are not at liberty to receive it, on account of the above objection. If καὶ νεκροῖς ἐπηγγελλσθη may mean, "the Gospel was preached to some during their lifetime, who are now dead," exegesis has no longer any fixed rule, and Scripture may be made to prove any thing. (Bengel takes it in *both* the last-mentioned

references: to the persecutors, and to the Christians.) It remains that we consider the view, that the persons pointed at are those spirits in prison to whom our Lord went and preached, ch. iii. 19. This supposition, but always with the protest raised above, that νεκροῖς does not refer only to these, but to the dead generally, and that these are only the occasion of the general assertion, is also adopted by Wiesinger. And it may be thus defended: granted, that the γάρ of our verse assigns a reason, not for the persecutors giving an account to the judge of the quick and dead, nor for the Christians bearing up under the prospect of martyrdom,—it will follow of necessity that it assigns a reason for the κρίναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκροῖς which it immediately follows: or rather, for the νεκροῖς portion of that clause. Our Lord is ready to judge the dead: and with reason: for even they have not been without opportunity of receiving His gospel: as the example which was adduced in ch. iii. 19 shews. For this end the gospel was preached even to the dead,—that they might—not indeed escape the universal judgment on human sin, which is physical death,—but, *that they might be judged* (aor.; be in the state of the completed sentence on sin, which is death after the flesh) *according to (as) man as regards the flesh* (this first clause following ἵνα being the subordinate one, of the state which the ἐπηγγελσθη left remaining), but (notwithstanding) *might live* (pres.; of a state to continue) *according to God* (a life with God, and divine) *as regards the spirit*: so that the relation of these two clauses with μέν and δέ is precisely as in Rom. viii. 10, εἰ δὲ χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν, τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζῶν διὰ δικαιοσύνην: where the former clause in the apodosis is not the consequence of the protasis, but an abiding fact, seeming to militate against, but really not hindering that consequence. And this interpretation I adopt, believing it to be the only one which satisfies the philological conditions of the sentence: which justifies the γάρ as accounting for the κρίναι νεκροῖς: the καί, as taking up, and bringing into prominence and climax the νεκροῖς: the νεκροῖς, as used in precisely the same sense as in the last verse, and contemporary with the verb which governs it: the ἐπηγγελλσθη, as grounded on a previously announced fact, ch. iii. 19: the aim and end introduced by the ἵνα, which on this, and on no other rendering, receives meaning and perspi-

καὶ ^k νήψατε ¹ εἰς προσευχάς, ^{8 m} πρὸ πάντων τὴν ⁿ εἰς ¹ Θεσσα. v. 6.
^o ἑαυτοὺς ⁿ ἀγάπην ^p ἐκτενῆ ^q ἔχοντες, ὅτι ἀγάπη ^r καλύπτει ^s 2 Tim. iv.
 8 ch. i. 13. v.
 8 only +.
 1 = Eph. vi. 18.
 Heb. iii. 13 reff.
 r James v. 20 Paov.

m James v. 12. n Rom. v. 8. Eph. i. 15. Col. i. 4. o = (see note) Heb. iii. 13 reff.
 p here only +. (see ch. i. 22 reff.) Polyb. xxiii. 5. 4. q = ch. ii. 12 reff. r James v. 20 Paov.

7. om και ^{N1}. rec ins τας bef προσευχας, with KL[P] rel (Polyc) Thl Ec: om AB^N b¹ c d j k o (18) [Cyr₁].

8. rec aft παντων ins δε, with KL[P] rel [vulg] (with fuld demid) spec syr coptt [Antch₁] Thl Ec Bede: om A (appy) B^N 13 am (with harl tol) arm [Cyr₁] Aug₂. elz ins η bef αγαπη, with a b f g h m [Cyr₁ Antch₁] Thl: om ABKL[P]^N rel Clem-rom₁ Clem₂ Chr₂ Ec. rec καλυψει, with L[P]^N rel aeth Ec: txt ABK a c h o 13. 36 vulg syrr copt arm Clem-rom₁ Clem₂ Cyr₁ Chr₂ Antch₁ Tert₁ [Hil].

cuity. And so, in the main, with minor deviations, the more accurate of the modern Commentators: Steiger, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, Weiss.

7—V. 11.] *General exhortations with reference to behaviour within the Christian body, in contemplation of the approaching end.* This portion of the Epistle falls into three sections: 7—11, *Christian and social duties*, in consideration of the end being at hand: 12—19, *Christian bearing of suffering*, in the same consideration: v. 1—11, *ecclesiastical and general mutual ministrations*: passing off into fervent *general exhortations and aspirations*. 7.] But (the connexion is close with what had gone before: the ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι of ver. 5 is in the Apostle's mind: and he passes, with it before him, from considerations external to the church, to those affecting its internal condition) the end of all things (not, 'of all men': nor as Ec. altern. is τέλος, the τέλος πάντων προφητῶν τοῦτο δὲ ἀληθεὶ λόγος, ὁ χριστός: but simply the end, as in reff. Observe the emphatically prefixed πάντων, almost bearing the sense of τούτων πάντων: as Bengel: "Finis adeoque etiam petulantiae malorum et passionum piorum") is at hand (on this being the constant expectation of the apostolic age, see Acts i. 7, note: 1 Thess. iv. 15, note): be therefore of temperate mind (see note on 1 Tim. ii. 9), and be sober unto (with a view to) prayers (the τὰς before προσευχάς, which Tischdf. in his 7th edition has again inserted [not in edn. 8], as probably omitted in AB &c., because its force was not perceived, may just as well be regarded as an insertion owing to the plural seeming strange, which has also led to the correction into προσευχήν in ms. 13. Possibly Polycarp's νήφοντες πρὸς τὰς εὐχάς, ad Phil. 7, p. 1012, led to the change. At all events, where subjective considerations are so equivocal, it is our simple duty to follow the most ancient testimonies).

8]. above all things (πρὸ πάντων, as Wies. well remarks, not placing love above prayer, but because all social life and

duty must presuppose love as its necessary bond and condition. Here again it is just as likely that the δέ was inserted because there seemed to be no immediate connexion, as that it was omitted to produce that connexion), having your love towards one another (on ἑαυτοὺς in this sense, see note, Col. iii. 13) intense (see ch. i. 22. "Amor jam præsupponitur: ut sit vehemens, præcipitur." Beng.): because love covereth a multitude of sins (from ref. Prov., except that there it is οὐκ ἔσθ' ἅπας, all sins. The LXX have translated this word wrongly πάντας τοὺς μὴ φιλοκεκοῦντας. De Wette denies the reference, seeing that if St. Peter had cited from the Heb., he would in all probability have written πᾶσας τὰς ἁμαρτίας, or rather πάντα τὰ ἀδικήματα, as in Prov. xvii. 9: and thinks, on account of the verbal correspondence with ref. James, that the expression was a proverb in common use. But even if so, there can be no reasonable doubt that Prov. x. 12 was the source of it: so that it comes to nearly the same thing. As to the meaning, the words here are used in a different reference from that in St. James, where see note. Here it is the hiding of offences (both from one another and in God's sight: see below) by mutual forbearance and forgiveness, which is meant. This has been recently denied by De Wette and Huther, the former understanding the sins rather as those of the Christian body, which mutual love keeps back from being committed, and the latter not excluding the other meaning. They would understand the words, as of old Ec., ὁ μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὸν πλησίον ἔλεος, τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν ἱλεων ποιεῖ, and many Commentators both Romanist (not Estius) and Protestant, that love causes God to overlook a multitude of sins. This they do partly on account of ἁμαρτιῶν, which they maintain cannot well be applied to the mutual offences of common life (see however Matt. xviii. 15, ἐὰν ἁμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου) and partly on account of ὅτι, which "indicare videtur incitamentum aliquod, quo Christianus amor

^s Ezek. xxviii 18. ^t 1 Tim. ii. 2. ^{Tit. i. 8} ^v γογγυσμοῦ. ¹⁰ ἕκαστος ^w καθὼς ἔλαβεν ^x χάρισμα, εἰς ^{ABKLP} ^{8 a b c d} ^{f g h j k} ^{1 m o 13} ^u ἄνευ ^{πλῆθος} ⁹ φιλόξενοι εἰς ἀλλήλους ^{ἁμαρτιῶν.} ¹¹ εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς ^ο λόγια θεοῦ ^{ἔαυτοὺς αὐτὸ} ^υ διακονοῦντες ὡς ^z καλοὶ ^a οἰκονόμοι ^b ποι- ^{κίλης χάριτος θεοῦ.} ¹¹ εἴ τις λαλεῖ, ὡς ^ο λόγια θεοῦ ^{ἔλ τις} ^d διακονεῖ, ^e ὡς ^{ef} ἐξ ^f ἰσχύος ἧς ^g χορηγεῖ ὁ θεός· ^{ἵνα} ^h ἐν πάσιν ⁱ δοξάζηται ὁ ⁱ θεὸς διὰ ⁱ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ^φ ἔστιν ^ῆ ^k δόξα καὶ τὸ ^l κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, ἀμήν.

^z = John x. 11. 1 Tim. iv. 6. 2 Tim. ii. 3. ¹ Cor. i. 7 al. ² Cor. ix. 10 only. 3 Kings iv. 7 bis. Judith xii. 2 al. ^h = 1 Tim. iii. 11. 1 in doxol., ¹ Cor. i. 7 al. ^{Tit. i. 7.} ^d absol., 1 Tim. iii. 10, 13 (so *διακονία*, Rom. xii. 7) ^e 2 Cor. ix. 10 only. ^g 2 Cor. ix. 10 only. ³ Kings iv. 7 bis. Judith xii. 2 al. ^k Jude 25 reff.

9. rec γογγυσμων (see Phil ii. 14), with KL[P] rel Cc: txt ABN a b d 13 vulg spec syrr [sah arm(appy) Damasc-ms] Thl Fulg.

11. [for ης, ως KLP m.] om εστιν A d k l 13 arm [Damasc-ms].

commendatur" (Hottinger in De W.). And doubtless there is something in this latter consideration, especially when we remember that the nearness of the divine judgment is a pressing motive throughout these exhortations. I do not see why we should not take the saying in its widest reference, understanding it primarily perhaps of forgiveness, but then also of that prevention of sin by kindness of word and deed, and also that intercession for sin in prayer, which are the constant fruits of fervent love. It is a truth from which we need not shrink, that every sin which love hides from man's sight, is hidden in God's sight also. There is but One efficient cause of the hiding of sin: but mutual love *applies* that cause: *draws the universal cover over the particular sin*. This meaning, as long as it is not perverted into the thought that love towards others covers a man's own sin 'ex promerito,' need not and should not be excluded):—

9.] hospitable towards one another (see besides reff., Rom. xii. 13. "Loquitur non de pomposa hospitalitate Luc. xiv. 12, . . . sed de Christiana illa et sancta hospitalitate, qua peregrinos egenos, maxime vero propter religionis veræ professionem exules Christiani ex sincera caritate promte in aedes suas recipiunt, eos amanter et benigne complectuntur, tanquam Christi membra et ecclesiæ concives foveant" &c. Gerhard) without murmuring (see ref. Phil. and note. The opposite to γογγυσμός in hospitality is simple open-heartedness, Rom. xii. 8: the consequence of it, "occulta maledicentia, odiosa exprobratio beneficiorum," as Gerhard here):

10.] And this is to be so, not merely in the interchange of this world's good offices, but also in the communication of the gifts of the Spirit, which are the common endowment of the whole body, individual

Christians being only the stewards of them. Each man even as (in whatever quality and quantity: but the subsequent injunctions seem more to regard the quality than the quantity. It is otherwise in Eph. iv. 7; Rom. xii. 3. The καθὼς has no reference to the *manner* of reception,—"Sicut gratis accepimus, ita gratis demus," Lorianus in Huther) he received a gift of grace (see Rom. xii. 6 ff.: 1 Cor. xii. 4, 28, χάρισμα, anarthrous, any one of the gifts known by that name), to each other (see above ver. 8: the ἑαυτοὺς here brings up strikingly the idea that all are members of one-body) ministering it (διακονεῖν, transitive, as in ch. i. 12: ministering to the need of others; his store out of which he ministers being that gift thus bestowed upon him) as (being: or, as becometh: see ch. i. 14) good (reff.) stewards (reff., there is most likely a reference to our Lord's parable of the talents) of the various (see this illustrated 1 Cor. xii. 4; Matt. xxv. 15; Luke xix. 13) grace of God.

11.] And this both in speaking and acting. If any one speaketh (as a προφήτης or διδασκαλος, see 1 Cor. xii. 8, 10, where the several branches of this gift are laid out), speaking (understand λαλοῦντες, from the former construction, not λαλεῖτω) as oracles (not, "the oracles;" the meaning is not, speaking in accord with Scripture, but, speaking what he does speak, as God's sayings, not his own: as a steward, "non liberalis de proprio sed de alieno," as Gerh. on the last verse. On λόγια, see note, ref. Heb.) of God: if any one ministereth (in Rom. xii. 8; 1 Cor. xii. 28, we have the several parts of this διακονία laid out), (διακονοῦντες) as (see above) out of (as his store and power of ministration) the power (thus to minister) which God bestoweth (ἐπιχορηγέω is commoner than the simple word: cf. 2 Pet. i. 11; 2 Cor. ix. 10; Gal.

¹² Ἀγαπητοί, μὴ ^m ξενίζεσθε τῇ ἐν ὑμῖν ⁿ πυρώσει ^{m ver. 4 reff. 9, 18 only. Prov. xxvii. 21.}
^o πρὸς ^p πειρασμὸν ὑμῖν γινωμένην, ὡς ^q ξένου ὑμῖν ^r συμβαλ-
 νοντος, ¹³ ἀλλὰ ^s καθὼς ^t κοινωνεῖτε τοῖς τοῦ χριστοῦ ^{o = 1 Cor. x. 11. xii. 7. 2 Cor. i.}

20. viii. 19 al. p Luke iv. 13. 1 Tim. vi. 9 al. Sir. xxvii. 5. q = Acts xvii. 18. Heb. xiii. 9. Wisd. xvi. 2, 3, 16. r = & constr. Mark x. 32. (Luke xxiv. 14.) Acts ii. 10, xx. 19. (xxi. 35.) 1 Cor. x. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 22 only. Josh. ii. 23. s Rom. viii. 26. 2 Cor. viii. 12 bis only. Lev. ix. 5 B. t Rom. xii. 13. Gal. vi. 6. Phil. iv. 15 al. Wisd. vi. 25. Polyb. ii. 32. 8 al.

^{13.} ἐλθ καθὼς : txt ABKL[P]N rel Clem, Did, Thl Ec. (B does not om του as Btly : see table.)

iii. 5 ; Col. ii. 19 : and ἐπιχορηγία Phil. i. 19 ; Eph. iv. 16. From signifying the supply of means to furnish a chorus for the public performances at Athens, it came to mean generally, to *supply*, or *furnish* : that (aim and end of all this, as of every act both of the Christian community and of the Christian man) in all things (not, as De Wette, in all of you as His organs, referring to John xiii. 31, xvii. 10 : but as in ref. The fact that all things are referred to God and done as of and to Him, is His being glorified in the Christian church. Ec. gives as an altern., ἐν πᾶσιν ἔθνεσιν, which is still more in fault) God may be glorified through Jesus Christ ("sicut a Deo per Christum omnia beneficia ad nos descendant, ita quoque . . . per Christum omnia ad Dei gloriam referri debent." Gerh.), to whom (viz. to God, as the main subject of the foregoing, and also because ἡ δόξα refers back to δοξάζεται : Grot., Calov., Steiger, al. refer the words to Christ, which is not so natural here, seeing that διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ is introduced only secondarily. The case is very similar to Heb. xiii. 21, where see note. See similar doxologies, ch. v. 11 ; Rom. xi. 36 ; Eph. iii. 21) is the glory and the might (exactly so in Rev. i. 6 ; see also ib. v. 13) to the ages of the ages (i. e., for ever and ever, see note, 1 Tim. i. 17). Amen (is, as Harl., not a note of conclusion, but of strong emotion of heart).

^{12—19.]} *Exhortations* (see summary above) in reference to the trial of affliction which they were to undergo : and that, in view of the end of things. The section falls into three parts: 1) vv. 12, 13,—these sufferings, as participation in Christ's sufferings, are to be rejoiced in, as in prospect of participation of His glory also : 2) 14—16—if really sufferings for Christ, the glory of Christ already rests on you : take care then that they be verily sufferings for Him : 3) 17, 18, these sufferings are a part of the coming judgment which begins at the house of God. Then ver. 19 concludes. This passage is no repetition of ch. iii. 13—iv. 6, which treated of their sufferings with reference to their inflictors : whereas this proceeds wholly on reference to a Christian's own inner hopes, and considerations within

the church itself. ^{12, 13.]} See above.

^{12.]} Beloved (so ch. ii. 11 ; here it begins an affectionate address in which comfort and joy is about to be introduced), be not astonished at (see on ver. 4 : think it not a thing alien from you, in which you are not at home. St. Peter himself ἐξενίζετο at our Lord's sufferings, when he said Ἰλεώς σοι, κύριε. On the construction with dat. of reference, cf. Brasidas, Thuc. iv. 85, θανμάζω δὲ τῇ τε ἀποκλείσει μου τῶν πυλῶν, καὶ εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ. : and Winer, § 31. 1. f) the passing through the fire (πύρωσις, lit. *burning* : in its later use, smelting, trying of metal by fire : cf. Ps. lxxv. 10 LXX, ἐπύρωσας ἡμᾶς, ὡς πυροῦται τὸ ἀργύριον : Prov. xxvii. 21, δοκίμιον ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσῷ πύρωσις. See also Rev. iii. 18. Ec. says, πύρωσιν τὰς θλίψεις εἰπὼν, ἐνέφηγεν ὡς διὰ δοκιμασίαν αὐτοῖς αἵται) which is taking place (γινωμένη (not τῇ γινωμένη) may be rendered "taking place," as predicate after πυρώσει : so that the object of their astonishment was τὸ τὴν ἐν αὐτοῖς πύρωσιν γίνεσθαι : the sentence would thus stand, "at the πύρωσις in your case happening for a πειρασμός to you." But this is not grammatically necessary, and would be pragmatically hardly justifiable : because it would take the occurrence of the πύρωσις for granted, and make its purpose alone matter of astonishment : which was not so) in your case (ἐν ὑμῖν is rendered "among you" by De Wette and Luther (einige in eurer Mitte betreffende, De W.), and this may be : we can hardly say with Wiesinger that it is afterwards treated as a trial for all : the εἰ δειδίζεσθε and εἰ (τις πάσχει) ὡς χριστιανός necessarily assume that there were exceptions from the supposition. But I prefer the other rendering, as the Apostle evidently is in this and the next verse speaking generally) for a trial to you (ὑμῖν, dat. commodi), as if (explanatory of ξενίζεσθε) some strange thing were happening to you (συμβαλνόντος, as Bengel, "temere : " were falling by chance on you : opposed to πρὸς πειρασμὸν γινωμένην, done with a purpose, by One who knows how to serve that purpose) :

^{13.]} but in as far as (καθό, not "in that," "inasmuch as," Ec. V., nor

u ch. i. 11 reff. v ch. i. 7 reff. w see ch. v. 1. x Matt. v. 12. Rev. xix. 7. see John viii. 66. ch. i. 8. y ch. i. 6 reff. z Matt. v. 11. a = Luke x. 6 Acts iv. 33. [Rom iii. 22] b = and w. ἐπεὶ, here only. (Matt. xi. 28. 1 Cor. xvi. 18 al.) Isa. xi. 2. c see ch. iii. 18. d Matt. vi. xxii. 7. Acts iii. 14. vii. 52. xxviii. 4. Rev. xxi. 8. xxii. 15 om. 17. Wisd. xii. 8 only. e = Matt. vi. 19 al. Exod. xxii. 7. see 2 Pet. iii. 10. f ch. ii. 12 reff.

u παθήμασιν χαίρετε, ἵνα καὶ v ἐν τῇ vw ἀποκαλύψῃ τῆς ABKLP
w δόξης αὐτοῦ x χαρήτε xy ἀγαλλιώμενοι. 14 εἰ z οὐκ ἐδίξασθε N a b c d
ἐν ὀνόματι χριστοῦ, z μακάριοι, ὅτι τὸ τῆς δόξης καὶ τὸ τοῦ f g h j k
θεοῦ πνεῦμα a ἐφ' ὑμᾶς b ἀναπαύεται. 15 μὴ γάρ τις ὑμῶν l m o 13
c πασχέτω ὡς d φονεὺς ἢ e κλέπτης ἢ κακοποιός, ἢ ὡς

14. om ἐν N¹ l. aft δόξης ins και δυναμεις A[P] a c g k 13. 36 vulg-ed[with demid harl tol] syr sah [æth arm] Ath, Did, [Antch, Damasc-ms] Cyp₂; και της δυναμεις αυτου N(N³ disapproving αυτου): om BKL rel am(with [fuld] lux) Syr Clem₁ [Ephr, Thl] Ec Tert Fulg. επαναπαυεται A[: επαναπαυεται] N³(Treg) c: επαναπαυεται N³(Tischd), expr [who cites for this readg 13 Damasc-ms and the fathers given under αναπαυεται]: αναπαυεται (see 2 Cor vii. 13) b d f g h k o 13 Ath Did Ephr Antch. rec at end ins κατα μεν αυτους βλασφημειται κατα δε υμας δοξαζεται, with KL[P] rel am(with harl tol) syr-w-ast sah Thl Ec Cyp₂; om ABN a c d 13 vulg-ed (with fuld demid) Syr copt æth arm [Ephr] Tert.

quando, Pott: see reff.) ye are partakers with the sufferings of Christ (i. e. have a share, in your own persons, of those sufferings which He personally bare: cf. 2 Cor. iv. 10; Phil. iii. 10; Heb. xiii. 13 &c. It is not the sufferings of Christ mystical in His Body the church (cf. Col. i. 24) which are meant: in these the readers might bear their part, but could hardly be said κοινωνεῖν), rejoice, that (ἵνα simply of the scope of that joy, as the preparation for what follows) ye may also at (in, i. e. "in the day or time of:" not to be taken with χαρήτε, as indicating that at which or because of which the joy takes place) the revelation of His glory rejoice (aor.: χαίρετε before, of the habit of life; now χαρήτε, of the single event of that day) exulting ("quia prius illud cum dolore et tristitia mixtum est, secundum cum exultatione coniungit." Calv.). 14—16.]

See the summary above, at ver. 12. 14.] If ye are reproached in [i. e. in the matter of, for] the name of Christ (see Matt. v. 11, from which the words are adopted, as also ch. iii. 14. The word there added, ψευδόμενοι, comes below, vv. 15, 16. On οὐκ ἐδίξασθε. Bengel says, "probrum putabant gentes si quem appellarunt Christianum, ver. 16." But probably the reference is more general, and Calv. is right, "probrorum meminit, quoniam plus sæpe acerbis in se habent quam bonorum iactura, vel etiam tormenta et cruciatus corporis: itaque nihil est quod ingenuos animos magis frangat." And ἐν ὀνόματι χριστοῦ also must have a wider sense: on account of your confession of Christ in word and deed, as De Wette: cf. ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι χριστοῦ ἐστέ, Mark ix. 41), blessed are ye (cf. ch. iii. 14: blessed, and that even now), because the Spirit of *glory and that of God (the Apostle does

not mean, by repeating the art., two different spirits, but identifies the same Spirit under two different denominations: the Spirit of glory, which is also the Spirit of God: "qui idem Spiritus Dei." Winer, § 20. 1. c, compares Thuc. i. 126, ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διὸς τῇ μεγίστῃ ἐορτῇ: and Plato, Rep. viii. 565 D, περὶ τὸ ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ τὸ τοῦ Διὸς ἱερὸν, both of which however want the καί. Huther strangely takes τὸ τῆς δόξης alone, independent of πνεῦμα, as a periphrasis of δόξα: Bengel takes τῆς δόξης as concrete, "ut sit appellatio Christi, Jac. ii. 1," and remarks, "ut in nuatur Spiritum Christi eundem esse Spiritum Dei Patris") resteth upon you (from ref. Isa.: on you, as on Him: cf. also Num. xi. 25, 26; 4 Kings ii. 15. ἐφ' ὑμᾶς, prægn., "demissus in vos requiescit in vobis," as Wahl: not, as Huther, "the construction of the prep. with the acc. denotes the living operation of the Spirit on him upon whom He rests:" for no such idea as living operation, however true the fact may be, is contained in ἀναπαύεται).

It is of course possible that the clause which follows in the rec. (see var. readd.) may have fallen out by similarity of endings, ἀναπαύεται . . . δόξασται: but in judging of this as a likelihood, we must remember that not only the three great mss. ABN omit it, but so many of the ancient versions, as to make it very improbable that it has been thus overlooked: and its very glossematic appearance, to explain τῆς δόξης, is against it.

15, 16.] Negative, and positive, resumptions and enlargements of ἐν ὀνόματι χριστοῦ. 15.] In the name of Christ, I say: for let no one of you suffer (reproach or persecution: suffer in any way) as (being) a murderer, or a malefactor (as opposed to ἀγαθοποιῶν, ch. iii. 17), or as (the re-

ἡ ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος· 16 εἰ δὲ ὡς ἡ χριστιανός, μὴ ἰαῖ- ^{g here only + (not found elsw.)}
 σχυνέσθω, ^kδοξαζέτω δὲ τὸν ^kθεὸν ἐν τῷ ¹ὀνόματι τοῦτῳ. ^{h Acts xi. 26. xxvi. 28 only.}
 17 ὅτι ὁ ^mκαιρὸς ⁿτοῦ ὀφείλασθαι τὸ ^pκρίμα ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ ¹Λουκ. xvi. 3. 2 Cor. x. 8.
 οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ· εἰ δὲ πρῶτον ἀφ' ἡμῶν, τί τὸ ^rτέλος τῶν ¹Phil. i. 20. 1 John ii. 28
 ἀπειθουσιν τῷ ^qτοῦ θεοῦ ^rεὐαγγελίῳ; 18 καὶ ^uεἰ ὁ ¹xii. 13. Sir. xlii. 1.
^kver 11. ¹= Mark ix. 41. Ev. iii. 1. ^mw. inf, Heb. xi. 15 reff. ^oMatt. x. 8 Luke xxiv. 27,
ⁿgen., Luke i. 57. ii. 6. xxii. 6. Acts xiv. 9. Winer, § 44. 4, a. ^pActs xxiv. 25 Heb. vi. 2. Rev. xx. 4.
⁴⁷. [John vii. 9.] Acts i. 22. vii. 35 al. Ezek. ix. 6. ^qsch ii. 7, 8 reff. ^rconstr, ch. iii. 1.
^q= Heb. vi. 8 reff. ^r= Heb. vi. 8 reff. ^uProv. xi. 31.
^tRom. xv. 16. 2 Cor. xi. 7. 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9.

15. ἀλλοτριοεπ. B^N [d] : ἀλλοτριοεπισκ. A m [Ephr].

16. χρηστίανος N (but corrd). rec (for ονοματι) μερει, with KL[P] rel Thl: txt
 AB^N m 13 vss Ephr, Cyr[p], Ec Tert, Aug Promiss.

17. om δ AN c d j. [for φη'] απο B. υμων A²N¹ c j m æth[-rom(Tischdf)] Thl
 Ec-comm. aft τω ins λογω N¹: but "prima manus puncta imposuit." (Tischdf.)

petition of ὧς separates the following word from the foregoing, as belonging to a separate class) a prior to other men's matters (ὁ ἐπισκεπτόμενος τὰ ἀλλότρια. "Hanc explicationem," says Gerhard, "probat 1) ipsa vocis compositio, 2) veterum expositio, Tert. Cyr. Aug. (Ec., δ τὰ ἀλλότρια περιεργαζόμενος), 3) temporis et loci circumstantia. Procul dubio quidam Christiani, ex incogitantia, temeritate et levitate, in actiones infidelium utpote vicinorum suorum curiosius inquirebant, eas proprio arbitrio redarguebant, ac iudices eorum esse volebant, quod non pertinebat ad eorum vocationem." Wies. suggests that the word probably alludes to the ἐπίσκοπος of the church, combining it with ἀλλοτριο-, to shew the incongruity).

16.] But if (he suffer) as (being) a Christian (see reff. The word appears here, as in Acts xxvi. 28, to be used as carrying contempt, from the mouth of an adversary) let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name (viz. that of χριστιανός: at, or in, the fact that he is counted worthy to suffer by such a name. This seems better, with Wies., al., than to take ὀνόματι as = μέρει, the word substituted for it in the later mss., as "causa nominata," "behalf" E. V., "regard, matter," as most Commentators. Even in ref. Mark, ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι does not lose its allusion to the ὄνομα itself: see there. On the sense, Bengel well remarks, "Poterat Petrus antithetivè dicere, honori sibi ducat: sed honorem Deo resignandum esse docet").

17—19.] See summary at ver. 12. The thought which lies at the root, is this: all men must come under the judgment of God. His own family He brings first under it, chastising them in this life: let then those who suffer for His sake glorify Him for it, as apprehending their part in His family, and as mindful of the terrible lot of those whom His judgment shall find impe-

nitent and unchastised. It is this latter thought, the escape from the weight of God's hand (ch. v. 6), and not (Gerh.) the thought of the terrible vengeance which God will take on their persecutors, which is adduced as the second ground of comfort to the persecuted Christians.

17.] Because (grounds the δοξαζέτω, and the whole behaviour implied in it) it is the season (now: "the time is come," as E. V.) of the judgment (nouns in -μα and -σις became very much confounded in later Greek: witness καύχημα, sometimes hardly distinguishable from καύχσις, even in the passages where we have maintained the concrete meaning, 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3. And κρίμα must very often be simply rendered "judgment," "act of judging;" cf. reff.) beginning at (ἀπό, reff.: and proceeding onward from) the house of God (explained in the next clause (ἀφ' ἡμῶν) to mean the church, the temple of living stones, the οἶκος πνευματικός of ch. ii. 5. The reference is to prophecies like Jer. xxv. 15 ff., especially ver. 29: xlix. 12: Ezek. ix. 6: Amos iii. 2. "Hanc sententiam ex trita et perpetua Scripturæ doctrina sumpsit Petrus: idque mihi probabilis est, quam quod alii putant, certum aliquem locum notari." Calv. Wiesinger reminds us that it is hardly possible that the destruction of Jerusalem was *past*, when these words were written: if that had been so, it would hardly have been said, ὁ καιρὸς τοῦ ἔρξασθαι: but if first (it begin) at us (= τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ, cf. Heb. iii. 6. The argument, 'a minori ad majus,' see expanded above. Cf. our Lord's question, Luke xxiii. 31, εἰ ἐν τῷ ὄργῳ ξύλα ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ τί γένηται;), what (will be) the end of them that disobey (reff.) the gospel of God (τοῦ θεοῦ prefixed to εὐαγγ. for emphasis: q. d. "the blessed tidings of the very God who is to judge them." Bengel's summary is excellent: "Judicium, initio tolerabilius,

δικαιος ὁ μολις σώζεται, ὁ ἄσεβης καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸς ποῦ φανείται; 19 ὥστε καὶ οἱ ἁπασχοντες κατὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ πιστῶ κτίστη παρατιθέσθωσαν τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν ἁγαθοποιῇ.

V. 18 Πρεσβυτέρους οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν παρακαλῶ ὁ συμ-

1. c. (Jude 15.) z = 1 Cor. iii. 7, 21. Phil. ii. 12. iv. 1 al. a see ch. iii. 18. b see ch. iii. 17. c = 1 Cor. i. 9. x. 13. 2 Cor. i. 18. 1 Thess. v. 24. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 13 al. d here only. 2 Kings xiii. 32. Judith ix. 12. Sir. xiv. 8. 2 Macc. 24 only. e Psal. xxx. 5. Luke xxi. 46. = Acts xiv. 23. xx. 32 f here only t. (-ποιός, ch. ii. 14.) g = Acts xi. 30. 1 Tim. v. 17, 19. Tit. i. 5. James v. 14. h = Heb. xiii. 19, 22 al. i here only.

18. ins δε bef ασεβης B¹ 137 syr. ins o bef αμαρτωλος AN l 3. 95¹-6.

19. rec ins ωs bef πιστω, with KL[P] rel syr Thl Ec Hil; om ABN d 13 vulg copt [æth arm] Ath., rec ευνταν, with m [(before ψυχ.) 13(e sil)]; om B: txt AKL[P]N rel Thl Ec. αγαθοποιαις A b¹ d o 13 vulg syrr [arm].

CHAΡ. V. 1. rec om ουν, with KL[P] rel copt Thl Ec: ins ABN a o 36. 69. 137 vulg syr-w-ast [arm Cyr, Jer.—in N the o is written over the traces of a τ. rec ins τους bef εν υμιν, with KL[P]N rel [vulg spec syrr copt Cyr-p, Thl Ec]: om AB a c

sensim ingravescit. Pii sua parte perfuncti cum immunitate spectant miserias impiorum: impii dum pios affligunt, suam mensuram implent et discunt quæ sua ipsorum portio futura sit: sed id melius sciunt pii, quare patientes sunt"? 18.] and (the question of the last verse is again repeated under a well-known form, taken from the O. T., which however casts solemn light on both members of the interrogation: explaining what is meant by judgment on God's people and also by the end of the disobedient. The citation is verbatim from the LXX, except that μέν is omitted between δ and δικαιος. The LXX departs from the Heb. text, which is as the E. V., "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner") if the righteous is (is being, see reff.: or rather perhaps the pres., of that which is to be) with difficulty saved (on account of the sharpness of the trial, and his own weakness. "Hoc μόλις temperatur 2 Pet. i. 11 proluxe." Bengel. Cf. Rev. v. 4, 5. The μόλις does not induce any doubt as to the issue, only wonder: if we be δίκαιοι by faith in Christ, our salvation, however difficult and apparently impossible, is as certain as Christ's own triumph), the ungodly (ἄσεβης, 'impious,' the man who in his innermost heart cares not for God and turns not to Him) and sinner (he that is devoted to sin. The absence of a second article, and the singular verb, both shew, that the same person is meant by both), where shall he appear (so in Ps. i. 5: where shall he stand and find an abiding place in the judgment)? 19.] Wherefore (general conclusion from vv. 17, 18. If the sufferings of Christians as Christians are a sign of God's favour towards them, in subjecting them to His judgments, with a view to

their not perishing with the ungodly world, then have they every reason to trust Him in those sufferings, and to take comfort: continuing in that same well-doing which is their very element and condition) let also them who suffer (καί, as well as all other persons: not as Bengel, καί, concessive: "καί, etiam, cum participio, idem quod εἰ καί, et si, cum verbo:" for it is on this very εἰ καί hypothesis that the Apostle has been long proceeding; so that it would be unnatural for him to introduce it here again with a climax:—nor as De Wette and Huther, is it to be taken with ἔστω) according to (in pursuit of, along the course of) the will of God (see on ch. iii. 17: here especially in reference to our ver. 17, seeing that it is God's will that judgment should begin at His house), commit (reff. deliver (subjectively) into the hands of, and confidently leave there) their souls (their personal safety and ultimate σώζεσθαι, ver. 18) in (ἐν, as clad in, accompanied with, subsisting and employed in) well-doing (as contrasted with the opposite characters in ver. 15. Huther says well: "This addition, ἐν ἀγαθῷ, shews that the confident surrender to God is to be joined, not with careless indolence, but with active practice of good") to a faithful Creator (in God being our Creator, without whom not a hair falls to the ground, we have an assurance that we are not overlooked by Him: in His being a faithful Creator (ἀσφαλὴς κ. ἀψευδὴς κατὰ τὰς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ, Ec.), whose covenant truth is pledged to us, it is implied that we are within that covenant, suffering according to His will and as His children. κτίστη must not be understood of the second creation in the new birth, nor must it be rendered possessor, as Calvin).

πρεσβύτερος καὶ ^k μάρτυς τῶν τοῦ χριστοῦ ¹ παθημάτων, ^k = Luke xxiv. 48. Isa. xliii. 10. ὁ καὶ τῆς ^m μελλούσης ^{mn} ἀποκαλύπτεσθαι ⁿ δόξης ^o κοινῶνός, ² ^p ποιμάντα τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν ^q ποιμνιον τοῦ θεοῦ [ἐπι- ^r ἐπι- ^m Rom. viii. 18. Gal. ii. 23. see ch. i. 5reff. n see ch. iv. 13. σκοποῦντες] μὴ ^s ἀναγκαστῶς ἀλλὰ ^t ἐκουσίως, ^u μηδὲ ^v αἰσ- ^o 1 Cor. x. 18. 2 Cor. i. 7. 2 Pet. i. 4 al. Isa. i. 23. Sir. vi. 10. p Matt. ii. 6. John xxi. 16. Acts xx. 28 al. 1 Kings xxv. 16. Isa. xl. 11. q here bis. Luke xii. 32. Acts xx. 28, 29. Zech. x 3 al. r Heb. xii. 15 only. 2 Chron. xxiv. 12 al. s here only +. t = here only. (Heb. x. 26 only.) Ps. liii. 6 (8). u here only +. (see Tit. i. 7, 11.)

69. 137. δόξης bef αποκαλύπτεσθαι A arm.

2. for ὑμιν ποιμνιον, ὑμνιον N¹. om επισκοπουντες BN¹ 27-9 [Ps Chr, Anton,] Jer, [Vig,]. (αλλα, so BN 13.) aft εκουσιως ins κατα θεον A[P]N¹ a m 13 vulg syr copt [æth arm Thl] Antch₁; και κατα θν b o. for μηδε, μη AL c² Syr æth Æc [Anton,].

CHAP. V. 1—11.] *Last hortatory portion of the Epistle*; in which the word ending the former portion, ἀγαθοποιῆς, is taken up and spread over various classes among the readers: thus vv. 1—4, he exhorts the *leaders of the church*; ver. 5, the *younger members* (see note there); vv. 6—9, *all in common*. Then, vv. 10, 11, follows his general *parting wish and ascription of praise to God*.

1.] **Elders** therefore among you I exhort (any who are in the situation of πρεσβύτεροι, anarthrous: the omission of τοῦς after πρεσβ. is not surprising in St. Peter's style, but has apparently led to the insertion of the art. by those who did not advert to this peculiarity. The designation here is evidently an official one (ver. 2), but at the same time reference to age is included: cf. νεώτεροι, ver. 5. The οὖν takes up the above exhortation, ch. iv. 19) **who am** a fellow-elder (with you: "Hortatio mutua inter æquales et collegas inprimis valet,"

* Beng.), and witness of the sufferings of Christ (μάρτυς, not in the sense of Acts i. 8, 22, ii. 32, x. 39, al. (De Wette, al.),—a witness to testify to by words,—nor as Heb. xii. 1; Acts xxii. 20; Rev. ii. 13, xvii. 6, a witness, in bearing about in his own person (Luth., Calv., Huther),—nor both of these together ("Petrus et viderat ipsum Dominum patientem, et nunc passiones sustinebat," Bengel);—but in the sense of an *eye-witness*, on the ground of which his apostolic testimony rested: q. d. I who say to you *χριστὸς ἐπαθεν σαρκί*, say this of sufferings which my own eyes saw. Thus this clause links on the following exhortation to the preceding portion of the Epistle concerning Christian suffering, and tends to justify the οὖν. Observe that it is not δ καὶ μάρτυς, but συμπρεσβ. κ. μάρτυς are under the same art.: q. d. "the one among the συμπρεσβύτεροι who witnessed the sufferings of Christ"), who am also a partaker of the glory which is about to be revealed (I prefer to take this as an allusion to our Lord's own words John xiii. 36,

ὅστερον ἀκολουθήσεις μοι, rather than regard it as alluding to the Transfiguration, as some (e. g. Dr. Burton), or to the certainty that those who suffer with Him will be glorified with Him (see above on this view of μάρτυς). As bearing that promise, he came to them with great weight of authority as an exhorter—having seen the sufferings of which he speaks, and being himself an heir of that glory to which he points onwards),—

2.] **tend** ([or **keep**] the aor. stronger than the pres. in the imperative: gathering together the whole ποιμαίνειν into one ποιμαίνει as the act of the life) **the flock** (compare the injunction given to St. Peter himself in John xxi. 16, *ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου*. "Quam ergo ovium pascendarum curam a Christo sibi noverat commendatam, in ejus societatem presbyteros vocat," Gerhard. The verb includes in one word the various offices of a shepherd; the leading, feeding, heeding: "pascere mente, pascere ore, pascere opere, pascere animi oratione, verbi exhortatione, exempli exhibitione," Bernard, in Wiesinger. Our only, but not sufficient, word is, "tending") of God (cf. Acts xx. 28. The similitude is among the commonest in Scripture: cf. Jer. iii. 15, xiii. 1—4; Ezek. xxxiv. 2 ff.; John x. 11 ff.) **which is among you** (τὸ ἐν ὑμῖν is taken by Erasm. and Calvin to mean "quantum in vobis est:" and no doubt this is possible; yet it sounds more Latin than Greek, which would rather perhaps be τὸ καθ' ὑμᾶς, or τὸ ἐξ ὑμῶν, as Wies. observes. But the sense is the greatest objection: "Petrus noverat sibi a Christo non esse dictum, pascere quantum in te est, oves meas, sed absolute et simpliciter, pascere," as Gerhard. And the ἐν ὑμῖν above seems decisive against this meaning. But even then we find various renderings: as "vobis pro vestra parte commissum," Bengel, as εἶναι or κεῖσθαι ἐν τινι, and so Luther (bie hēerte, fo euch befohlen ist), Steiger, al.: Huther says, ἐν signifies here, as elsewhere also, inner communion, not merely local presence: "the

† here only.
2 Chron.
xxix. 34.
Tobit vii. 8
al2.
Deut. ix. 29.

χροκερδῶς ἀλλὰ † προθύμως, 3 μηδ' ὥς † κατακυριεύοντες ABKLP
τῶν † κλήρων ἀλλὰ † τύποι γινόμενοι τοῦ † ποιμνίου. 4 καὶ †
† = Matt xx. 25 || Mk. (Acts xix. 6) only. Num. xxi. 24 al
† = Phil iii. 17. 1 Thess. i. 7. 2 Thess. iii. 9. 1 Tim. iv. 12. Tit. ii. 7.
x = here only see note, and 1 im o 13

3. om ver. B.

flock which is under your charge." Gerhard gives "qui vobiscum est, videlicet cum quo unum corpus, una ecclesia estis," to which I do not see that Huther has any right to object, as he does. But the mere local meaning is by far the best. He orders them to feed the flock of God, not generally, nor oecumenically, but locally, as far as concerned that part of it found among them) [overseeing (it) (the word ἐπισκοποῦντες, which tallies very much with St. Peter's participial style, has perhaps been removed for ecclesiastical reasons, for fear πρεσβύτεροι should be supposed to be, as they really were, ἐπισκοποί: "ipsium episcopatus nomen et officium exprimere voluit," Calv.)] not constrainedly ('co-actē' as Bengel, "necessitas incumbit, 1 Cor. ix. 16, sed hujus sensum absorbet lubentia. Id valet et in suscipiendo et in gerendo munere. Non sine reprehensione sunt pastores qui, si res integra esset, mallem quidvis potius esse." Bede, "Coacte pascit gregem Dei, qui propter rerum temporalium penuriam non habens unde vivat, ideo prædicat Evangelium ut de Evangelio vivere possit." And then, as Calv., "Dum agimus ad necessitatis præscriptum, lente et frigide in opere progredimur") but willingly (not exactly, as Bede, "superne mercedis intuitu," but out of love to the great Shepherd, and to the flock. The addition in AM al., κατὰ θεόν, is curious, and not easily accounted for. It certainly does not, as Huther says, clear up the thought, but rather obscures it. The expression is seldom found; and never in the sense here required. Cf. Rom. viii. 27; 2 Cor. vii. 9 ff.), nor yet (μηδέ brings in a climax each time) with a view to base gain ("propter questum et terrena comoda," as Bede. Cf. Isa. lvi. 11; Jer. vi. 13, viii. 10; Ezek. xxxiv. 2, 3, &c.; and Tit. i. 7) but earnestly (as 2 Cor. xii. 14 (cf. προθυμία, 2 Cor. viii. 11, ix. 2), prompted by a desire not of gain, but of good to the flock;—ready and enthusiastic, as (the illustration is Bede's) the children of Israel, and even the workmen, gave their services eagerly and gratuitously to build the tabernacle of old): 3.] nor yet as lording it over (the κατα as in reff. and in καταδυναστεύω James ii. 6, κατακαυχάμαι Rom. xi. 18, James ii. 13, καταπαρτρύω Matt. xxvi. 62, carries the idea of hostility, and therefore, when joined with κυριεύω, of oppression; of using the

rights of a κύριος for the diminution of the ruled and the exaltation of self. Christian rulers of the church are προϊστάμενοι (1 Thess. v. 12; Rom. xii. 8), ἡγούμενοι (Luke xxii. 26), but not κυριεύοντες (Luke xxii. 25, 26). One is their κύριος, and they are His διάκονοι the portions (entrusted to you) (so is κλήρος understood by (not Cyril, as commonly cited: see below) Bede apparently, Ærasm. ("gregem qui cuique forte contigit gubernandus"), Æstius ("gregis Dominici portiones, quæ singulis episcopis pascendæ et regendæ velut sortito obtigerunt"), Calov., Bengel, Wolf, Steiger, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger, al. And so Theophanes, Homil. xii. p. 70 (in Suicer), addresses his hearers, ἡμεῖς δέ, ὃ κλήρος ἐμὸς: cf. also Acts xvii. 4 (of which I do not see why De Wette should say that it has nothing to do with the present consideration). On the other hand, 2. 'the heritage of God' is taken as the meaning by Cyril (on Isa. iii. 12 (vol. iii. p. 63), not i. 6, as commonly cited by all, copying one from another. But the passage is not satisfactory. In the Latin, we read "non ut dominentur in clero, id est, populo quæ sors Domini est:" but the words in italics have no representatives in the Greek, which simply quotes this verse without comment), Calv. ("quum universum ecclesiæ corpus hæreditas sit domini, totidem sunt veluti prædia, quorum culturam singulis presbyteris assignat"), Beza (and consequently E. V.), Grot., Benson, al. But the objections to this are, that κλήροι could not be taken for portions of κλήρος,—and that θεοῦ could in this case hardly be wanting. Again, 3. some, principally R.-Cath. expositors, have anachronistically supposed κλήροι to mean the clergy: so even Æc.,—κλήρον τὸ ἱερὸν σύστημα καλεῖ, ὥσπερ καὶ νῦν ἡμεῖς, and Jer., Epist. ad Nepot. (lii. 7, vol. i. p. 262): so Corn. a-Lap. ("jubet ergo S. Petrus Episcopis et Pastoribus, ne inferioribus clericis imperiose dominari velint"), Justiniani (doubtfully: "sive P. de fidei populo universo, sive de ordine ecclesiastico loquatur"), Feuardentius, al. 4. Dodwell understood it of the church-goods: which view has nothing to recommend it, and is refuted by Wolf, Curæ, h. l. That the first meaning is the right one, is decided by τοῦ ποιμνίου below: see there), but becoming (it is well, where it

^z φανερωθέντος τοῦ ^a ἀρχιποίμενος ^b κομιεῖσθε τὸν ^c ἀμα- ^z = 2 Cor. v. 10.
^ράντινον τῆς δόξης ^d στέφανον. ⁵ Ὁμοίως νεώτεροι ^e ὑπο- ¹ Col. iii. 4.
^{τάγητε} πρεσβύτεροις, πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις τὴν ^f ταπεινο- ¹ John ii. 28.
^{Heb. xiii. 20 reff.} ^{b = ch. i 8 reff.} ^{c here only.} ^{d 1 Cor. ix. 25. 2 Tim.}
^{iv. 8. James i. 12} ^{Rev. ii. 10. Prov. iv. 9.} ^{e Heb. xii 9 reff.} ^{f Acts xx. 19. Eph.}
^{iv. 2. Phil. ii. 3.} ^{Col. ii. 18, 23. iii. 12} ^{Paul only, exc. here +.} ^{(φρων, ch. iii. 8.} ^{-φρονῶν, Ps. cxxx. 2.)}

5. aft ὁμοίως ins δε Ν¹(Ν³ disapproving) [syrr] : δε οι b ο : δε και οι a c : και οι m.
 ins τοις bef πρεσβύτεροις Ν g. rec aft ἀλλήλοις ins υποτασσόμενοι,
 with KL[P] rel syr [æth] Thl Ec: om ABN 13 vulg Syr copt arm [Ephr.] Antch.,

can be done, to keep the distinctive meaning of γίνομαι. This more frequently happens in affirmative than in negative sentences: cf. μὴ γίνου ἕπιστος ἀλλὰ πιστός, John xx. 27, where this distinctive meaning can be well brought out in the latter clause, but not in the former) **patterns of the flock** (the tyrannizing could only apply to the portion over which their authority extended, but the good example would be seen and followed by the whole church: hence τῶν κλήρων in the prohibition, but τοῦ ποιμῆνι in the exhortation. τύποι, because the flock will look to you: "pastor ante oves vadit." Gerh. The Commentators quote from Bernard, "Monstruosa res est gradus summus et animus infimus, sedes prima et vita ima, lingua magniloqua et vita otiosa, sermo multus et fructus nullus:" and from Gregory the Great, "Informis est vita pastoris, qui modo calicem Domini signat, modo talos agit: qui in avibus cœli ludit, canes instigat," &c.); 4.] and (then) (καὶ of the result of something previously treated, as Matt. xxvi. 55; John x. 16 al. fr.: see Winer, § 53. 3) **when the chief Shepherd** (see ch. ii. 25; Heb. xiii. 20: and compare Ezek. xxxiv. 15, 16, 23; Matt. xxv. 32) **is manifested** (used by St. Peter, as ἀποκαλύπτω, in a double reference, to Christ's first coming, and His second also: cf. ch. i. 20: so also by St. Paul, Col. iii. 4; 1 Tim. iii. 16: by St. John, 1 John ii. 28, iii. 2, 5, 8. Here, clearly of the second coming. It would not be clear, from this passage alone, whether St. Peter regarded the coming of the Lord as likely to occur in the life of these his readers, or not: but as interpreted by the analogy of his other expressions on the same subject, it would appear that he did), **ye shall receive** (reff.) **the amarantine** (ἀμαράντινος is adj. from ἀμάραντος, the everlasting, or unfading, flower. Most Commentators have assumed without reason that it = ἀμάραντος, ch. i. 4, unfading. Philostr. in Heroicis, p. 741, cited in Wolf, has ὅθεν καὶ στεφάνους ἀμαράντινους εἰς τὰ κήδη πῶτοι Θετταλοὶ ἐνόμισαν: see also Palm and Rost, sub voce. In the sense,

there will be no difference: but the Apostle would hardly have used two derivatives of the same word, to express one and the same quality) **crown** (reff.) **of His glory** (or, of glory: but I prefer the other. That we shall share His glory, is a point constantly insisted on by St. Peter: cf. ver. 1, ch. iv. 13, i. 7: and above all, ver. 10 below. This idea reaches its highest in St. John, with whom the inner unity of the divine life with the life of Christ is all in all. Cf. especially 1 John iii. 2 f.). 5—7.] *Exhortation to the younger, and to all, to humility and trust in God.* 5.] **In like manner** (i. e. 'mutatis mutandis,' in your turn: see ch. iii. 7: with the same recognition of your position and duties), **ye younger, be subject to the elders** (in what sense are we to take νεώτεροι and πρεσβύτεροι here? One part of our answer will be very clear: that πρεσβύτεροι must be in the same sense as above, viz., in its official historical sense of presbyters in the church. This being so, we have now some clue to the meaning of νεώτεροι: viz. that it cannot mean younger in age merely, though this, as regarded men, would generally be so, but that as the name πρεσβύτεροι had an official sense, of superintendents of the church, so νεώτεροι likewise, of those who were the ruled, the disciples, of the πρεσβύτεροι. Thus taken, it will mean here, the rest of the church, as opposed to the πρεσβύτεροι. Nor will this meaning, as Weiss maintains, p. 344, be at all impugned by πάντες δέ which follows, inasmuch as that clearly embraces both classes, πρεσβύτεροι and νεώτεροι. As Wiesinger well says, The Apostle is teaching what the πρεσβ. owe to the church, what the church to them, what all without distinction to one another. Weiss would understand these νεώτεροι as he does in Acts v. 6, and νεανίσκοι ib. ver. 10 (but see note there), young persons, who were to subserve the ordinary wants of the elders in the ministration. Luther, Calv., Gerhard, al., and more recently De Wette and Huther, take νεώτεροι for the younger members of the congregation: in which case, as most of these confess, we must enlarge the sense of πρεσβυτέρους here,

g (see note)
here only τ.

(-δῶμα,
Isa. iii. 20
Theod.)

Prov. iii. 34.

James iv. 6.

i James iv. 6.

reff

k Acts xviii.

Rom. xii. 2.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

James iv. 6

(from l. c.), v. 6 only.

3 Kings xi. 34 bis.

Hos. ii. 6 bis only.

φροσύνην ἔγκομβώσασθε, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ὑπερηφάνους ἀντιτάσσει, ταπεινοὺς δὲ δίδωσιν χάριν. ταπεινώθητε οὖν ὑπὸ τὴν κραταίαν χεῖρα τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ὑμᾶς ὑψώσῃ ἐν καιρῷ, πᾶσαν τὴν μέριμναν ὑμῶν ἐπιρίψαντες ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι αὐτῷ μέλει περὶ ὑμῶν.

ABKLP
x a b c d
f g h j k
l m o 13

om δ B 177¹ (Clem.).
6. χεῖραν [A]N. aft εν καιρω ins επισκοπης A[P] 13 vulg spec syr-w-ast copt
[æth arm] Ephr.
7. rec επιριψαντες, with B²KL[P] rel: txt AB¹N. for 2nd υμων, ημων N¹ [13].

which in my mind is a fatal objection to the view. The above interpretation, that νεώτεροι are the rest of the congregation as distinguished from the πρεσβύτεροι, is that of Bede, Est., Benson, Pott, al., and of Wiesinger: yea (the E. V. happily thus gives the sense of the δέ: q. d. Why should I go on giving these specific injunctions, when one will cover them all?) all gird on humility to one another (an allusion to our Lord's action of girding Himself with a napkin in the servile ministration of washing the disciples' feet: of which He himself said, καὶ ὑμεῖς ὀφείλετε ἀλλήλων νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας. ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήτε. The impression made on St. Peter by this proof of his Master's love is thus beautifully shewn. As to the details: the ὑποσασόμενοι of the rec. has probably been a clumsy gloss to help out the construction of the dat. commodi ἀλλήλοις. ἔγκομβώσασθε is variously interpreted. Its derivation is from κόμβος, a string or band attached to a garment to tie it with: hence κόμβωμα, an apron, through κομβώ, to gird or tie round; and thus ἔγκομβώ, to gird on, and -όμαι, to gird on one's self. ἔγκομβωμα is used for a kind of girdle by Longus, Pastoralia ii. 33, and Pollux iv. 119. See in Wetst. The Schol. in ms. 16 says, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐνεilhσασθε, περιβάλεσθε, ἢ ἀναστειλάσθε. In Hesych., the κομβολύτης is explained to be a βαλαντιότομος. There is a very complete and learned dissertation on this passage in the Fritzscheiorum Opuscula, pp. 259—275, containing all the literature of the subject. The result there is, "omnes lectores, oratione in eos conversa, admonet, ut quemadmodum servi heris se modeste submittunt (the ἔγκομβωμα being a servile garment or apron), ita unus alteri tanquam minor majori cedens obsequiosum modestumque se præbeat: 'omnes autem lubenter alter alteri cedentes modestiam

vobis pro servorum encombomate incingite.'" This is perhaps going too far, to seek the meaning of the verb altogether in its derivative: but the reference is at least possible. For more particulars consult the dissertation itself, and Wetstein's note. Some put a comma after ἀλλήλοις, and join πάντες δὲ ἀλλήλοις to the preceding, 'yea, all of you (be subject) to one another.' But this is unnecessary, the dative being in this sense abundantly justified: cf. Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 22; 2 Cor. v. 13. Winer, § 31. 4. δ): because (reason why you should gird on humility) God (the citation agrees verbatim with James iv. 6) opposeth Himself to the proud ("reliqua peccata fugiunt Deum, sola superbia se opponit Deo; reliqua peccata depriment hominem, sola superbia erigunt eum contra Deum. Inde etiam Deus superbis vicissim se opponit," Gerhard. The student will remember the saying of Artabanus to Xerxes, Herod. vii. 10, δρᾶς τὰ ὑπερέχοντα ζῶα ὡς κεραυνοὶ ὁ θεός, οὐδὲ ἐξ φαντάζεσθαι, τὰ δὲ σμικρὰ οὐδὲν μιν κνίσει; . . . φιλείει γὰρ ὁ θεός τὰ ὑπερέχοντα πάντα κολοῦει), but giveth grace to the humble (ταπεινοῖς here in a subjective sense, the lowly-minded, those who by their humility are low. "Humilitas est vas gratiarum," Ang. in Gerh.).
6.] Humble yourselves (on the medial signification of some verbs in the aor. 1 pass. in the N. T., see Winer, § 39. 2. The commonest example is ἀποκριθῆς. Cf. also διεκρίθη, Matt. xxi. 21; Rom. iv. 20, &c.) therefore (the same spirit as before continues through this and the following verses: the μέριμνα here, and the παθήματα, ver. 9, keeping in mind their persecutions and anxieties, as also does κραταίαν χεῖρα, see below) under the mighty hand of God (on the expression, see reff., LXX. The strong hand of God is laid on the afflicted and suffering, and it is for them to acknowledge it in lowliness of mind), that He may exalt you (the Apostle

8 ^u Νήψατε, ^v γρηγορήσατε· ὁ ^w ἀντίδικος ὑμῶν διάβολος ^{u ch. iv 7 reff.}
^x λέων ^y ὠρνούμενος περιπατεῖ ^z ζητῶν τίνα ^a καταπιεῖν, ^{v Matt. xxiv.}
⁹ ᾧ ^b ἀνίσταται ^c στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει, ^d εἰδότες ^e τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν ^{u ch. iv 7 reff.}
^{x Rev. iv. 7 reff.} ^{y here only.} ^{z Matt. xii 46, 47. Acts xiii. 8. Gal. i 10 al.} ^{u Matt. v. 25}
^{xxi. 13. Zech. xi. 3.} ^{z Matt. xii 46, 47. Acts xiii. 8. Gal. i 10 al.} ^{u Matt. v. 25}
^{24. 1 Cor. xv. 54. 2 Cor. ii. 7. v. 4. Heb. xi. 29. Rev. xii. 16 only. Num. xvi. 32.} ^{u Matt. v. 25}
^{7 reff.} ^{c 2 Tim. ii. 19. Heb. v. 13, 14 only. Deut. xxxiii. 13.} ^{u Matt. v. 25}
^{e see 1 Cor. xi. 5.} ^{b James iv. 5. Ps. a Matt. xxiii. d so ch. i. 18.}

8 rec ins σι bef ο αντιδικος, with LN^[3] a c h m 13 [vss Antch, Damasc,] Ec [Orig-int, Cypr, Cassiod,]; om ABK[P] rel 36 Thl [Orig, (int,)] Eus, Lucif,]. om τινα B: καταρ. bef τινα m. rec for (καταπιεῖν) καταπιη, with A rel: καταπιει (d¹ ?) j k l 13. 180 Ps-Ath: txt BKL[P]N³(-πιν N¹) c h m copt [Orig-ms, Damasc-ms] Cypr Hil.

refers to the often repeated saying of our Lord, Matt. xxiii. 13, Luke xiv. 11, xviii. 14. The same is also found in the O. T., Ps. xviii. 27; Prov. xxix. 23) in (the) time (appointed) (ἐν καιρῷ) is one of those phrases in which the article is constantly omitted: see reff., and Winer, § 19. 1. This humility implies patience, waiting God's time: "ut nimis festinationi simul obviam eat," Calv. The καιρός need not necessarily be understood as Bengel ("Petrus sæpe spectat diem judicii") of the end; it is more general: cf. ἐν καιροῖς ἰδοὺς, 1 Tim. vi. 15): 7.] casting (aor., once for all, by an act which includes the life) all your anxiety (πᾶσαν τήν, 'the whole of;') not, every anxiety as it arises: for none will arise if this transference has been effectually made. This again is an O. T. citation (ref. Ps.), ἐπιβρίψων ἐπὶ κύριον τὴν μέριμνάν σου. The art. also shews that the μέριμνα was not a possible, but a present one; that the exhortation is addressed to men under sufferings. As to the connexion, we may remark, that this participial clause is explanatory of the former imperative one, inasmuch as all anxiety is a contradiction of true humility: μέριμνα, by which the spirit μερίζεται, part for God, part for unbelief, is in fact an exalting self against Him) upon Him, because (seeing that: the justifying reason for the ἐπιβρίψαι) He careth (αὐτῷ prefixed for emphasis, to take up the ἐπ' αὐτόν) for (about: the distinction between περί and ὑπέρ after verbs of caring is thus given by Weber, Demosth. p. 130 (see Winer, § 47. 1): "περί solam mentis circumspectionem vel respectum rei, ὑπέρ simul animi propensionem significat." But perhaps it must not be too much pressed) you.

8, 9.] Other necessary exhortations under their afflictions; and now with reference to the great spiritual adversary, as before to God and their own hearts. "Ne consolatione illa, quod Deo sit cura de vobis, ad securitatem abutatur, præmonet nos Apostolus de Satanæ insidiis." gloss. interlin.

8.] Be sober (see ch. iv. 7, and Luke xxi. 34, 36. This sobriety

of mind, as opposed to intoxication with μέριμνα βιωτικά, is necessary to the ἀντιστήναι στερεοί: only he who is sober stands firm), be watchful (can it be that Peter thought of his Lord's ὁπῶς οὐκ ἰσχύσατε μίαν ὥραν γρηγορήσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ, on the fatal night when he denied Him?

Bengel says, "νήψατε, vigilate, anima: γρηγορήσατε, vigilate, corpore:" but the distinction is not borne out: both words are far better taken as applying to the mind; as Aug. in Wies.: "corde vigila, fide vigila, spe vigila, caritate vigila, operibus vigila"): your adversary (the omission of any causal particle, as ὅτι, inserted in the rec., makes the appeal livelier and more forcible, leaving the obvious connexion to be filled up by the reader. ὁ ἀντίδ. ὑμ., your great and well-known adversary: "ut sciant, hac lege se Christi fidem profiteri, ut cum diabolo continuum bellum habeant. Neque enim membris parcat, qui cum capite præliatur," Calv. ἀντίδικος properly, and in reff. an adversary in a suit at law: but here = ἱερεῖ, an enemy in general) the devil (anathrous as a proper name, as in Acts xiii. 10; Rev. xx. 2) as a roaring lion ("comparatur diabolus leoni famelico et præimpatentia famis rugienti, quia perniciem nostram inexplēbiter appetit, nec ulla præda ei sufficit," Gerh.) walketh about (cf. Job i. 7, ii. 2) seeking whom to devour ("incorporando sibi per mortalem culpam," Lyra: see reff.): 9.] whom resist (see reff. James) firm in the faith (dat. of reference, as σχήματι εὐθελὲς ὡς ἄνθρωπος Phil. ii 8, τέκνα φύσει ὁργῆς Eph. ii. 3, &c.), knowing (being aware: it is an encouragement against their giving way under Satan's attacks, to remember that they do not stand alone against him; that others are, as Gerhard expresses it, not only παθημάτων συμμετόχοι, but in "precibus et pugna contra Satanam σύμμαχοι") that the very same sufferings (this construction, a gen. after ὁ αὐτός, is not elsewhere found in N. T. In it, as in the dat. construction in reff., the adj. is made into a subst. to express more completely the identity. It

f ch ii 17
only +.
1 Macc. xii.
10, 17 only.
g Heb. viii. 5
reff.
h see 2 Cor.
i. 3. ix. 8.
i ch. ii 9 reff
k 2 Tim ii 10.
see 2 Cor. iv.
7.
l = ch. i 6 reff.
here only +. (-vos, Job xvi 1h)
vi. 16. ch. ii. 11. Jude 25. Rev. i. 6. v. 13.

παθημάτων τῇ ἐν κόσμῳ ὑμῶν ἡ ἀδελφότητι ἡ ἵπιτελείσθαι. ABKLP
10 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡ πάσης χάριτος ὁ ἡ καλέσας ὑμᾶς ἡ εἰς τὴν N a b c d
ἡ αἰώνιον αὐτοῦ ἡ δόξαν ἐν χριστῷ ἡ Ἰησοῦ ἡ ὀλίγον παθόντας f g h j k
αὐτὸς ἡ καταρτίσει, ἡ στηριξεῖ, ἡ σθενώσει, ἡ θεμελιώσει.
11 αὐτῷ τῷ ἡ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ἀμήν.
m Heb xiii 21 reff
n = Luke xxiii 32 Rom i 11 xvi 25 al Ps 1 12.

9. for 2nd τη, την N¹ (but corrd). ins τω bef κοσμω B[N].
10. rec ημας, with K c g k vulg Syr Did¹ Ec Vocat: txt AB L[P] N rel demid syr
copt [æth arm] Thl. ins τω bef χριστω B. om ιησου BN a c, insd in syr
with ast. rec καταρτισταί, with KL[P] rel (Syr) Thl Ec: txt AB N d 13 vulg
æth arm Vocat. rec aft καταρτισ. ins umas, with KL[P] rel syr-w-ast copt [æth]
Thl Ec: om AB N a 13 vulg arm Vocat. rec στηριξαι σθενωσαι, with b² c g syr
Thl Ec: txt ABKL[P] N rel vulg copt æth arm Vocat. rec θεμελιωσαι, with b² c g
[syr copt]: om (homœotele) AB vulg [Syr] æth Vocat: txt KL[P] N rel [arm] Thl Ec.
11. rec ins η δοξα και bef το κρατος, with L[P] N vulg-ed (with demid harl [tol])
æth-pl Thl: η δοξα κρατος, omg και το, K j l: το κρ. κ. η δοξ. a c¹ m 13 syr copt arm:
txt AB am (and fuld) æth-rom. om των αιωνων B 36 copt arm.

is (see Winer, § 34. 2) much as when an adj. is made into a subst. governing a gen.: e.g. τὸ ἀμετάθετον τῆς βουλῆς Heb. vi. 17, τὸ ὑπερέχον τῆς γνώσεως Phil. iii. 8, τὸ πιστὸν τῆς πολιτείας Thuc. i. 68, τὸ ὑπερβᾶλλον τῆς λύπης Plato, Phædr. 240 A) are being accomplished in (the case of: the dat. of reference, as in γίνεσθαι ὑμῶν and similar phrases. Much unnecessary difficulty has been found in the word ἐπιτελείσθαι. It has its usual N. T. meaning of 'accomplish,' 'complete,' as in reff. and Phil. i. 6, al.; these sufferings were being accomplished, their full measure attained, according to the will of God, and by the appointment of God, in, with reference to, in the case of, the ἀδελφότης. The Dative must not be regarded as = a gen. with ὑπό: but there is another way of taking it, viz. as dependent on τὰ αὐτά, making ἐπιτελείσθαι middle: "knowing that ye are accomplishing the same sufferings with" &c. This is defended by Harless; but in this case we should certainly expect ὑμᾶς to be inserted, as αὐτὸν in Luke iv. 41, and σεαυτὸν in Rom. ii. 19) your brotherhood (ref.) in the world (ἐν κόσμῳ, not to direct attention to another brotherhood not in the world, as Huther; but as identifying their state with yours: who, like yourselves, are in the world, and thence have, like yourselves, to expect such trials).

10, 11.] *Final assurance of God's help and ultimate perfecting of them after and by means of these sufferings.*

10.] But (q.d. however you may be able to apprehend the consolation which I have last propounded to you, one thing is sure: or as Bengel, "vos tantum vigilate et resistite hosti: cætera Deus præstabit") the God of all grace (who is

the Source of all spiritual help for every occasion: see reff.) who called you (which was the first proof of His grace towards you) unto (with a view to; 'consolationis argumentum.' He who has begun grace with a view to glory, will not cut off grace till it be perfected in glory. Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 12; 2 Thess. ii. 14) His eternal glory in Christ Jesus (ἐν χρ. Ἰησ. belongs to καλέσας, which has since been defined by ὑμᾶς εἰς τ. α. αὐ. δόξ. Christ Jesus is the element in which that calling took place. The words cannot, as Calov., al., be joined with what follows), when ye have suffered a little while (these words belong to what has gone before, ὁ καλέσας ὑμᾶς κ.τ.λ., not to what follows, as is decisively shewn by the consideration that all four verbs must belong to acts of God on them in this life, while these sufferings would be still going on. The ὀλίγον παθόντας expresses the condition of their calling to glory in Christ, viz. after having suffered for a short time. παθόντας, as in all cases of an aor. part. connected with a future verb, is to be taken in the strictness of its aoristic meaning as a futurum exactum: the παθήματα are over when the δόξα comes in), shall Himself (αὐτός, solemn and emphatic: "ostendit enim Apostolus ex eodem gratiæ fonte et primam ad gloriam cœlestem vocationem et ultimam hujus beneficii consummationem provenire," Gerhard) perfect (you) (see ref. Heb. and note: "ne remaneat in vobis defectus," Beng.), shall confirm (establish you firmly, so as to be στερεοὶ τῇ πίστει: "ne quid vos labefactet," Beng.), shall strengthen (the word σθενώ belongs to later Greek), shall ground (you) (fix you as on a foundation, "ut superetis omnem vim adversam. Digna Petro oratio. Con-

¹² Διὰ Σιλουανοῦ ὑμῖν τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ ὡς ἴλο- r — Rom. viii.
18 Phil. iii.
13 Heb. xi.
19. Wisd.
xv. 12
see Eph. iii. 3.
so Gal. vi. 11.
Philom. 19, 21.
x = Rom. v. 2. 1 Cor. xv. 1.
γίζομαι ^s δι' ^s ὀλίγων ^t ἔγραψα ^u παρακαλῶν καὶ ^v ἐπιμα-
τυρῶν ταύτην εἶναι ἀληθῆ χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ ^w εἰς ἣν ^s here only.
^x στήτε. ¹³ ὑ ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι ^z συνεκλεκτῇ, t so Gal. vi. 11.
Philom. 19, 21.
x = Rom. v. 2. 1 Cor. xv. 1.

u absol., Luke iii. 18. 1 Cor. iv. 13. 2 Tim. iv. 2 al.
w constr., Matt. ii. 23. Mark i. 39. xiii. 16. John i. 18 al.
y = Rom. xvi. 3, 16, &c. Col. ii. 10, 15 al. z here only +.

12. σιλβανου B. ins και bef ταυτην N¹(N³ disapproving). rec (for στήτε)
εστηκατε, with KL[P] rel Thl Ec: txt ABN j 13.

13. aft βαβυλωνι ins εκκλησια N 4-marg 33-marg vulg Syr arm Ec.

firmat fratres suos," Bengel. Cf. Luke xxii. 32, σὺ ποτὲ ἐπιστρέφας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου: and 2 Tim. ii. 19, ὁ στερεὸς θεμέλιος τοῦ θεοῦ ἔστηκεν):

11.] to Him (again emphatic: "ne quidquam laudis et gloriæ sibi vindicent," Gerh.) be (i. e. *be ascribed*: or, as ch. iv. 11, *ἔστιν, is, i. e. is due*) the might (which has been shewn in this perfecting, confirming, strengthening, grounding you, and in all that those words imply as their ultimate result,—of victory and glory) to the ages of the ages. Amen.

12—14.] CONCLUSION. By Silvanus the faithful brother (there seems to be no reason for distinguishing this Silvanus from the companion of St. Paul and Timotheus, mentioned in 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 19, and known by the name of Silas in the Acts. See further in Prolegomena, § iv. 19), as I reckon (ὡς λογίζομαι belongs most naturally to τοῦ πιστοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, not to δι' ὀλίγων which follows: and indicates the Apostle's judgment concerning Silvanus, given, not in any disparagement of him, nor indicating, as De W. and Bengel, that he was not known to St. Peter, but as fortifying him, in his mission to the churches addressed, with the Apostle's recommendation, over and above the acquaintance which the readers may already have had with him), I have written (the epistolary aor. See reff.) to you (ὑμῖν is taken by some, as E. V., Luther, Steiger, al., as dependent on πιστοῦ, which is harsh, and leaves ἔγραψα without any object of address) in (by means of, as my vehicle of conveying my meaning) few words (Erasm., Grot., Pott, al. fancy that this ἔγρ. δι' ὀλίγων refers to the second Epistle: but see 2 Pet. iii. 1. On δι' ὀλίγων, cf. Heb. xiii. 22. It perhaps may here refer to some more copious instructions which Silvanus was to give them by word of mouth: or may serve to fix their attention more pointedly on that which had been thus concisely said), exhorting (such in the main is the character of the Epistle) and giving my testimony (the ἐπί in ἐπιμαρτυρῶν indicates merely the direction

of the testimony, not as Bengel, "testimonium jam per Paulum et Silam audierant pridem: Petrus *insuper testatur*") that this (of which I have written to you; see below) is (the inf. εἶναι belongs to both παρακαλῶν and ἐπιμαρτυρῶν) the true grace (not "doctrina evangelii" as Gerh., nor "state of grace" as De Wette, but simply "grace" ch. i. 2, as testified by the preaching of the Apostles to be covenanted and granted to them by God. This identification of the preached and written message with the true mind of God towards man, is not uncommon with our Apostle: e.g., ch. i. 12, 25 (ii. 10, 25). The reason of this was not any difference, as some would have us believe, between the teachings of St. Peter and St. Paul, but the difficulty presented to the readers in the fact of the fiery trial of sufferings which they were passing through) of God, in which stand ye (the construction is pregnant; into which being admitted, stand in it. On every account, we are bound to read στήτε, not ἐστήκατε, which has apparently come in from the similar ἐν ᾗ (ᾧ) ἐστήκατε in reff. Every reason which Wiesinger gives against στήτε, is in fact a reason for it. στήτε eis is, he says, evidently wrong, because the readers were already in the grace:—I answer,—and consequently it was corrected to what seemed right: εἰς ἣν στήτε, he says further, would not fit the context:—and consequently, we may reply, the temptation would be stronger to correct it. The idea of its having been an emendation to suit παρακαλῶν is simply absurd; that participle referring back to the contents of the Epistle, not requiring any justification in this sentence; as any, even the dullest copyist, must see. As it stands, it is a short and earnest exhortation, containing in it in fact the pith of what has been said by way of exhortation in the whole Epistle). 13.] She that is elected together with you in Babylon *

salutes you (*who, or what is this?*) The great majority of Commentators understand it to mean a sister congregation, elect like yourselves, ch. i. 1. So N al.

a (see note) καὶ Μάρκος ὁ ^a υἱός μου. ¹⁴ ὑ ἀσπάσασθε ἀλλήλους ^b ἐν ABKLP
 = (?) here only. see bcd φιλήματι ^d ἀγάπης. ^e εἰρήνη ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ^f ἐν f g h j k
¹ Tim. i. 2. ² Tim. i. 2. ¹ Thess. v. 20. Luke vii. 45. xii. 49. Prov. xxii. 6. Cant. i. 2 only. ^d here only. ^e 3 John 15.
 b (ἀγίῳ) Rom. xvi. 16. 1 Cor. xvi. 20. 2 Cor. xii. 12.
 c as above (b). f Rom. viii. 1. xvi. 7. 2 Cor. v. 17.

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Α.

14. εἰρήνης (but s erased) N. rec aft χριστῶ ins ἰησου, with KL[P]N rel vulg-ed(with am [tol]) syr copt [arm] Thl Œc: om AB 13(appy) 36 fuld(with demid harl) Syr æth. rec adds αμην, with KL[P]N rel vulg-ed(with demid fuld [tol]) syr [arm] Thl Œc: om AB 13 am(with harl) copt æth.

SUBSCRIPTION. om (K?) rel: εγραφη απο ρωμης f h: η πρωτη πετρου επιστολη εγραφη απο ρωμης j: τελος της πρωτης επιστολης καθολικης πετρου 36: του αγιου αποστολου πετρου καθολικη επιστολη α' L: [πετρ. απ. επ. α' P:] txt ABN.

in digest, E. V., Luth., Calv., Gerhard, Steiger, &c., and the more recent interpreters, De Wette, Huther, Wiesinger. And this perhaps may be a legitimate interpretation. Still it seems hardly probable, that there should be joined together in the same sending of salutation, an *abstraction*, spoken of thus enigmatically, and a *man*, Μάρκος ὁ υἱός μου, by name. No mention has occurred in the Epistle of the word ἐκκλησία, to which reference might be made: if such reference be sought for, διασπορά, in ch. i. 1, is the only word suitable, and that could hardly be used of the congregation in any particular place. Finally, it seems to be required by the rules of analogy, that in an Epistle addressed to ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπιδημοί, individually, not gregatim, ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή must be an individual person also. These considerations induce me to accede to the opinion of those, who recognize here the ἀδελφὴ γυνή whom St. Peter περιήγεν, 1 Cor. ix. 5: and to find, in the somewhat unusual periphrastic way of speaking of her, a confirmation of this view. Bengel, who defends it, adduces ch. iii. 7, where the wives are called συγκληρονόμοι χάριτος ζωῆς. Still, I own, the words ἐν Βαβυλῶνι a little stagger me in this view. But it seems less forced than the other. On the question, *what Babylon* is intended, whether Rome, or the Chaldaean capital, or some village in Egypt, see Prolegomena, § iv. 10 ff., and *Marcus my son* (perhaps, and so must have thought, the well-known Evangelist (see Eus. H. E. ii. 15: Orig. in Eus. vi. 25: Œc. al.): perhaps the *actual son* of St. Peter, bearing this name (Œc.-altern., Bengel, al.). The

fact of Peter taking refuge in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark (Acts xii. 2), casts hardly any weight on the side of the former interpretation: but it derives some probability from the circumstance that St. Mark is reported by Eus. l. c., and iii. 39, v. 8, vi. 14, 25, to have been the ἀκόλουθος and μαθητὴς and ἐρμηνευτὴς Πέτρου, on the authority of Papias and Clement of Alexandria: and that Irenæus (Hær. iii. 11, p. 174, Eus. v. 8) reports the same. The υἱός is understood either spiritually or literally, according as one or other of the above views is taken).

14.] Salute one another in (as the medium of salutation) a kiss of love (see on ref. Rom. where, as every where except here, φιλῆμα ἀγίου is the expression. For a full account of the custom, see Winer, Realw. art. Kuss). Peace be to you all that are in Christ (the concluding blessing of St. Paul is usually χάρις, not εἰρήνη: cf. (Rom. xvi. 24) 1 Cor. xvi. 23; 2 Cor. xiii. 13; Gal. vi. 18; Eph. vi. 24 (where however εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κ.τ.λ. precedes); Phil. iv. 23; Col. iv. 18; 1 Thess. v. 28; 2 Thess. iii. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 21; 2 Tim. iv. 22; Tit. iii. 15; Philem. 25 (Heb. xiii. 25). "Formula petita," says Gerhard, "ex salutatione Christi præsertim post resurrectionem usitata." The blessing differs also from those in St. Paul, in the limitation implied by ὑμῖν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν χριστῶ, whereas St. Paul has ever μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν. Here it is, "peace to you, I mean, all that are, and in as far as they are, in Christ;" in union and communion with Him. τοῖς ἐν χριστῶ is quite in St. Paul's manner, cf. ref. See also our ch. iii. 16, v. 10).

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β.

I. ¹ Συμεὼν Πέτρος ^a δούλος καὶ ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ ^a James i. 1
reff.
 χριστοῦ τοῖς ^b ἰσότημιον ἡμῖν ^c λαχοῦσιν πίστιν ^d ἐν ^e δι- ^b here only +
ισοτιμούς
ἀπέδειξε,
Jos. Antt. xii.
3, 1. Xen.
 καιοσύνη τοῦ ^e θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ ^f σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ.

Hier. viii. 10. c = Acts i. 17 (Luke i. 9. John xix. 24) only. 3 Macc. vi. 1. 1 Kings xiv.
 47. Wisd. viii. 19 only.) d see Rom. v. 9 xv. 13. e Rom. i. 17. iii. 5, 21, 22. x.
 3. James i. 20. f ver. 11. ch. ii. 20, iii. 2, 18. so 2 Tim. i. 10. Tit. i. 4. ii. 13. iii. 6.

TITLE. Steph ἐπιστολὴ πετροῦ καθολικὴ δευτέρα: elz petr. του αποστ. επιστ. καθ. δευτερα: ἐπιστολὴ καθολικὴ δευτ. του αγιου αποστολου πετροῦ L: πετροῦ επιστ. β' CK [P(appy)] j l m o 13. 36 (δευτερα K j l m o): txt ABN.

CHAP. I. 1. σιμων B a¹ c l m Ec (σειμων B³(Tischdf, expr)). (In C the 3 lines following the title are almost totally illegible; Tischdf however thinks that he can distinguish a Π at the beg of the 1st line, and hence conjectures that the ms omitted σιμων.) εἰς δικαιοσύνην N. for θεου, ^{ku} N [sy-rk sah].

CHAP. I. 1, 2.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. Symeon (see var. readd. The form, as belonging to our Apostle, is found, besides here, only in Acts xv. 14. Its occurrence is at all events a testimony in favour of the independence of the second Epistle. It was not *adapted* to the first: which, considering that it *refers* to the first, is a note, however slight, on the side of its genuineness) Peter, a servant (Rom. i. 1) and apostle (an ingenious reason is given by De Wette for the occurrence of both these designations: that the Writer combined 1 Pet. i. 1, with Jude 1) of Jesus Christ, to them that have obtained (λαγχάνειν (with acc. as reff. Acts, 3 Macc.) shews, as Beng., that "non ipsi sibi pararunt:" as Huss in Huther, "sicut sors non respicit personam, ita nec divina electio acceptatrix est personarum") like precious faith (*faith*,—i. e. substance of truth believed: faith objective, not subjective,—of equal value: not, as De W., which confers equal right to God's kingdom, equal honour and glory: such a meaning would be unexampled. The E. V. has hit the meaning very happily by *like precious*. Cf. 1 Pet. ii. 7. Huther quotes from Horneius (similarly Estius); "dicatur fides æque pretiosa, non quod omnium credentium æque magna sit, sed quod per fidem illam eadem mysteria et eadem beneficia divina nobis proponantur") with us (apparently, in the first place, the Apostles:

but more probably, in a wider sense, the Jewish Christians, with whom the Gentiles had been admitted into the same covenant, and the inheritance of the like precious promises) in the righteousness of our God and (our) Saviour Jesus Christ (first, concerning ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. Some Commentators, as Beza, Grot., Piscator, al., take δικ. for an attribute of God, and ἐν as instrumental, by the righteousness, goodness, truth, of God: others, as Estius, Horneius, al., understand δικ. as "justitia quam Deus nobis dat et Christus peperit" (Horn.), explaining ἐν as 'cum' or 'per:' but, as Huther well replies, this is objectionable, seeing that righteousness comes by faith, not faith by righteousness. De Wette would give two different meanings to δικ. as applied to the Father and to the Son, in the former case making it mean *grace*, in the latter *love*: but this is evidently quite arbitrary. Gerhard would confine it altogether to the "obedientia et satisfactio Christi," against which is τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν. The best explanation seems to me that of Huther, that δικαιοσύνη here betokens the righteous dealing of God, corresponding to His attribute of righteousness, as opposed to προσωποληψία: and that the words are to be taken in close connexion with the foregoing, τοῖς ἰσότημιον ἡμῖν λαχοῦσιν πίστιν, ἐν being used of the conditional element, in which the λαχεῖν πίστιν ἰσότημιον is

g = 1 Pet. i. 2² f χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνη ε πληθυνθείη ἐν ἡ ἐπιγνώσει τοῦ C χαρις
(1 off)
h Heb. x. 26 θεοῦ καὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν. ἈΒCΚL
ref. P² a b c
i w. gen. abs., 1 Cor. i. 18. 2 Cor. i. 20. d f g h j
k = here his (Acts xvii. 29) only. Job xxvii. 3 k l m o
2 Macc. iii. 29. 1 Luke xiv. 32. xxv. 42. Acts xxviii. 10. Heb. ii. 17. m Acts iii. 12. 1 Tim. ii. 2 al⁷ 2 Tim. ii. 5. Tit. i.
1 vv. 6, 7, ch. ii. 11 only. Isa. xi. 2. (-βείν, Acts xviii. 23 -βής, ch. ii. 9. -βώς, Tit. ii. 12) n here
bis. Mark xv. 45 only. Gen. xxx. 20. o Heb. ix. 15 ref. p = 1 Pet. ii. 9. (ver. 5)

2. aft ἡσσυ ins χριστου ΔΛN (a c) 36 [syrr] copt æth arm; bef ἡσ., d g² 13 vulg [-ed(with tol)] Aug¹.—τον κύ ἡμων iū xū. omg του θύ και, a c 69. 137-63 spec syrr: του κύ και θύ ἡμων, omg ἡσσυ, j: om τ. θεου κ. ἡσ. [P] am(with demid fuld harl).

3. ins ta bef πάντα AN c 13 Did². aft προς ins τον θεον και N¹(N³ disapproving). rec (for ἰδια δοξή κ. ἀρετῇ) δια δόξης κ. ἀρετῃ, with BKL rel Thl Ec., δόξης κ. ἀρετῃ, omg δια, l: txt ΔCN[P a e] 13. 36 vulg spec Did² [Cæs.] Bede, δόξη κ. ἀρετῇ, omg ἰδια, a c.

grounded: so that the sense is, in His righteousness, which makes no difference between the one party and the other, God has given to you the like precious faith, as to us. De W.'s objection to this, that thus the Epistle must be regarded as written to Gentile Christians, is not valid, or proves too much: for at all events there must be two parties in view in the words ἰσότημον ἡμῖν, whatever these parties be. Next, as to the words τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. Undoubtedly, as in Titus ii. 13, in strict grammatical propriety, both θεοῦ and σωτήρος would be predicates of Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ. But here, as there, considerations interpose, which seem to remove the strict grammatical rendering out of the range of probable meaning. I have fully discussed the question in the note on that passage, to which I would refer the reader as my justification for interpreting here, as there, τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν of the Father, and σωτήρος Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ of the Son. Here, there is the additional consideration in favour of this view, that the Two are distinguished most plainly in the next verse): 2.] grace to you and peace be multiplied (so in ref.: but further specified here by what follows) in (as the vehicle, or conditional element of the multiplication) knowledge (ἐπίγνωσις, "cognitio maturior:" but this can hardly be given in English without too strong a phrase) of God, and of Jesus our Lord (every unusual expression, like ἡσ. τοῦ κυρ. ὑμῶν, occurring only Rom. iv. 24, should be noticed as a morsel of evidence to the independence of the Epistle).

3—11.] *Exhortation to advance in the graces of the spiritual life*: introduced (vv. 3, 4) by a consideration of the rich bestowal from God of all things belonging to that life by the knowledge of Him, and the aim of His promises, viz. that we should partake in the divine nature. 3.] Seeing

that (the connexion with the greeting which precedes must not be broken: it is characteristic of this Epistle, to dilate further when the sense seems to have come to a close. The sense of ὥς with a gen. absolute is, "assuming that," "seeing that;" cf. Plato, Alcib. i. p. 10, οὐκοῦν ὥς διανοομένου σου ταῦτα ἐρωτῶ, ἀφίημί σε διανοεῖσθαι: Xen. Cyr. iii. 1. 9, ἀλλ' ἐρώτα, ἔφη, ὁ Κύρε, ὅτι βούλει, ὥς τὰληθῆ ῥεοῦντος. See Matthiæ, § 568. 2. Winer, § 65. 9. The latter explains the usage thus, "ὥς with a participle in the gen. absolute construction, gives to the idea of the verb a subjective character, of assumption, or intention.") His divine (θεῖος, a word peculiar in N. T., as an adjective, to this Epistle: see ref.) power hath given (δεδωρημένης, middle in signification, as perfect passives so often: so προσκέκλημαι αὐτοῖς, Acts xiii. 2, xvi. 10, xxv. 12: ὁ ἐπήγγελεται, Rom. iv. 21; Heb. xii. 26: see Winer, § 39. 3) us all things (πάντα is prefixed by way of emphasis) which are (requisite) for (reff.) life and godliness (εὐσέβεια is a mark of the later apostolic period: reff.), through (by means of, as the medium of attainment: "Dei cognitio principium est vitæ (John xvii. 3) et primus in pietatem ingressus." Calv.) the knowledge (ἐπιγν. see above) of Him that called us (i. e. of God, who is ever the Caller in the N. T.: see e. g. 1 Pet. ii. 9) by (dat. of the instrument, as in Acts ii. 33, v. 31; James iii. 7) His own glory and virtue (αἱ ἀρεταὶ are predicated of God in ref. 1 Pet. 1. However these words be read, whether as in text, or διὰ δόξης κ. ἀρετῆς, both substantives belong to God, not to us: still less must we render, as in E. V., "called us to glory and virtue," of which meaning there is not a trace in either reading. Bengel seems to give the meaning well, "ad gloriam referuntur attributa Dei naturalia, ad virtutem ea quæ dicuntur moralia: intime

⁴ δι' ὧν τὰ μέγιστα καὶ ἡ τίμια ἡμῖν ἔπαγγέματα
 ὁ δεδωρόται, ἵνα διὰ τούτων γένησθε ἡ θείας ἡ κοινωνοί
 φύσεως, ἡ ἀποφυγόντες τῆς ἐν κόσμῳ ἡ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἡ φθο-
 ρᾶς. ἡ καὶ ὑ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἡ δὲ ἡ σπουδῇ ἡ πᾶσαν ἡ παρεῖ-
 xxii. 22 only. u = Tit. iii 5 al. v absol., Rom. vii. 7, 8. 1 Thess. iv. 5. James i.
 14, 15 (see ch. ii 10, 18) w Rom viii 21. 1 Cor. xv. 42, 50. Gal. vi. 8. Col. ii. 22. ch.
 ii. 12 bis, 13 only Ps cii. 4. x Matt x. 18. John vi. 51. viii. 16, 17. xv. 27. Acts iii. 24 al.
 y = here only. (Rom. ix. 17 al.) Winer, § 21. 3, Remark 2. z Rom. xii. 8, 11. Jude 3 al. Exod.
 xii 11. a = Acts xx 1 Phil ii. 29 al. b here only τ. Demosth. 454. 1, 12

4. transp *μεγιστα* and *τιμια* BKL^N rel spec syr Thl C^{ec}: txt AC[P] m 13. 36 vulg syr-pk coptt Did, Jer.,—rec *ἡμιν* bef *καὶ*, with KLN^{rel} C^{ec}: txt (A)BC[P] a c m 13 vulg spec syr[-txt] Did Thl.—for *ἡμιν*, *ἡμιν* A 66-8 syr-pk syr-mg. *φύσεως* bef *κοινωνοί* N. ins *τω* bef *κόσμῳ* ABL^N. for *ἐν ἐπιθ.*, *ἐπιθυμίας* καὶ C 69. 137-63 syr arm [καὶ (only) P]: *ἐπιθυμίας* 13 vulg lat-ff.—*τῇ ἐν τῷ κ. ἐπιθυμίαν* N [Jer.].
 5. *αὐτοὶ* A 13 vulg spec æth. δε bef *τοῦτο* C²N a c d h 13. 36 [syr arm] Thl: om *τοῦτο* A. om *πασαν* C a c am¹ (but added by origl scribe) Thl, insd in syr

unum sunt utraque” Cf. Gal. i. 15, *καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*, 4.] through which (His attributes and energies) He hath given to us (*δεδωρόται* again middle in sense, see above: not as E. V., passive: the subject is ὁ καλέσας) the [or, His] greatest and precious promises (*ἐπαγγέματα*, as in ch. iii. 13, *promises*: not, *things promised* (Est., Beng, al.), still less, as Dietlein, proclamations of Christian doctrine, which the word cannot mean. Benson’s idea, that by ἡμῖν are meant the Apostles, and that the second person γένησθε refers to the Gentile Christians, seems quite beside the purpose), that by means of these (promises: i. e. their fulfilment: not to be referred, as Calv., Benson, De Wette, to τὰ πρὸς ζῶντων κ.τ.λ. as the antecedent: nor, as Beng., to δόξη καὶ ἀρετή: τούτων shews pointedly that the last-mentioned noun is the antecedent) ye may become (aor., but not on that account to be rendered, as Huther, *mürdet*, *that ye might be*, adding, that the Writer assumes the participation to have already taken place: for the aor. is continually thus used of future contingencies without any such intent: e. g. *πιστεύετε εἰς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε*, John xii. 36. The account of this usage of the aor. has not been any where, that I have seen, sufficiently given. It is untranslatable in most cases, but seems to serve in the Greek to express that the aim was not the procedure, but the completion, of that indicated: not the *γίνεσθαι*, the carrying on of the process, but the *γενέσθαι*, its accomplishment) partakers of the divine nature (i. e. of that holiness, and truth, and love, and, in a word, perfection, which dwells in God, and in you, by God dwelling in you: “vocat hic divinam naturam id quod divina presentia efficit in nobis, i. e. conformitatem nostri cum Deo, seu imaginem Dei quæ in nobis reformatur per divinam presentiam in nobis.” Hemming in Hu-

ther: which is only so far wrong, that it confounds our *κοινωνία* in the divine nature, of which the above would be a right description, with that nature itself, having escaped (not a conditional participial clause, but like *ὀλίγων παθόντας* in 1 Pet. v. 10, merely a note of matter of fact, bringing out in this case the negative side of the Christian life, as the former clause did the positive:—“when ye have escaped”) from (the construction, of *ἀποφεύγω* with a gen. is not very usual. Matthiæ gives a similar instance from Xen. An. i. 3. 2, *ἐξέφυγε τοῦ μὴ καταπετρωθῆναι*, and another from Soph. Antig. 488, *οὐκ ἀλύξετον μόνον κακίστου*. In Philoct. 1034 we have *δοκοῖμ’ ἂν τῆς νόσου πεφευγέμαι*. These last instances shew that the gen. here is due, not to the preposition *ἀπο*, but to the idea of separation and distance implied in the sense of the verbs) the corruption (= destruction, of soul and body) which is in the world in (consisting in, as its element and ground) lust (Calvin: “hanc non in elementis quæ nos circumstant, sed in corde nostro esse ostendit, quia illic regnant vitiosi et pravi affectus, quorum fontem vel radicem voce concupiscentiæ notat. Ergo ita locatur in mundo corruptio, ut sciamus in nobis esse mundum”).

5—7.] *Direct exhortation*, consequent on vv. 3, 4, to progress in the spiritual life.

5.] And on this very account (αὐτὸ τοῦτο, lit. “this very thing:” but just as τί, “what,” has come to mean “why?” “for what reason?” so αὐτὸ, or τοῦτο, or the strengthened demonstrative produced by the juxtaposition of both, has come to mean, “wherefore,” “for this reason.” See Winer in ref.: and cf. Xen. Anab. i. 9. 21, αὐτὸ τοῦτο οὐπερ αὐτὸς ἐνεκα φίλων ἤετο δέισθαι, . . . καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπειρᾶτο συνεργεῖν τοῖς φίλοις κράτιστος εἶναι,—“for the very reason, for which he thought that he himself wanted

c 2 Cor. ix. 10. *ενέγκαντες*^c ἐπιχορηγήσατε ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν τὴν ^d ἀρετὴν, ABCKL
 Gal. iii. 6. *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^d ἀρετῇ τὴν ^e γνῶσιν, ^f ἐν δὲ τῇ ^g γνῶσει τὴν P N a b c
 Col. iii. 19. ^h ἐγκράτειαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ⁱ ἐγκρατείᾳ τὴν ^j ὑπομονήν, ἐν δὲ d f g h j
 ver. 11 only+. ^k τῇ ^l ὑπομονῇ τὴν ^m εὐσέβειαν, ⁿ ἐν δὲ τῇ ^o εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν k l m o
 Sir. xxv. 22. ^p φιλαδελφίαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ^q φιλαδέλφειᾳ τὴν ἀγάπην. ^r ταῦτα 13
 Phil. i. 19.) ^s γὰρ ὑμῖν ^t ὑπάρχοντα καὶ ^u πλεονάζοντα οὐκ ^v ἀργούσ
 d = here bis. ^w *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^x εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν ^y ἀγάπην. ^z ταῦτα
 Phil. iv. 5. ^{aa} *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^{ab} εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν ^{ac} ἀγάπην. ^{ad} ταῦτα
 11. 9 ver. 3. ^{ae} *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^{af} εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν ^{ag} ἀγάπην. ^{ah} ταῦτα
 only.) ^{ai} *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^{aj} εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν ^{ak} ἀγάπην. ^{al} ταῦτα
 viii. 7. ^{am} *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^{an} εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν ^{ao} ἀγάπην. ^{ap} ταῦτα
 e = 1 Pet. iii. 7. ^{aq} *ἐν δὲ τῇ* ^{ar} εὐσεβείᾳ τὴν ^{as} ἀγάπην. ^{at} ταῦτα
 f here bis. Acts xxiv. 25. Gal. v. 23 only+. Sir. xviii. 30 (title) only. g James i. 3, 4 reff. h ver.
 3 reff. 1 Rom. xii. 10. 1 Thess. iv. 9. Heb. xiii. 1. 1 Pet. i. 22 only+. (φῶς, 1 Pet. iii. 8.)
 k Acts iii. 6 iv. 37. xxviii. 7. Sir. xx. 16. l eia Paul only. = Rom. v. 20 bis. ii. 1. 2 Cor. iv. 15. Phil.
 iv. 17 al. 2 Chron. xxiv. 11. m Matt. xii. 36. xx. 3, 6. 1 Tim. v. 13 bis. Tit. i. 12. James ii.
 20 only. Wisd. xv. 15.

with ast. in **N** the *ἐπι* of *ἐπιχορηγήσατε* is written over the line appy by the original scribe. *ἡμῶν* C: om spec.

7. for 1st *τη, την* (sic) **N**.

8. for *υπαρχοντα, πασοντα* A 5. 9. 73 vulg sah [sy-r-pk and æth, appy] Cyr[?] Ps-Chr.

friends . . . he also tried to be' &c.: and Plato, *Protag.* p. 310 E, αὐτὰ ταῦτα νῦν ἤκα παρά σε. The reason here being, *ὥς* . . . δεδωρμένῃς κ.τ.λ., above: so that this forms a sort of apodosis to that sentence. The E. V. '*beside this*' is entirely at fault. Nor can we, as Dietlein, make αὐτὸ τοῦτο the object after *ἐπιχορηγήσατε* giving on your part (*παρεισενέγκαντες*, lit. *introducing by the side of*: i. e. besides those precious promises on God's part, bringing in on your part) all diligence (so σπουδὴν εἰσενέγκαι or εἰσενέγκασθαι in Libanius, Josephus, Antt. x. 9. 2, Diod. Sic. p. 554, in Wetst.), furnish (from the original meaning of the verb, to *provide expenses for a chorus*, it easily gets this of *furnishing forth*: see reff. And the construction and meaning of the following clauses is not as Horneius and the E. V., "adjicite fidei virtutem &c.," but the *ἐν* is each time used of that which is assumed to be theirs, and the exhortation is, to take care that, in the exercise of that, the next step is developed: "præsens quisque gradus subsequenter parit et facilem reddit: subsequens priorem temperat ac perficit." Bengel) in your faith (Bengel remarks, "fides, Dei donum: ideo non jubetur subministrare fidem, sed in fide fructus illos, qui septem enumerantur: fide chorum ducente, amore concludente") virtue (best perhaps understood with Bengel as "strenuous animi tonus ac vigor." Ec. gives it τὰ ἔργα; but this seems too general: it is indeed that which *produces* τὰ ἔργα, without which faith is dead: and hence the connexion), and in your virtue, knowledge (probably that practical discriminating knowledge, of which it is said Eph. v. 17, *μη γίνεσθε ἄφρονες, ἀλλὰ συνέτετε τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου*: "quæ malum a bono secernit, et mali fugam docet," Beng.: not as Ec., ἡ τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀποκρίφων μυστηρίων εἰδησις), 6.]

and in your knowledge, self-restraint (*ἐγκράτεια*, τὸ μηδενὶ ἀποσύρεσθαι πάθει, as Ec. "Temperance" is now too much used of one sort only of self-restraint, fully to express the word. The Commentators compare Sir. xviii. 30, where under the head *ἐγκράτεια ψυχῆς* is said, *ἐπίσω τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν σου μὴ πορεύου*, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρέξεων σου κώλυον. The connexion is: let such discriminating knowledge not be without its fruit, of steady holding in hand of the passions and tempers), and in your self-restraint, patient endurance (in afflictions and trials), and in your patient endurance, godliness (i. e. it is not to be mere brute Stoical endurance, but united with God-fearing and God-trusting. Or it *may* perhaps be used without direct reference to God, as in Dio Cass. xlviii. 5, διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφὸν εὐσέβειαν: but the other is much more likely in the N. T.: especially as the social virtues follow), 7.] and in your godliness, brotherly kindness (not suffering your godliness to be moroseness, nor a sullen solitary habit of life, but kind and generous and courteous), and in your brotherly kindness, love (universal kindness of thought, word, and act towards all: a catholic large-heartedness, not confining the spirit of φιλαδέλφεια to ἀδελφοί only, Matt. v. 46, 47. So that these two last correspond to the ἀγάπη εἰς ἀλλήλους καὶ εἰς πάντας of 1 Thess. iii. 12. 8, 9.] *Reasons for the foregoing exhortations*: 1. *positive*, the advantage of these Christian graces in bringing forth fruit towards the mature knowledge of Christ: 2. *negative*, the disadvantage of their absence from the character. 8.] For these things (the above-mentioned graces) being in you (ὑπάρχων of previous subsistence, εἶναι of mere matter-of-fact being: see note on Acts xvi. 20) and multiplying (not merely as E. V. "abounding": see reff.) render you (not pres. for

οὐδὲ ⁿ ἀκάρπους ^o καθίστησιν εἰς τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ⁿ Matt. xiii. 22. 1 Cor. xiv. 14. Eph. v. 11. Tit. iii. 14. Jude 12 only. Jer. ii. 6. Wis. x. xv. 4 only.
 Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ^p ἐπίγνωσιν. ⁹ ὃ γὰρ μὴ ^q πάρεστιν ταῦτα,
 τυφλὸς ἐστίν, ^r μυωπάζων, ^s λήθην ^t λαβὼν τοῦ ^u καθα-
 ρισμοῦ τῶν ^v πάλαι αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτιῶν. ¹⁰ Διὸ μάλλον,

^o James iii. 6 reff. ^p ver. 2. ^q = here only. (see Heb. xii. 5.) ^r here only. (see note.) ^s here only. Jos. Antt. i. 9. 1, διὰ χρόνον μήκος λήθην λαβόντες. Deut. vii. 19. Wisd. x. xi. 11 ^t so 2 Tim. i. 5. Heb. xi. 29. ^u Heb. i. 3 (reff.). Job vii. 21. ^v Heb. i. 1 reff. ^w art., here only. ^{Gr.} freq.

αὐτ ἀκαρπους, οὐδ is written but marked for erasure by **Ν**¹.

9. For ἀμαρτιῶν, ἀμαρτημάτων **AKN** d 36(sic) [arm Marc.] Damasc. Ps-Chr. [*de-lictorum* vulg spec].

future, but as expressing the habitual character and function of these virtues) not idle (ἄργος = ξεργος) nor yet (οὐδέ introduces a slight climax: a man may be in some sense not unworkful, but yet unfruitful) unfruitful towards (εἰς not = ἐν as E. V. after Luth., Calv., Grot., al.: these virtues are all regarded as so many steps in advancing towards the ἐπίγνωσις of Christ, which is the great complex end of the Christian life) the perfect knowledge (here, considering the place which it holds, it is well to give the full sense of ἐπίγνωσις) of our Lord Jesus Christ (in Him are hid, ethically as well as doctrinally, all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge: the knowledge of Him is the imitation of Him: for as it is true that hereafter the seeing Him as He is will ensure our being perfectly like Him, so it is true that here the only way in any degree increasingly to see Him as He is, is to become increasingly like Him. He only can declare Christ, who reflects Christ).

9.] For (negative reason: see above: and that, with reference not only to the exhortations of vv. 5, 6, 7, but by this γὰρ connected also with ver. 8: the advantage of the presence is great, for the disadvantage of the absence indicates no less than spiritual blindness and oblivion) he to whom these are not present (contrast to ταῦτα ὑμῶν ὑπάρχοντα κ. πλεονάζοντα, ver. 8) is blind (lacks discernment altogether of his own state as a member or Christ and inheritor of heaven), short-sighted (μυωπάζειν λέγονται οἱ ἐκ γενετῆς τὰ μὲν ἑγγύς βλέποντες, τὰ δὲ ἐξ ἀποστάσεως οὐχ ὁράντες: ἐναντία δὲ πᾶσιν οἱ γέροντες τοῖς μυωπάζουσιν, τὰ γὰρ ἑγγύς μὴ ὁράντες τὰ πόρρωθεν βλέπουσι, Aristot. Probl. § 31. Hence some, e. g. Beza, Grot., Est., De W., Huther, interpret the word of not being able to see the heavenly things, which are distant, only earthly, which are close at hand. Perhaps, however, Horneius is right in characterizing this as an "interpretatio argutorum quam ut Apostolo proposita fuisse videri possit." The vulg. "manu tentans" (Luth., und tappet mit der hand: "manu

viam tentans," Erasmus.) seems to have come from the gloss ψηλαφών. Thl. explains it by τυφλώττειν, ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν γῆν μυῶν τυφλῶν εἰς ἅπαν διατελούντων: but thus we should have a mere tautology. Wolf adopts the interpretation "shutting the eyes," seeing that Hesych. and Suidas explain it by καμμῖνειν, and that μυωπάζειν is only μύειν τὰς ὄψεις. "Itaque," he proceeds, "τυφλὸς μυωπάζων is dicitur qui ideo cæcus est, quia sponte claudit oculos, ut ne videat, aut qui videre se dissimulat, quod vel invitatus cernit." This was also the opinion of Bochart, Hieroz. i. 4, whose arguments will be found reproduced in Suicer sub voce. On the whole I prefer the interpretation "short-sighted," without endorsing the ingenious explanation of Beza al. above), having incurred forgetfulness (reff. and Athen. xii. 5, p. 523, λήθην λαβόντες τῆς Κρητῶν περὶ τὸν βίον εὐκοσμίαι. See more examples in Kypke, Krebs, and Loesner, h. l. Bengel says, "participio nactus exprimitur quod homo volens patitur." But surely this is very doubtful; certainly not upheld by the usage of the phrase) of the purification of his former sins (i. e. of the fact of his ancient, pre-Christian, sins having been purged away in his baptism. This, and not the purification of the sins of the world, and of his among them, by the cross of Christ, is evidently the sense, by the πάλαι and αὐτοῦ. And thus almost all the Commentators. καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ἐπιγινούς ἑαυτὸν διὰ τὸ καθαρῶσαι τῷ ἁγίῳ βαπτίσματι, ὅτι πλήθους ἁμαρτιῶν ἐξεπλήθη, δεόν ἐίδέναι ὅτι καθαρῶς καὶ ἀνιδίωτα ἔλαβε, νήφει ἵνα διαπαντὸς τηρῇ τὸν ἁγιασμόν, οὗ χωρὶς οὐδεὶς ὕψεται τὸν κύριον, δὲ δὲ πέλαθετο. Ec. and so Thl.).

10, 11.] The exhortation is resumed, and further pressed, both on the preceding grounds, and on account of its blessed ultimate results, if followed. 10.] Wherefore the rather ("quæ cum ita sint, impensius." διὸ referring to the two considerations urged in vv. 8, 9, and μάλλον making them reasons for increased zeal in complying with the exhortation), brethren

^w Gal. ii. 10. ^{Eph.} iv. 3. ^{1 Thess.} ii. 17. ^{2 Tim} ii. 15 al. ^{Isa} xxi. 3. ^{x Heb} ii. 2 reff. ^{z Rom} xi. 29. ^{y Eph} i. 18. ^{Phil} ii. 14. ^{Heb.} iii. 1 al. ^{Jer.} xxxviii. (xxxi.) 6. ^{Judith} xii. 10. ^{A compl.} Aid. only. ^{z Acts} ix. 15. ^{Rom.} ix. 11 xi. 5, 7, 28. ^{1 Thess.} i. 4 only +. ^{Isa.} xxi. 7 Aq. ^{a (=)} ^{Rom} xi. 11. ^{James} ii. 10 iii. 2 (bis) only. ^{1 Kings} iv. 2, 3. ^{b =} ^{Acts} vii. 8. ^{xvii.} 33. ^{xviii.} 14. ^{1 Thess.} iv. 17 al. ^{c Col.} iii. 16. ^{1 Tim.} vi. 17. ^{Titus} iii. 8 only +. ^{d ver} 5 reff. ^{e Acts} xii. 24. ^{1 Thess.} i. 9. ii. 1. ^{1 Heb.} x. 10 only. ^{1 Kings} xvi. 4. ^{f ch.} i. 1 reff. ^{g stat.} ^{Matt} xxi. 6 only. ^{h Luke} xxi. 61. ^{Joh} xxi. 26. ^{2 Tim} ii. 14. ^{Tit.} iii. 1. ^{3 John} 10. ^{Jude} 5 only +. ^{Wisd} xvi. 22 only.

10. aft σπουδασατε ins ινα δια των καλων εργαων N a c 5. 15. 36. 69. 73. 99 vulg syr coptt [arm]: δι αγαθων εργαων υμων
 13. παρακλησην A. [ins την bef εκλογην P.] ποιεισθε A a c 5. 25. 36. om ποτε A 73 æth Ambrj.

11. om η N b¹. ^{αιωνιαν} C¹. και σωτηρος bef ημων A 106 æth: om και σωτηρος a k 32: ημ. [twice] syr-pk coptt.

12. rec (for μελλησω) ουκ αμελησω, with KL rel syrr Thl Ɔc: txt ABC[P]N vulg coptt [æth] arm Bede. (13 defective.) rec υμας bef αι, with A a c k vulg [syrr copt æth] Ɔc [om αι P sah]: περι τουτων υπομιμνησκειν bef υμας N: txt BCKL rel

(making the appeal more close and affectionate), give diligence (so the E. V. admirably. 'Be earnest' would express rather σπουδάσετε pres., whereas the aor. includes the whole σπουδάσαι in one life-long effort) to make (not ποιεῖν, which lay beyond their power, but ποιέσθαι, on their side, for their part. But the verb must not be explained away into a pure subjectivity, 'to make sure to yourselves': it carries the reflective force, but only in so far as the act is and must be done for and quoad a man's own self, the absolute and final determination resting with Another. Calvin's "studete ut re ipsa testatum fiat, vos non frustra vocatos esse" (βεβαίαν ποιέσθαι?) is a very weak dilution of the sense. We must take the passage as we find it: and as it stands its simple and irrefragable sense is that by σπουδὴν παρει-
 ενέγκαι ἐπιχορηγήσαι ἐν κ.τ.λ. is the way βεβαίαν ποιέσθαι our κλήσιν and ἐκλογὴν. How this is to be reconciled with the fact, that our κλήσις and ἐκλογὴ proceed entirely and freely from God, would not be difficult to shew: but it must not be done, as Calvin attempts it, by wresting plain words and context) your calling and election (as Grot., al., "vocatō quæ vobis contigit per evangelium, id electio eam secuta, qua facti estis Dei populus." Both these were God's acts, cf. ver. 3 and 1 Pet. i. 1, 2) secure ('ratæ', as Grot.: for both, in as far as we look on them from the lower side, not able to penetrate into the counsels of God, are insecure unless established by holiness of life. In His foreknowledge and purpose, there is no insecurity, no uncertainty: but in our vision and apprehension of them as they

exist in and for us, much, until they are made secure in the way here pointed out): for, doing these things (act., ποιούντες, now, because these are works done. And the participle is conditional, carrying with it an hypothesis: as E. V. 'if ye do these things'), ye shall never offend (reff. stumble and fall): 11.] for thus (i. e. ταῦτα ποιούντες) shall be richly (the adverb πλουσίως is not, as Luther, surprising, but most natural and obvious with the verb ἐπιχορηγήσεται, which is one of furnishing and ministering; therefore of quantity. The adverb belongs to the figure latent in the verb: and must therefore be interpreted in and with the interpretation of the verb: in which case it will indicate high degrees and fulness of glory) furnished to you (the verb seems expressly chosen in order to answer to ἐπιχορηγήσατε, ver. 5: "furnish forth your own lives with these Christian graces, so shall be furnished to you" &c.) the [or, your] entrance (which all Christians look for: not the fact of this entrance taking place, but the fact of its πλουσίως ἐπιχορηγήσθαι, is that asserted) into the eternal kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. 12—21.] The above exhortations confirmed by the consideration of the certainty of the power and announced coming of Christ, as shewn, 1. by apostolic testimony, 2. by O. T. prophecy. 12—15.] The Apostle holds it necessary to remind them of this truth, and will do so up to his approaching end. 12.] Wherefore (namely, because ταῦτα ποιούντες is the only way to a rich participation in the blessings and glories of Christ's kingdom) I will be sure (μελλήσω, ref., is of very rare occurrence.

ⁱ καίπερ ^k εἰδότας καὶ ^l ἐστηριγμένους ἐν τῇ ^m παρούσῃ ἁληθείᾳ. ^{13 n} δίκαιον δὲ ὁ ἡγοῦμαι, ^p ἐφ' ὅσον εἰμι ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ^q σκηνώματι, ^r διεγείρειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ^s ὑπομνήσει, ¹⁴ εἰδὼς ὅτι ^t ταχυνὴ ἐστὶν ἡ ^u ἀπόθεσις τοῦ ^v σκηνώματός μου, καθὼς καὶ ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς ^v ἐδήλωσέν μοι. ^{15 w} σπουδάσω δὲ καὶ ^x ἐκάστοτε ὑἔχειν ὑμᾶς μετὰ τὴν

q here bis. Acts vii 46 (from Ps. cxxxix 5) only. (vos, 2 Cor v. 1, 4.)
39. Luke viii 24. vi 18) only. 2 Macc. vii 21. xv. 10 only. r = ch. iii. 1 (Mark iv. 9)
xii. 11 2 Macc. vi. 17 only. t ch. ii. 1 only. Isa. lxx. 7. a 2 Tim. i. 5. ch. iii. 1 only. Wisd.
v Heb. ix. 8 reff. John xxi. 18, 19. u 1 Pet. iii. 21 only. x here only. Xen. Conv. i. 14.
y = Luke vii. 42 Eph. iv. 28.

Thl. (13 def.) om καίπερ to *umas* next ver (*homœotel umas . . umas*) N¹.

13. om τῷ C¹(appy). ins τη bef υπομνησει AN 5.

14. om καθὼς το ἡμῶν N.

15. σπουδαζω N [in arm].

The expression is nearly equivalent to "I will take care" (σπουδάσω, Hesych.): for (see Lexx. and esp. Palm and Rost) the original idea of μέλλω (akin to μέλω and the Latin "velle") includes purpose; and the verb is very commonly used, by Homer, e. g., to signify intent: so Od. v. 293, οὐκ ἔρ' ἔμελλες λήξειν ἀπαρῶν, and in other examples in Palm and Rost. At the same time there is an objectivity in the word, of which it is not possible to divest it, implying that the thing intended is surely about to happen: and which I have tried to express as above) **always to remind you concerning these things** (τούτων, the things just now spoken of: in the widest sense: it does not merely take up the ταῦτα of ταῦτα ποιοῦντες, nor merely, as De W., refer to the kingdom of Christ and His coming), **although ye know them** (ἐκαστον ὑμῶν, καίπερ ἀκριβῶς εἰδότα, ὅμως ἐπαναμνήσαι βούλομαι. Demosth. p. 74. 7) and are confirmed (firmly established) in the truth which is present with you (the words "*the present truth*," E. V., give a wrong idea to the English reader: seeming to mean, the truth at present under notice. The meaning is exactly as in ref., τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ παρόντος εἰς ὑμᾶς:—"which is (known and professed) among you." "Vos quidem, inquit, probe tenetis quænam sit evangelii veritas, neque vos quasi fluctuantes confirmo, sed in re tanta monitiones nunquam sunt supervacuae, quare nunquam molestæ esse debent. Simili excusatione utitur Paulus ad Rom., xv. 14." Calvin).

13.] But (notwithstanding this previously conceded fact, that you know and stand firm in the truth) **I think it right** (why, follows, ver. 14) **as long as** (ἐφ' ὅσον, scil. χρόνον, see Rom. vii. 1 al.) **I am in this tabernacle** (see for the sense 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.: and below), **to stir you up** in (not, "by:" in, as the medium in which I strive towards the stirring up, and in using which it has place) remind-

ing (the same phrase occurs in ch. iii. 1):

14.] **knowing** (as I do: δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι above) **that rapid is** (see below. ἔστιν, of that which is to be: the normal present) **the putting off** (the two figures, of a tabernacle or tent, and a garment, are intermingled, as in 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.) **of my tabernacle, even as our Lord Jesus Christ declared to me** (the allusion is to John xxi. 18 ff., where a swift and sharp death is announced to St. Peter by our risen Lord. And the sentence does not mean to say, as commonly understood, that he must *soon* put off his tabernacle, but that the putting off, whenever it did come, would be sudden and quick; so vulg: "certus quod velox est depositio tabernaculi mei" (which can hardly be interpreted with Estius, "id est, brevi futura est"): so Bengel, "*repentina est*; præsens. Qui diu ægrotant, possunt alios adhuc pascere. Crux id Petro non erat permissura. Ideo prius agit quod agendum est." So Eur. Hippol. 1044, ταχὺς γὰρ ἔξῃς ῥᾶστος ἀνδρὶ δυστυχεῖ: Soph. Ajax 833, σὺν ἀφαδάστω καὶ ταχεῖ πηδήματι πλευρὰν διαβρῆξαντα: Mosch. iii. 26, σείο, Βίων, ἔκλυσε ταχὺν μόρον αὐτὸς Ἀπόλλων. Missing this point, some have imagined that some other special revelation to St. Peter is implied: and such revelations are related by Hegesippus de excid. Hierosol. iii. 2, Ambros. Sermo de bas. trad. Ep. 21 (32), vol. iii., p. 867: see especially Corn. a-Lapide h. l. But even if ταχυνὴ be understood **'soon,' 'not far off,'* no such inference need be drawn. For it might well be that advancing old age might lead the Apostle to the conclusion that the end prophesied to him *δταν γηράσῃς* could not be far off. The Commentators quote Jos. Antt. iv. 8. 2, where Moses says, ἐπεὶ . . . δεῖ με τοῦ ζῆν ἀπελθεῖν . . . δίκαιον ἡγησάμην μηδὲ νῦν ἐγκαταλείπειν τὸ ἐμὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμετέρας εὐδαιμονίας πρόθυμον).

15.] **Moreover** (δὲ καὶ both serve for con-

^z = Luke ix. 31 (Heb. xi. 22) only. ^{Wisd. iii. 2.} a here only Ps. xxix. 4. ^{μν. ποι.,} Thuc. ii. 54. ^{b = here (2 Tim. iii. 15) only.} Herod. ii. 66, ^{πρὸς ταῦτα σοφίζονται τάδε.} c 1 Tim. i. 4, iv. 7. 2 Tim. iv. 4. Tit. i. 14 only. ^{Sir. xx. 19 only.} d ch. ii. 2, 15 only. Isa. lvi. 11. Sir. v. 2 (see note). e = 1 Cor. xii. 8. xv. 1. 2 Cor. viii. 1 al. Jer. xvi. 20.

ABCKL
 P N a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m o
 13

μειαν P 13 Ec.

nexion with the foregoing) **I will endeavour that ye may on every occasion have it in your power (reff.) after my decease** (it is at least remarkable that, with the recollection of the scene on the mount of transfiguration floating in his mind, the Apostle should use so close together the words which were there also associated, viz. *σκήνωμα* and *ξόδος*: see Luke ix. 28 ff. The coincidence should not be forgotten in treating of the question of the genuineness of the Epistle) **to exercise the memory of these things (μνήμην ποιεῖσθαι** is almost always used for *to make mention of*: so Herodot. vi. 19, 55, vit. Hom. 14, and other examples in West.; but such evidently is not its sense here. In Thucyd. (reff.) the sense is ambiguous, but from *ὄντας ἄσονται* following, it would appear that *to quote or make mention* is also the sense there, though Palm and Rost give it as here. An interpretation has been given to this latter clause which the very position of the Greek words, *μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον*, after *ἔχειν ὑμᾶς*, ought sufficiently to have guarded against: viz. that St. Peter says *σπουδάσω καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἔξοδον*, meaning, as Ec. and Thl. mentioning this view, *ὅτι καὶ μετὰ θάνατον οἱ ἅγιοι μέμνηται τῶν τῆδε, καὶ πρὸς βεβούσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ζώντων* (but not with approval, merely stating that *τοῦτό τις ἐν ἐπερβάτω ἀκούοντες* (per hyperbaton intelligentes) *βούλονται παριστᾶν ἀπὸ τούτου ὅτι κ.τ.λ.*). Many of the R.-Catholic interpreters take this view; so Corn. a-Lap., *ἔχειν*, “habere scilicet in mente et memoria mea (?) ut crebro vestri sim memor apud Deum, eumque pro vobis orem, ut horum monitorum meorum memoriam vobis refricet. Ita Ecumenius (compare above. The more candid Estius confesses, “Ec. etiam hujus meminit interpretationis, sed alteram præfert ut simpliciore”, &c.” and he concludes: “Hinc patet S. Petrum et Sanctos vita functos curare res mortalium, ideoque esse invocandos.” And so Justiniani, but not so confidently: Feuardentius, doubtfully at first, but “vires acquiens eundo,” and ending with a vehement invective against the heretics who hold the interpretation which he himself had previously given. Estius, on the other hand, impugns this view, supporting the ordinary one, and ending “Jam quid attinet, statuere

velle doctrinam certissimam argumento incerto, cum alia certissima nequaquam desint?” It is most instructive, especially in our days, to take up any of the texts, by which the abuses of Rome are supposed to be sanctioned, and to trace their interpretations through the R.-Cath. Commentators themselves. It will be most frequently found, as here, that the confident allegation of them has arisen at first out of some merely conjectural sense, impugned by the very authorities which they quote for it, or supported, as in this case (compare the citations in Corn. a-Lap. and Estius), by spurious writings attributed to the Fathers. 16–18.] *Corroboration of the certainty of the facts announced by apostolic eye-witness.*

16.] For (reason for the zeal which he had just predicated of himself) **not in pursuance of (ἐξακολ., see reff.** The preposition must not perhaps be pressed: certainly not as Bengel, “*τὸ ἐξ errorem notat*, cap. ii. 2, 15.” If it is to be rendered, its sense may be much as in our expression, “following out,” i.e. “in pursuance of,” as given above) **cunningly-devised fables** (add to reff., Aristoph. Nub. 543, *ἀεὶ καινὰς ἰδέας σοφίζομαι*. They are, as Pott (in Huther), “fabulæ ad decipiendos hominum animos artificiose excogitatæ atque exornatæ.” The Commentators quote from the præmium of Josephus, *οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι νομοθέται τοῖς μύθοις ἐξακολουθήσαντες κ.τ.λ.* Such cunningly-devised fables would be the mythologies of the heathen, the cabalistic stories of the Jews; and these may be alluded to, and perhaps also the fables of the Gnostics, which could, it is true, only be in their infancy, but still might be pointed at by St. Peter, as by St. Paul in reff.: see Prolegomena, Vol. III. ch. vii § i. 34) **did we make known to you** (the Writer of this Epistle, says De Wette, wishes to appear to stand in closer relation to his readers, than the writer of 1 Peter: cf. 1 Pet. i. 12. But why so? May not the same Apostle in one place mean the actual preachers who delivered the Gospel to them, in the other, the Apostles, who were its first witnesses? For observe, that first Epistle is addressed to certain definite churches; this, to all Christians generally. Or again, why should it be regarded as absolutely impossible that

ρίσαμεν ὑμῖν τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ δύναμιν ^{James v. 7, 8}
καὶ ^{ref Pet. ch.} παρουσίαν, ἀλλ' ^{iii 4, 12 only.} ἐπόπται γενηθέντες τῆς ἐκείνου ^{g here only t.}
^h μεγαλειότητος. ^{17 i} λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν ^{(2 Mac. iii.}
καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς ^k ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ ^{39, vii. 35.} τοιαῦδε ὑπὸ τῆς ^m με- ^{21.}
γαλοπρεποῦς ⁿ δόξης ^{h Luke ix 43.} ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ^{Acts xix. 27}
^{9. Dan. vii. 27 LXX. Esdr. i 5 only.} ^{1 particip. constr. 2 Cor. v. 6. vii. 5 ul. Lev. iv.}
^{5. Winet; § 45, 6 δ.} ^{h = 1 Pet. i. 13. ver. 21.} ^{1 here only.} ^{m here}
^{only. Deut xxxiii. 26. (-πεια, Ps. xx. 5.)} ^{n = (see note) δυνάμεις, Matt xxvi. 64 i.}
^{o MATT. (iii. 17 ii) xiii. 5. Gen. xxii. 2.}

16. om χριστοῦ P. aft δυν. ins τε P 13.]

17. ins του beφ θεου CN a c 69. ανεχθεισης C³. τοιαυδε bef αυτω C¹ 13
Thl [om αυτω P]. rec ουτος εστιν bef ο υι. ο αγαπ., omg 2ud μου (as elsewhere),
with ACKLX rel [vss: P has ουτος εστιν in both places]: txt B.

the publication of some one or more of the existing Gospels may have taken place, and may be alluded to in these words?) the power (viz., that conferred on Him by the Father at His glorification, of which the following scene testified, and the actuality of which He himself asserted, when He said, Matt. xxviii. 18, ἐδόθη μοι πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς: in the strength of which He will come to judge the world) and coming (i. e., as ever, second and glorious coming: not, as *Erasm.* and many others, His first coming. Nor must the two words be made by hendiadys into "præsentissima majestas," as *Bengel* of our Lord Jesus Christ, but (in virtue of) having been admitted (the part., as so often, renders the reason,—the enabling cause of the act. The γενηθέντες may here be pressed to its passive sense, "having been admitted as:" seeing that γενομένοι would have been the more natural word, were no such meaning intended) eye-witnesses (ἐπόπτης is a technical word, used of those who were admitted to the highest degree of initiation in the Eleusinian mysteries: and, considering the occasion to which allusion is made, there seems no reason for letting go altogether this reference here: "admitted as initiated spectators." Still, in English, we have no other way of expressing this than as above. Any attempt to introduce the allusion would overcharge the language. The word "admitted" gives a faint hint of it) of His majesty (viz. on the occasion to be mentioned. The words must not be generalized, to reach to all occasions of such witnessing: but it is obvious that neither must the Transfiguration be regarded as standing altogether alone in such an assertion. It is indeed here that incident which marked, to the Apostle's mind, most certainly the reality of Christ's future glory: but it was not the only occasion when he had seen the exhibition of divine power by Him as a foretaste of His power at his return to judgment: cf. John

v. 25—28, with John xi. 40—44).

17.] For (justification of the above assertion that we were admitted witnesses of His majesty) having received (the construction is an interrupted one, and seems rightly explained by *Winer*, as in ref.: "the construction is broken off by the parenthetical clause φωνῆς . . . ἐδόθησα, and the Apostle continues, ver. 18, καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν, instead, as he would have said, ἡμᾶς εἶχε ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἀκούσαντας (-οντας?), or the like." So that the participle does not want supplying by ἦν or ἐτύγχανε, nor is it put for the finite verb) from God the Father (not τοῦ πατρός, or τοῦ π. αὐτοῦ, because θεὸς πατήρ was a term well known: cf. the same in Gal. i. 3; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; 1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 John 3; Jude 1) honour and glory (honour, in the voice which spoke to him: glory, in the light which shone from Him), when a voice was borne to Him (the occurrence of a similar expression in ref. 1 Pet. is to be noticed. The dative is purely local) of such a kind (viz. as is stated in what follows: "purporting as follows") by (uttered by: the ὑπό of agency after a passive verb. As *Winer* remarks, § 47, all other renderings are arbitrary) the sublime glory (the words seem to be a periphrasis of God Himself. In ref. Deut., God is called ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς τοῦ στερεώματος. So *Gerh.*, *De Wette*, *Huther*. Others understand them of the bright cloud which overshadowed the company: others of the heaven: but ὑπό, in its only admissible meaning (see above), will not suit either interpretation), This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased (the words are as in Matt. xvii. 5, where however we have ἐν ᾧ for εἰς ὃν, and αὐτῷ ἀκούετε is added. In Mark and Luke the words εἰς ὃν κ.τ.λ. are wanting [and in the critical text of St. Luke. It is δ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος]. It is worth notice, that the words are in

ἔστιν, ^ρ εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ ^ρ εὐδόκησα. ¹⁸ κα ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ABCKL
P N a b c
d f g h j
k l m o
13
^γ ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ^κ ἐνεχθεῖσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ὄντες
^q ἐν τῷ ^{α'} ἁγίῳ ^α ὄρει. ¹⁹ καὶ ἔχομεν ^ς βεβαιότερον τὸν
^ρ ^τ προφητικὸν λόγον, ^φ ^υ καλῶς ^υ ποιεῖτε ^ν προσέχοντες
^ς Heb. ii. 2 i. eff. comp., here only. ^τ Rom. xvi. 26 only +. ^υ James ii. 8 i. eff. ^ν οἷς ποιήσετε καλῶς
^{μῇ} προσέχοντες, Jos Antt. xi. 6. 12. ^ν = Heb. u. 1 i. eff.

ἠυδοκησα A m 13. 40 Thl.

18. [ταυτης της φωνης . . ενεχθησις(sic) 13. Steph ημεις (misprint).] for
 ες, εκ του ΑΝ. for συν, ουν Ν¹. rec τω ορει τω αγιω, with AC³KL[P]N rel
 vulg (Ec. Aug: txt BC¹ 13 [arm] Thl Promiss.

an independent form here. εἰς ὃν is a pregnant construction,—“on whom my pleasure has lighted and abides.” εὐδόκησα, aor., but only to be given in Eng. by the present. If an account is to be given of the aoristic sense, it must be “my pleasure rested from eternity”).

18.] Substantiation of the personal testimony above adduced by reference to the fact. And this voice we (Apostles: Peter, James, and John) heard borne from heaven (not, as E. V. ungrammatically, “this voice which came from heaven” (τὴν ἐξ οὐρ. ἐν.): we heard it borne, witnessed its coming, from heaven), being with Him in the holy mount (De Wette is partly right, when he says that this epithet “holy” shews a later view of the fact than that given us in the evangelistic narrative: but not right when he designates that later view *münbergläubiger*. The epithet would naturally arise when the gospel history was known, as marking a place where a manifestation of this divine presence and glory had taken place. The place whereon Moses stood is said, ref. Exod., to be *holy ground*. So that really all we can infer from it is, that the history was assumed to be already well known: which is one entirely consistent with the probable date of the Epistle: see Prolegg. It is hardly necessary to refute Grotius’s idea, that Mount Sion is meant, and that the voice referred to is that related in John xii. 28).

19—21.] The same—i. e. the certainty of the coming of Christ, before spoken of,—is further confirmed by reference to O. T. prophecy.

19.] And we have more sure the prophetic word (first, for the construction: βεβαιότερον is predicative after ἔχομεν: ‘we have more sure’: either in the sense of, a. we hold faster, making βεβαιότερον quasi-adverbial: or, b. we possess, more secure. . . . Of these, the latter (see below) is the only one which suits the interpretation of the comparative which we prefer. And thus a double explanation is possible: 1. that the comparative alludes to what has gone before as its reason, as if it had been said διὰ ἔχομεν

βεβαιότερον, or καὶ τὴν ἔχ. . . . or καὶ ἐκ τούτου ἔχ.: i. e. ‘on account of this voice from heaven which we heard, we have firmer hold of, or esteem (possess) more sure, the prophetic word, as now having in our own ears begun its fulfilment.’ So Ec., ἐπεὶ δὲ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐζυνωμεν διὰ τῆς πείρας τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν προκατηγγελέμενα, βεβαιότεραν κρίνομεν φησι διὰ τούτων τὴν προφητείαν αὐτῶν: the scholia, Grot., Bengel (“firmior fit sermo propheticus ex implemento”), al., and hesitatingly, De Wette. The great objection to such a view is, the omission of any such connecting particles as those above supplied. It is true the Apostle may have omitted them: but even supposing that, it is further against the view, that if such be the force of the comparative, the thought is not at all followed up in the ensuing verses. We come then to the other possible force of the comparative: 2. that it is used as comparing the prophetic word with something which has been mentioned before, as being firmer, more secure than that other. And if so, what is that other? The most obvious answer is, the voice from heaven: and this is at first sight confirmed by the consideration that one word would thus be compared with another, the φωνή with the λόγος. But then comes in the great difficulty, How could the Apostle designate the written word of God, inspired into and transmitted through men, as something firmer, more secure, than the uttered voice of God Himself? And our reply must be, that only in one sense of βεβαιότερος can this be so, viz. as being of wider and larger reference, embracing not only a single testimony to Christ as that divine voice did, but τὰ εἰς χριστὸν παθήματα, κ. τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας: as presenting a broader basis for the Christian’s trust, and not only one fact, however important. This is a modification of Huther’s view, which takes the comparison to be, that the testimony of the Transfiguration presented only the glory of Christ in the days of His flesh, whereas the prophetic word substantiates His future glory also. But this is in-

ὡς ^{wx} λύχνω ^{wy} φαίνονται ἐν ^z αὐχμηρῷ τόπῳ, ἕως οὗ ^a ἡμέρα ^w John v. 35.
^b διαυγάσει καὶ ^c φωςφόρος ^d ἀνατείλη ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ^x John, as
 above. Matt.
 v. 15. vi. 22.
 Maik iv.
 21. Luke viii. 16 al⁵ Rev. xviii. 23 al² only. Ps. cxviii. 105. y = John i. 5 v. 35. 1 John ii.
 8. Rev. i. 16. vii. 12 xxi. 23 only. Gen. i. 17. z here only. Xén Mem. ii. 1. 32.
 a = Rom. xiii. 1. Thess. v. 5, 8. b here only + Polyb. iii. 104. 5, ἄμα τῷ διαυγάζειν. (-γής,
 Rev. xxi. 21. see 1 Kings xiv. 36.) c here only (see note) + d intr., Matt. 17.
 16 || Mk. Mark xvi. 2. Heb vii. 14. James i. 11 al. Gen. xix. 25

19. αχμηρῷ A Δ6. 33.

ins η bef ημερα [P] N m [13].

sufficient, or rather is not strictly correct: for the Apostle clearly does regard the voice at the Transfiguration as a pledge of Christ's future glory. Either of these is better than Calvin's view:—"non difficilis est huiusmodi solutio, quia hic respectum habet gentis suæ Apostolus: . . . quum apud Judæos indubium esset, a Domino profectum quicquid Prophetæ docuerant, non mirum est si dicat Petrus, firmiorem esse eorum sermonem: jam vetustas quoque ipsa semper aliquid reverentiæ secum trahit." Bede's view is worth quoting: "si enim quispiam (inquit) nostro testimonio discredendum putaverit, quod in secreto gloriam Redemptoris nostri conspeximus divinam, quod vocem Patris ad eum factam audierimus, certe sermoni prophético nemo contradicere, nullus de hoc ambigere audebit, quem divinis Scripturis jam olim insertum omnes verum esse testantur." And so nearly, Estius. But in this case we should have expected *ἐρχομεν* δὲ καὶ A modification of this view is found in Augustine, in Joh. Tract. xxxv. 8, vol. iii. pt. ii., "quia nos non ibi fuimus, et istam vocem de cælo tunc non audivimus, ait ad nos ipse Petrus, Et habemus certiores propheticum sermonem. Non audistis vocem de cælo delatam, sed certiores habetis propheticum sermonem" (see the same more fully expanded in his Serm. de Scripturis xliii. (xxvii.) 3, 4 (5), vol. v. p. 256). But then we should have expected *ἐρχε*. Of course, all attempts to shelve the comparative by making it into a positive (Wir haben ein festes prophetisches Wort, Luth.), or a superlative ("habemus firmissimum sermonem propheticum," Beza), are out of the question. τὸν λόγον προφητικόν cannot be as Sherlock, Griesb., N. T. prophecies,—nor as Benson, al., O. and N. T. prophecies combined, on account of the subsequent expression in ch. ii. 1, which confines it to O. T. times), to which ye do well in paying attention (cf. Joseph. in reff. προσέχοντες, sc. τὸν νοῦν, gives the idea of adherence, not merely of notice: compare Heb. ii. 1), as to a candle (the figure is taken from the lighting of a candle at night, and the imagery is as in Rom. xiii. 12, ἡ νὺξ πρόεκυψε, ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤγγικεν) shining in a dark place (αὐχμηρὸς (αὖθ), lit. dry, arid: hence neglected,

dirty, dark: "Aristoteles de coloribus ponit τὸ στίλβον κ. λαμπρὸν τῷ αὐχμηρῷ καὶ ἀλαμπῇ." Wetst. (which seems to answer Kypke, who questions if the sense "dark" can be proved except from Suidas and the grammarians). Suidas gives αὐχμηρὸν, στυγνόν, ἢ σκοτεινόν: and so Hesych., ξηρόν, σκοτῶδες) until day shall dawn (aor. in the sense of 'futurus exactus': the fact involved in the διαυγάσειν coming in upon and putting an end to the state indicated by the pres. participles above. The ἕως οὗ belongs more naturally to προσέχοντες than to φαίνονται, because that which follows ἕως οὗ relates to the readers, not to the word of prophecy. For διαυγάσειν in the sense of dawning, see ref. Polyb. Plut. moral., p. 893 E, uses it of lightning, τῇ πληγῇ καὶ τῷ σχισμῷ διαυγάσει) and the morning-star shall rise in your hearts (it is said by the Commentators quoting from one another, that φωςφόρος is taken by Hesych. for the sun. But he merely says, φωςφόρος, φωτοδότης, λαμπρὸς ἀστὴρ. And as there is no precedent, so also is there no occasion, for thus understanding it here. The dawn of the day is accompanied by the rising of the morning-star. It is not quite clear, what time is here pointed out by the ἕως οὗ. Gerhard says, "Petrus h. l. docet, scripta prophetica lucem quandam tenuem tempore V. T. exhibuisse, donec per verbum evangelii et operationem Spiritus sancti uberior, clarior et perfectior lux divinæ notitiæ in N. T. fuerit secuta." But it is entirely against this view, that the pres. ᾧ καλῶς ποιεῖτε προσέχοντες makes it necessary, as indeed does the whole context, that the time spoken of, which the ἕως οὗ is to put an end to, should be present. De Wette modifies this last view by saying, that this O. T. darkness of the pre-Christian time still endures for those who have not yet embraced the Christian faith. But this would make the readers, who are said, ver. 12, to be ἐσθιγριμένοι ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ ἀληθείᾳ, to be still unconverted to Christianity. Bede, Calvin, al., understand it of the glorious day which is to come when the Lord shall be manifested. So Bede: "ad lucernam nocturnam pertinet quod 'filii Dei sumus et nondum apparuit quid erimus.' Et in comparatione quidem impiorum, dies sumus, Paulo di-

eso Heb. x 34. ὑμῶν, ²⁰ τοῦτο πρῶτον ^e γινώσκοντες, ὅτι πάντα ^f προ- ABCKL
James i 3. φητεία ^g γραφῆς ^h ἰδίας ⁱ ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται. ²¹ οὐ Ps a b c
ch iii. 3. ^f = Matt. xiii. ^g = 1 Tim. v. 18. ch. iii. 16 al. ^h προφήτης ἰδιον οὐδὲν d i g h j
14. epp. here only Rev. i. 3 (x1 6) al⁵ ^g = 1 Tim. v. 18. ch. iii. 16 al. ^h προφήτης ἰδιον οὐδὲν k l m o
ἀποβέγγεται, Philo, Quis rer. div. hær. 52, vol. i. p. 510. ⁱ here only τ. Gen. xl. 8 Aq. 13

cente, Fuistis aliquando tenebræ, nunc autem lux in Domino. Sed si comparemur illi vitæ in qua futuri sumus, adhuc nox sumus, et lucerna indigemus." So Calvin, "Ego hanc caliginem ad totum vitæ stadium extendo, ac diem tunc nobis illucere interpretor, quum facie ad faciem videbimus quod nunc cernimus per speculum et ænigmate:" so Dietlein, al. Others, as Grot., al., De Wette, Huther, think that some state *in the readers themselves* is pointed at, which is to supervene upon their present less perfect state: Grot. interpreting it of their attainment of the gift of prophecy: De Wette of their arriving at full conviction of the certainty of the coming of Christ: Huther, much the same, adding, "The writer distinguishes between two degrees of the Christian life: in the first, faith rests upon outward evidences, in the second, on inward revelations of the Spirit: in the first, each detail is believed separately as such: in the second, each is recognized as a necessary part of the whole. And hence the being in the former is naturally called a walking *ἐν τόπῳ αὐχμηρῷ*, in the light of a *λύχνος*, while the being in the latter is a walking in the light of the morning." And this latter I believe to be nearly the true account. That which refers the words to the time of the Lord's coming is objectionable, because thus, 1. the time of the Christian's walk here, in which he is said to be light in the Lord, would, not comparatively (as Bede above), but absolutely, be described as a walking in darkness by the slender light of O. T. prophecy: 2. the morning-star arising *in men's hearts* is not a description which can apply to the Lord's coming. So that, whatever apparent analogy there may be with the comparison used in Rom. xiii. 11 ff., the matters treated of seem to be different. At the same time it may well be, that the Apostle should have mingled both ideas together as he wrote the words; seeing that even in our hearts the fulness of the spiritual day will not have arisen, until that time when we see face to face, and know even as God knew us): 20.] *Caution as to the interpretation of O. T. prophecy*: to be borne in mind, while taking heed to it. This *first knowing* (τοῦτο, viz. what follows, introduced by ὅτι. πρῶτον, not as Bengel, "prius quam ego dico," but first and as most important in applying yourselves to prophetic interpretation. γινώσκοντες, as in reff.,

being aware of, and bearing in mind: = εἰδότες, 1 Pet. i. 18), that no prophecy of Scripture (γραφῇ most probably here imports the O. T. only, from the ποτε, and indeed the aorists in the next verse.

πάντα . . . οὐ, in the Hebr. manner for οὐδεμία: see Rom. iii. 20; 1 Cor. i. 29 al.) comes of private interpretation (how are these words to be understood? Two references seem to be possible: 1. to us, who try to understand written prophecies: 2. to the prophets themselves, as they spoke them. And of these the former, maintained by Bede, Erasmus, Aret., Gerhard, Pott, Steiger, al., seems precluded by the context, the next verse assigning as a reason for the position in this, that the prophets spoke not of themselves, but as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And though this might have been alleged as a reason why private interpretation cannot solve those prophecies, yet in that case we should expect not οὐ γάρ, which simply assigns the direct reason, but οὐδὲ γάρ, which assigns an analogical or remote reason. So that we seem driven to the conclusion that the saying regards, not our interpretation of prophecy, but its resolution, or interpretation, by the prophets themselves. And so Ec.: τουτέστιν ὅτι λαμβάνουσι μὲν ἀπὸ θεοῦ οἱ προφῆται τὴν προφητείαν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι βούλονται, ἀλλ' ὡς τὸ κινοῦν αὐτοὺς ἐνεργεῖ πνεῦμα. καὶ ἤδεσαν μὲν καὶ συνέσαν τὸν καταπεμπόμενον αὐτοῖς προφητικὸν λόγον, οὐ μέντοι καὶ τὴν ἐπίλυσιν αὐτοῦ ἐποιοῦντο: and below, . . . καίπερ εἰδότες οὐ χρεῖαν εἶχον ἐρμηνεύειν τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν, ἀλλ' ἐτέροις διηκόνουν ταῦτα, ἡμῖν γάρ. Similarly Thl.: and De Wette, adding, that this is said to excuse the difficulty of the interpretation of prophecy, and to remove occasion of unbelief and scoffing (ch. iii. 3). But as Huther well remarks, this last purpose is not only not indicated in the context, but is quite out of the question; the Apostle referring to prophecy not as difficult of interpretation, but as a candle shining in a dark place, nay, as being even more firm and secure than external proofs of the same truths. I believe Huther's view to be the true one: which arises from this consideration, that ἐπίλυσις is not the subsequent interpretation of a prophecy already given, but the intelligent apprehension of the meaning of the prophecy, out of which (but not ἰδίας on the part of those

γὰρ ^k θελήματι ἀνθρώπου ¹ ἡνέχθη ^f προφητεία ποτέ, ἀλλὰ ^k οὐκ ἀπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου ^m φερόμενοι ⁿ ἐλάλησαν ^o ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἀνθρώποι.

II. ¹ Ἐγένοντο δὲ καὶ ^p ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ, ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσονται ^a ψευδοδιδάσκαλοι, ^r οἵτινες ^s παρ-

17. Job xviii. 1. φερόμενοι τ. θυμοῦ, Jos. B. J. vi. 5, 2. n = Luke xxiv. 25. Acts iii. 21, 24. xxviii. 25 Jer. i. 7. o John v. 30. vi. 17, 18. p Matt. vi. 15. xiv. 11, 24. Mk. Luke vi. 26. Acts xiii. 6. 1 John iv. 1. Rev. xvi. 13 al. Jer. vi. 13 Zech. xiii. 2. q here only t. r = Heb. viii. 5 reff. s here only. Polyb. iv. 20. 5 & freq. oi προδότες τούτους παρειαγαγόντες ἐντὸς τῶν τευχῶν, Diod. Sic. xii. 41. (-aktos, Gal. ii. 4.)

21. rec ποτε bef προφητεία, with ALN rel vulg [syr-pk arm] Ec Promiss Cassiod. i. txt BCK[P] a c m 13. 36 syr copt Did. Thl. (ἄλλα, so BN g j.) rec (for απο) oi ἁγιοι, with vulg syr-pk (Ec Fulg. 3; ἁγιοι KLN rel; ἁγιοι του A: απο[. . .] ἁγιοι C 27-9 aeth Did. i. txt B[P] a 662-8-9. 137 syr (copt) [arm].

CHAP. II. 1. om εν τω λαω N³ [arm Cyr].

by whom it is sent) the prophecy itself springs. And this is much confirmed by γίνεται, which with a gen. as here, is not = ἔστιν, but rather seems to denote *origin*. So that the sense will be, that prophecy springs not out of human interpretation, i. e. is not a prognostication made by a man knowing what he means when he utters it: but &c. Thus, and thus alone, the whole context coheres. And this appears to be Bengel's view, though he does not express himself very clearly: "ut calide concinnatis fabulis opponitur spectatio apostolica: sic propriae interpretationi opponitur φορά, vectura prophetica. Itaque ἐπιλυσίς dicitur interpretatio qua ipsi prophetae res antea plane clausas aperuerunt mortalibus. Prophetia nec primo humana est, nec a se ipsa unquam ita desciscit ut incipiat esse verbum propriae, i. e. humanae ἐπιλύσεως, sed plane divinæ patefactionis est, et in rebus exituque talis cognoscitur, imo etiam firmior fit"). 21.] Reason of the above position. For prophecy was never (at any time: ποτέ belongs to the negative, and though pointing, as do likewise the aor., to a state of things passed away, and therefore not to be referred to N. T. prophecies, (see on ch. ii. 1.) must not be rendered as E. V. (after Beza, as usual) "in old time") sent ('allata,' vulg.: cf. above, vv. 17, 18) after the will (dat. of the cause; or rule, by or according to which: as in τίς στρατεύεται ἰδίοις ὁψωνίοις ποτέ; 1 Cor. ix. 7: cf. 1 Cor. xi. 5; Heb. xii. 18) of man: but men spoke from God (spoke as with the voice of, as emissaries from, God: the ἀπο of ἀποστέλλω and ἀπόστολος. Besides critical considerations, probability seems against the reading ἁγιοι, in that, on account of the repetition, ἁγίου . . . ἁγιοι, the stress, in the latter part of the sentence, would be laid on the fact of ἁγιότης, which does not form any logical contrast to ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, instead of on the fact of the φορά

and the λαλῶν coming from God, which does), [being] borne (borne along, carried onward, as a ship by the wind, reff. Acts. "Impulsus fuisse dicit, non quod mente alienati fuerint (qualem in suis prophetis ἐνθουσιασμόν fingunt Gentiles) sed qui nihil a se ipsis ausi fuerint, tantum obedienter sequuti sint Spiritum ducem." Calv. See besides reff., Jos. Antt. iv. 6. 5, οὐκ ὦν ἐν ἑαυτῷ, τῷ δὲ θεῷ πνεύματι κεινημένος: Macrobi. i. 23, speaking of the processions carrying the image of the Sun at Heliopolis,—"ferunturque divino spiritu, non suo arbitrio, sed quo deus propellit vehentes") by the Holy Spirit.

CHAP. II. 1-22.] DESCRIPTION OF ERRONEOUS TEACHERS WHO SHOULD ARISE: THEIR UNGODLY PRACTICES, AND CERTAIN DESTRUCTION. On the close parallelism with Jude 4-19, see in Prolegg. The fact will necessitate continual reference to that Epistle. 1.] Transition to the new subject. But (contrast to last verse) there were false prophets also (as well as the true prophets, just spoken of) among the people (of Israel. These words, more than any that have preceded, define the prophecies spoken of before as O. T. prophecies), as there shall be among you also (καὶ with ἐν ὑμῖν. On ἔσονται, Bengel says "et jam esse coeperunt tunc." It was so, see vv. 9 ff.: still the future in ἔσονται is simple, and this first declaration a pure prophecy) false teachers (teachers of falsehood: cf. ψευδολογος. In the case of ψευδοπροφῆται, the ψευδο- is ambiguous, whether subjective, pretenders to be prophets when they were not, or objective, prophesiers of false things: cf. for the latter Jer. xiv. 14, LXX, ψευδῇ ὁ προφῆται προφητεύουσιν . . .; ib. 15; xxiii. 25, al. fr.), the which (οἵτινες, of a class: not simply identifying the individuals) shall introduce (shall bring in by the side of that teaching which ye have received. There is a hint of secrecy and

t = (see note) εἰσαξουσιν ^t αἱρέσεις ^u ἀπωλείας, καὶ τον ^v ἀγοράσαντα
 here only. Acts v. 17 al.^s.
 1 Cor. xi. 19.
 Gal. v. 20
 only, 1 Macc.
 viii. 20
 u Matt. vii. 13.
 2 Thess. ii. 3
 al. Isa. lvii.
 4. gen., ver.
 10.
 v = 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23. Rev. v. 9, xv. 3, 4.
 4. Rev. vi. 10. (1 Pet. ii. 18 reff.) Job v. 8.
 22, 23 Jude 4 al.† (Gen. xviii. 15.) y Acts v. 28, ver. 5 only. Gen. vi. 17.
 a ch. i. 16 reff. b Mark vii. 22 al.† Wisd. xiv. 26 only. plur., Rom. xiii. 13. 1 Pet. iv. 2, ch. i. 14.
 c Acts ix. 2, xix. 9, 23 al. see Rom. iii. 16. vv. 15, 21. d = James ii. 7 reff. e Mark vii. 22 2 Cor.
 ix. 5. Eph. iv. 19 al. Jer. xxii. 27. f here only†. γράμματα πλαστά προσφέρειν, Plut. Thes. 20.

for εαυτ., αυτοῖς B¹ [m].

2. rec (for ἀσελγείαις) ἀπωλείαις, with [copt] Ec-ced : txt ABCKL[P]N rel vss [Thl].
 for οδος, δοξα AN³ 9 sah [æth].

unobservedness, but not so strong as in E. V. "shall privily bring in." It is stronger in the *παρεῖδυσαν* of Jude 4) **heresies** (αἱρέσεις here rather in the sense in which we now understand the word, new and self-chosen doctrines, alien from the truth : not sects (vulg.), which may be founded, but can hardly be said to be introduced) of destruction (whose end is destruction, Phil. iii. 19. The expression is not to be resolved as E. V. (after Beza, as usual) by an adjective, "damnable heresies," as it thereby loses its meaning, merely conveying the writer's own [judgment of] condemnation), and **denying** (a remarkable word from St. Peter) the master (compare τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι, Jude 4) who bought them (reff. No assertion of universal redemption can be plainer than this. "Ex hoc loco bene colligitur," says Estius, endeavouring to escape the inference, "Christum redemisse quosdam reprobos, nimirum illos, qui redemptionis ejus secundum aliquos effectus facti sunt participes : cujusmodi erant hi, de quibus Petrus loquitur : utpote per fidem in baptismo regenerati, et peccatorum veniam consecuti, licet postea in veterem peccati servitutem lapsi. . . . Sed ne hinc colligas, ad omnes omnino homines effectum redemptionis extendi." Calvin passes it without a word. It may be noted that by the use of this particular predication for Christ here, those heresies seem especially to be aimed at, which denied or explained away the virtue of the propitiatory sacrifice of our Lord, by which He has bought us to Himself, bringing upon themselves (the construction is not very plain. Of the two participial clauses, . . . ἀρνούμενοι, and ἐπάγοντες . . ., one must be taken as equivalent to a finite verb, corresponding to *παρεῖδουσιν* above : unless indeed we understand καὶ to mean "even," and make both participial clauses follow *παρεῖδουσιν* . . . as epexegetical of it. This, however, would leave the *ἐπάγοντες* awkwardly pendent, and re-

quiring "and" to fill it up, as in E. V. As regards then the alternative before proposed, Huther thinks it most natural to regard *ἐπάγοντες* as a finite verb : "who, by denying &c., bring on themselves &c.:"—Winer, § 45. 6. a, prefers making both depend on *παρεῖδουσιν*, regarding them however not as co-ordinate, but *ἐπάγοντες* as a sequel added to the sentence οἷτινες . . . ἀρνούμενοι. I much prefer taking καὶ as the simple copula, and regarding ἀρνούμενοι as standing in the place of a finite verb, co-ordinate with *παρεῖδουσιν* followed, as a consequence, by *ἐπάγοντες* κ.τ.λ.) swift (see note on reff., not *speedy*, but as Horneius in Huther, "inopinatam et inexpectatam") destruction [cf. αἱρέσεις ἀπωλείας above]:

2. and many shall follow after (see on ch. i. 16) their licentiousnesses (the connexion of depraved moral conduct with erroneous doctrine was in the early ages of the church almost universal : see the Pastoral Epistles passim, and below vv. 18, 19. In || Jude, the two are expressed co-ordinately : τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν, κ. τὸν μόνον δεσπότην κ. κύρ. ἡμ. Ἰ. χ. ἀρνούμενοι) on whose account (by reason of whom, i. e. from the ἀσέλγεια of those who follow after the false teachers : for to these, and not to the false teachers themselves, is the οὗς most likely referable. It is those who, seeming to be in the way of truth, yet favour and follow false teachers, that cause most scandal to the way of truth itself) the way of truth (reff. and Ep. Barnab. 5, p. 734, "homo habens viam veritatis") shall be evil spoken of ("ab iis qui foris sunt, discrimen ignorantibus verorum et falsorum Christianorum." Bengel):

3.] and in (i. e. living in, girt about with, as their element, not as E. V. "through") covetousness with feigned speeches (Wetstein quotes Artemid. i. 53, πλάσσειν δοκεῖ . . . ἀγαθὸν βήτορι . . . καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀπατεῶσι, διὰ τὸ τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα δεικνύναι τὰς

ὁμᾶς ἔμπορεύονται, οἷς τὸ ἡ κρίμα ἱ ἔκπαλαι οὐκ ἄργεϊ, ε = here (James iv 13) only. Pa. οὐκ ἄργεϊ. 4 Εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς ἄγγελλον ἁμαρτησάντων οὐκ ἠ ἐφέλιστο, ἀλλὰ ὁ σειροῖς ἔξοφον ἁ ταρταρώσας ἱ παρέδωκεν ἱ εἰς ἱ κρίσιν ἱ τηρου-
 n = 1 Cor. xi 29 (Gal. v. 10, w. gen.) 1 Tim. v. 12. James iii. 1. 1 eh, iii. 5 only t. k here only see Eccl. xii. 3. Esdr. ii 30 (25). 1 Cor. xii. 28 al. Jer. xii 14. 28 AB22 (not F. B1 def.). cxx. 3, 4. n Acts xx. 29. Rom. viii 32 xi 21. 1 Cor. vii. 23 al. Jer. xii 14. o here only t. see note. p Heb. xii. 18 reff. q here only t. r = Luke xxiii. 26 al. s John xii. 17. Acts xxv. 21. 1 Pet. i. 4. t = Matt x. 15. 2 Thess. i. 5 al. fr. 6, 8.

3. [ὑμᾶς bef λογούς K: aft εμψ. m.] εκπορευονται N¹. νυσταξει KL h j k
 l m o Thl.

4. For εἰ, η (but corrd) N¹. rec σειραις, with KL [P(appy)] rel [vulg-ed syrr
 copt arm Ephr. Did.] Cyr[-p] Procop[¹] [Damasc.] Thl Gc: txt ABCN vulg syr-pk.
 ζοφους AN¹. rec τετηρημενους, with b [Ephr.] Thl Gc: κολαζομενους τηρειν AN
 syr[-pk] syr-w-ast] copt: κολαζομενους τηρεισθαι 13: txt BC¹KL[P] rel [syr-txt arm]
 Procop [τηρομ. κολαζομ. τηρειν C², cruciandos in iudicium (in jud. cruc. am) reservari
 vulg].

τέχνας ταύτας) they will make gain of you ("quæstum ex vobis facient, ad quæstum suum vobis abutentur." Gerh. See ref., and Athenag. xiii. 569, Ἀσπασία ἐνεπορεύετο πλήθῃ γυναικῶν: Philo in Flacc. § 16, vol. ii. p. 536, ἐνεπορεύετο τὴν λήθην τῶν δικαστῶν (Huther). Pott tries to give the word the classic meaning of *lucrarī*, 'to gain over': "sectæ suæ conciliare conantur:" and this is borne out by Prov. iii. 14, LXX, κρεῖσσον αὐτὴν ἐμπορεύεσθαι, ἢ χρυσίου κ. ἀργυρίου θησαυροῦς: but the other meaning seems better here. These false teachers would care not for their sect, but for their gain), for whom (οἷς is the dat. incommodi: its antecedents being the subjects of the verb ἐμπορεύονται, viz. the false teachers) the sentence (of God, decreeing their ἀπώλεια) from long since (ἐκπαλαι cannot surely, as De Wette, be joined predicatively with τὸ κρίμα, 'the sentence from of old decreed,' cf. οἱ πᾶσαι προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα, Jude 4: in this case we should at all events expect τὸ κρίμα τὸ ἐκπαλαι. Rather, with most Commentators, should ἐκπαλαι be taken adverbially with the following verb. The word is found, besides ref., in Arrian, Exp. Alex. i. 9, εἰς λογισμὸν τοῦ ἐκπαλαι: Jos. Antt. xvi. 8. 4, ἐκπαλαι μὲν συνεδρεύων αὐτῷ προσέκειτο: Plut. Aristid. p. 328 B, ἀνὴρ θυμοειδὴς κ. φιλοκίνδυνος, ἐκπαλαι πρὸς τὴν μάχην σπαργῶν. Phrynichus, p. 45, condemns it: ἀπόπαλαι, ἐκπαλαι ἀμφοῖν δυσχεραίνε, ἐκ παλαιῶν γὰρ χρὴ λέγειν: where see Lobbeck's note) is not idle (i. e. is working itself out, is living and in action), and their destruction slumbereth not (i. e. is awake, and ready to seize them: ἀπώλεια being personified: for the verb, see reff.). 4—11.] *Argument, enforced by three historical proofs, that God will assuredly punish these wicked persons.* The protases, εἰ γὰρ . . . καὶ

ἀρχ. κόσμ. . . . καὶ πόλεις, have no single apodosis, properly so called, to answer to them, but the apodosis when it comes, is complicated with an additional protasis καὶ δίκαιον Δὸτ κ.τ.λ. which causes it to consist of two members, the deliverance of the righteous, and the punishment of the wicked. 4.] *First historical proof: the punishment of the apostate angels.* Cf. Jude 6. For (connect with the position immediately preceding, οἷς τὸ κρίμα κ.τ.λ.) if God spared not angels having sinned (how, is not here specified; but Jude, ver. 6, is more particular: see note there. ἁμαρτησάντων, anarthrous, is not = τῶν ἁμ., "that sinned:" but carries a ratiocinative force, giving the reason of οὐκ ἐφέλιστο: "for their sin"), but casting them into hell (the word is no where else found: but its meaning must be plain by analogy. Tartarus is no where else mentioned in the N. T. or LXX: there can be no doubt that it is used as equivalent to γέεννα. It seems best to take the verb absolutely, by itself, and join σειροῖς (ξόφον to παρέδωκεν, as is done in E. V. So Huther after Calov., Pott, Wahl, al., against De Wette, Dietlein, al. The aor. participle is contemporary with the aor. verb παρέδωκεν, as in ἀποκριβὲς εἶπε) delivered (them) over ("παρέδωκεν is here, as often, used with an implied idea of punishment." Huther) to dens (so with the reading in txt: σειρός, the same as σίρος, or σιρρός, properly a cave where corn is stored, so Demosth. p. 100 ult., δαυρῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς Θερκίσις σιροῖς, also p. 135. 5. The form σειρός is found (as a var. read. in Demosth. also) in Pollux ix. 49; Phot. p. 504. 23; Varro de re rust. i. 57. The word is used for a wolf's den, by Longus i. 11. The other reading, σειραίς, has perhaps come from the δεσμοῖς αἰδίοις of || Jude, and would seem to suit the sense better: see there)

u Matt. v. 21. μένους, ⁵ καὶ ^u ἀρχαίου κόσμου οὐκ ⁿ ἐφείσατο, ἰλλὰ ABCKL
 A. 59. Acts xv. 21. PNa b c
 Sir xvi. 7. d f g h j
 xxix. 1. k l m n o
^v = here (Luke i. 59. Acts vii. 3. Rev. xvi. 11 xxi. 20) only
 w. αὐτός, Thucyd. passim, & Gr writers, see 2 Macc. v. 27.
 x abs., John xii. 12. Jude 24.
 a ver. 1. b here only t. (φ-ρα, Tobit viii 2.)
 Matt. xx. 18 || Mk. e Heb. iv. 11 reff.
 Ed-vat.). Zeph. iii. 11. g = Heb. i. 2 reff.
 w 1 Tim. ii. 7. 2 Tim. i. 11 only. Gen. xli. 43. Dan. iii. 4. Sir xx. 15 only.
 y Matt. xxiv. 38, 39. Luke xvii. 27. Gen. vi. 17, &c. z Jude 4 reff.
 c 2 Tim. ii. 14 only. GEN. xix. 29. d w dat.
 f Jude 15 only. Dan. ix. 5 LXX & Theod.-AB(not h so τ. πιστῶ Ἀβρ., Gal. iii. 9.

5. (αλλα, so ABCLN g j l)

for κοσμῳ, κοσμον N¹.

6. om καταστροφή BC¹ cor^t [κατεστρεψεν (omg κατεκρινεν) P].

for ασεβειν,

ασεβει B[P] a 69. 187.

of darkness (if the reading *σειραῖς* be retained, the expression is remarkably illustrated by Wisd. xvii. 17, ἀλύσει σκότους ἐδόθησαν: and will probably mean, as there, that darkness itself is the chain, gen. of apposition) in custody (pres.: "*being kept*." The readings are in great confusion, from the combined influence of || Jude, and our ver. 9) unto (with a view to: or merely temporal, *until*: but this is not probable here, as the want of *μεγάλης ἡμέρας*, Jude 6, removes all definite allusion to the time of the judgment) judgment: 5.] *Second historical proof*

—the flood. Wanting in Jude—and spared not the ancient world, but preserved (here first comes in the idea of the preservation of the righteous, which is worked out further in the next verse) Noah the eighth person (i. e. with seven others: according to the well-known formula, generally found in Greek with αὐτός: so Thucyd. ii. 79, ἐστρατήγει δὲ Ξενοφῶν δὲ Εὐριπίδου τρίτος αὐτός, and passim. But the shorter phrase is not without classic example: e. g. Plato, Legg. iii. p. 695 c, λαβὼν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἑβδομος, and other examples in Winer, § 37. 2: and in Wetstein. The numeral adj. must be taken with Νῶε, not with κήρυκα) preacher of righteousness (the obvious construction would be, "*as a preacher of righteousness*:" so Huther: but we should thus be introducing an element logically extraneous to the context, which treats not of the *purpose why* the righteous are preserved, but simply of their preservation. And in these later Epistles, all considerations based on stricter views of the usage of the article before substantives are exceedingly unsafe. The fact, that Noah was thus a preacher of (moral) righteousness to the depravity of his age, is found alluded to in Jos. Antt. i. 3. 1.—δ Νῶεος δὲ, τοῖς πρᾶττομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν δυσχερά- νων καὶ τοῖς βουλευμασιν ἀγῶς ἔχων, ἔκειθεν ἐπὶ τὸ κρείττον αὐτοῦ τὴν διδου- ναν καὶ τὰς πρᾶξεις μεταφέρειν: Bere- schith Rabba xxx. 6, in Wetst. "κήρυξ

generationis diluvij, id est, Noachus:" al. in De Wette), bringing (= "*when He brought*," or, "*and brought*:" contemporary with the ἐφύλαξεν above) the flood (anathrous, as well known; in the earlier written reff. Matt., Luke, the art. is expressed) on the world (again anathrous) of ungodly men (Dietlein, in his commentary, attaching ver. 4 to ver. 5, and believing the crime of the angels to be that in Gen. vi. 2 (see note on Jude 6), holds that only one example is furnished by them both, as declaring God's dealings with the old world; vv. 7, 8 giving corresponding testimony with regard to the new. But his reasons, as Huther has shewn, will not hold: seeing that, 1. the sentences are strictly co-ordinate with each other, ver. 6: ver. 5: ver. 5: ver. 4, all being simply coupled by καὶ: 2. there is no mention of the new world at ver. 6, as there is none of the old at ver. 4: 3. the angels cannot be part of the κόσμος ασεβῶν. And Dietlein's idea, that if we take three examples, both members of the apodosis ver. 9, will not be represented in ver. 4, proves nothing, because that apodosis answers not to each of vv. 4, 5, 6, separately, but to vv. 4—7 generally: the idea of rescuing the righteous coming in as secondary, by the way. And the repetition of οὐκ ἐφείσατο, vv. 4, 5, by which Dietlein tries to strengthen his position, is in fact against him: marking off, as it does, expressly, ver. 5 from ver. 4, as a second example of God's unsparing vengeance):

6.] *Third historical proof: the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah*, Jude 7. And burning to ashes (Suidas, τεφρώ- σας, ἐμπρήσας, σποδώσας. The aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. following) the cities of (gen. of apposition) Sodom and Gomorrah, condemned (them) (κατέκρινεν, not imperf., but first aor. as παρέδωκεν and ἐφύλαξεν in the co-ordinate verses above) to (better than "*wilt*:" see reff.: not "*eversione damnavit*," "*funditus evertendo punivit*," as Gerh.: but "*in cineres redigens damnavit ad ever-*

Λὼτ ¹ καταπονούμενον ὑπο τῆς τῶν ^k ἀθέσμων ἐν ¹ ἀσελ- ⁱ Acts vii. 24
 γείᾳ ^m ἀναστροφῆς ⁿ ἐρύσατο. ⁸ βλέμματι γὰρ καὶ ^p ἀκοῇ ² Mac. viii.
^q ὁ δίκαιος ^r ἐγκατοικῶν ^s ἐν αὐτοῖς ^t ἡμέραν ^u ἐξ ἡμέρας ^k ch. iii. 17
 ψυχὴν δικαίαν ^v ἀνόμοις ἔργοις ^v ἐβασάνιζεν. ⁹ ^w οἶδεν ³ Mac. v.
 κύριος ^x εὐσεβεῖς ἐκ ^y πειρασμοῦ ⁿ ῥύεσθαι, ἀδίκους δὲ εἰς ¹² Diod.
^z ἡμέραν ^z κρίσεως ^a κολαζομένους ^b τηρεῖν, ¹⁰ μάλιστα δὲ ¹ Pet. i. 15
 τοὺς ^{cd} ὅπισω ^c σαρκὸς ἐν ^e ἐπιθυμίᾳ ^f μισαμοῦ ^g πορονομέ- ¹ ver. 2 reff.
⁷⁴ Rom. vii. 24. ² Cor. i. 10 al. ^{Exod} vi. 6 ^{Ps.} cxxxix. 1. ^o here only ^t. (Gr. freq. see
 Wetst) ^p = 1 Cor xii. 17. ^{Xen.} Mem. i. 4 6. ^q so James v. 6. ^r here
 only ^t. Baruch ii. 17 (23) ^{Ald} only. ^s = Acts ii. 29. ^{Num.} xxi. 21. ^t here only ^{Gen.}
^{xxxix} 10. ^{Esth.} iii. 7. ^{Isa.} lviii. 2. ^{Eurip.} Rhes. 445. ^u of things, here only. (see Acts ii. 23
 al.) ^{Jer.} vi. 13. ^v = here only. (Matt. xiv. 24 || Mk.) ^w = Matt. vii. 11 || L. ^{Luke} xii.
⁵⁶. ^{Phil} iv. 12 bis. ¹ Tim. iii. 5. ^{James} iv. 17. ^{Xen.} Cyr. i. 6. 46. ^x Acts x. 2, 7 only. ^{Isa.}
^{xxiv} 16. (see ch. i. 3 reff.) ^y = 1 Pet. i. 6 reff. ^z Matt. x. 15 al³. ^{ch. iii.} 7. ¹ John iv.
¹⁷. see Rev. xiv. 7. ^{Jude} 6. ^a Acts iv. 21 only ^t. ^{Wisd} xi. 16 ^{pres. partic.} see note, and
 Winer, § 48. 1. ^b (Strd.). ^b = ver. 4. ^c Jude 7. ^d = 1 Tim. v. 15 al. ^{Jude} ii. 19.
^e ch. i. 4 reff. ^f here only (-μα, ver. 20). ^{Wisd} xiv. 26. ¹ Mac. iv. 43 only. ^g = ch. iii.
³. ^{Jude} 16, 18. ^{Jer.} vii. 9, 24.

7. λαθ B¹ am (with vuld).

ἀναστροφή A.

(ερύσατο (one ρ), so B¹.)

8. om o B.

9. πειρασμον N¹ a h m [tol syr copt Ephr, Antch, Damasc, Ec-comm.] aft δε ins πεφ-
 λακισμενους (so Tischdf, expr: περιφλ. Treg) N¹ (N³ disapproving). for ἡμεραν, ηραν N.

10. επιθυμiais C[P a] 5. 6. 9. 15-8. 26-7-9. 36-7 syrr copt Thl Jer; επιθυμias N¹.

sionem," as Pott, Wahl, Winer, De Wette, Huthler) overthrow (καταστροφή is the word used (ref. Gen.) in the history), laying down an example (cf. πρόκειται δείγμα, Jude 7) of (i. e. that which might shew forth the fate of) those that should in after time live ungodly (so the E. V. well, but with "after"):

7.] and rescued (the contrast, the deliverance of the righteous, is here brought out at more length. This contrast is wanting in Jude, where only the punitive dealings of God are treated) righteous Lot (δικαίον, as repeating the δικαιοσύνη of ver. 5: see also again, ver. 8) distressed (καταπονέω, properly to wear down or tire out by toil, as τῇ ἐνδείᾳ τῆς τροφῆς τὴν ἀλκὴν τοῦ θηρίου καταπονέω, Diod. iii. 37: Ἡρακλῆς ὁ καταπονούμενος τῷ τῆς Δηϊανέρας χιτῶνι, Pol. xl. 7. 3: hence to oppress, as in ref. Acts, or harass beyond bearing as here) by the behaviour of the lawless (ἀθεσμοί, "homines nefarii, qui nec jus nec fas curant") in licentiousness (ἐν ἀσελγ. ἀναστροφή is to be taken together, as ἐν ἀσελγ. ἀναστρέφειν: ἐν ἀσελγ. denoting the character of the behaviour or manner of life):

8.] Explanation of καταπονούμενον. For by sight and hearing (these datives belong to ἐβασάνιζεν below, not as vulg., Eras., al., ungrammatically, to δ δίκαιος,—"ad spectu et auditu justus erat," nor as Gerh. to ἐγκατοικῶν: nor again are they to be understood of the Sodomites, as Wetstein,—"Lotus vultu eorum meretricio conspecto, et audita fama impudicitiae eorum . . .") It was by his own sight and hearing of what went on around him, that he ψυχὴν δικαίαν ἐβασάνιζεν.

βλέμμα is more usually of the look of a man from without: so in De-

mosth. Mid. in Wetst. τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ, and in numerous other examples in Wetst. The transition from this to the subjective sense is obvious) the righteous man, dwelling among them, day by day tormented his righteous soul with their lawless deeds (the form of the sentence is peculiar: that being represented as a deliberate act of Lot on himself, which was in fact the impression made on him by the lawlessness around him. The same way of speaking is common among us, when we say that a man "distresses himself" at any occurrence: cf. Isa. lviii. 5, "a day for a man to afflict his soul."—ἡμέραν ταπεινοῦν ἄνθρωπον τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. The older expositors have curiously and characteristically missed the right sense: so Ec., πρὸς ζῆλον τῶν ἀσεβῶν αὐτῶν πράξων ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας παρακαλούμενον, εἴτα βασάνιζοντα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν διὰ τῆς τούτων ἀποχῆς καὶ ἐγκρατείας (which he further expands afterwards): and similarly Thl.):

9.] (Apothesis; the last verse having been quasi-parenthetical, explanatory of καταπονούμενον. See above on ver. 4) the Lord knoweth how (reff. The expression indicates both the apprehension of the manner of the act and the power to perform it) to rescue godly (men) out of temptation (as in ref. 1 Pet., where see note,—trials, persecutions, and the like), and to reserve unrighteous (men) under punishment (not as most, cruciandos: "to be punished," E. V.: but as in ver. 4, actually in a penal state, and thus awaiting their final punishment) to the day of judgment (the great final doom: see reff.):

10.] but chiefly (cf. Jude 8) those who go after the

h Eph. i. 21. νους καὶ ἡ κυριότητος ἰ καταφρονούντας. κ τολμηταί, ἰ αὐ- ABCKL
Col. i. 16 θάδεις, m δόξας οὐ ἡ τρέμουνσιν ὁ βλασφημοῦντες, 11 p ὅπου PN a b c
Jude 8 only +. ἄγγελοι ἰσχύι καὶ δυνάμει μείζονες ὄντες οὐ ἡ φέρονσιν d f g h j
i Heb. xii. 2. ἡ κατ' αὐτὸν παρὰ κυρίῳ ἡ βλάσφημον κ κρίσιν. 12 οὗτοι k l m n o
k here only +. Jos. B. J. iii. 10, 2. 13
l Tit. i. 7 only Gen. xlii. 3. Prov. xxi. 24 only. m = Jude 6 only (see note) n Mark v. 33 ἡ L only Isa.
lxv. 2. o = ver. 2 al. fr. consti., ch. i. 19. p see Heb. ix. 16 reff q = John xviii.
29. Acts xxv 18 only. r Acts vi. 11 (13 rec.) 1 Tim i. 13. 2 Tim. iii. 2. Rev. xii. 5 only. Isa. lxvi.
3 only. Wisd. i. 6 al. s = Jude 9. John vii. 24. viii. 16. Deut. xix 6.

καταφρονούντες Α.

11. om παρὰ κυρίῳ Α α 13 vulg syr-pk copt æth [Ephr.] Bede [syr has it with ast].

flesh (more general here than in || Jude, where *ἐτέρας* defines the particular sin. Here, all following after unlawful carnal lusts is meant) in lust of pollution (lust, hankering after unlawful and polluting use of the flesh. The gen. is not to be resolved into an adjective, "*cupiditas fœda*," as Wahl), and despise lordship (so in Jude 8, *κυριότητα ἀθετοῦσιν*: where see note). *Darers* (the construction suddenly alters to a description of the wicked persons who were the object in the former sentence. Cf. ref. and Thucyd. i. 70, where the Corinthians characterize the Athenians as *καὶ παρὰ δύναμιν τολμηταί, καὶ παρὰ γνώμην κινδυνευταί*), self-willed (see note on ref. Tit., where the word is explained. Both these plurals are used as substantives, in apposition with each other and with 'they,' the understood subject of the following verb), they tremble not (when) speaking evil of (this participial construction, meaning much the same as an infinitive, is common: see ref. and Acts v. 42, xii. 16; and Winer, § 45. 4. a) glories (what is meant by this, is somewhat doubtful: see on || Jude. We might take the word here, as there also, in its widest sense, as any dignities or glories, human or divine, were it not for the example there following. The vulg. has a curious rendering
* here: "sectas (δόξας) non metuunt introducere blasphemantes:" whereas in Jude it renders "majestatem autem blasphemant:" on which Estius, "cur autem interpres eandem vocem hic *sectas*, apud Judam *majestatem*,—seu *majestates* translulerit in sententia simili, seu potius eadem, mihi non liquet"); 11.] where (i. e. "in cases where:" nearly = *whereas*: so ref., and Thucyd. viii. 96, ὅπου γὰρ . . . τοσαύτη ἡ συμφορὰ ἐπεγεγένητο, πῶς οὐκ εἰκότως ἠθύμουν;) angels, being greater (than they) in strength and might (such is of necessity the meaning, and not the curious and hardly grammatical interpretation of Huther, "angels who are greater in strength and might than the other angels," as, e. g., the archangel Michael in || Jude. This meaning would require ἄγγελοι οἱ ἰσχ. κ. δυν. μείζ. ὄντες. As it is, the ὄντες carries a slight ratiocinative force with it: "being," i. e.

"though they be:" and the thought is not, as Huther, a lame one, but shews forcibly the unbecomingness of their irreverence, seeing that even angels who are so far above them yet do not bring railing accusations against δόξαι, bring not against them (scil. δόξαι: in the interpretation, *bad angels*, fallen from their heavenly estate, but regarded here according to their essential condition as sons of glory. Cf. Milton's "excess of glory obscured," as descriptive of Satan,—an expression probably taken from the study of the original text in this place or in || Jude. The vulg. rendering, 'adversum se,' is clearly wrong: see below) before the Lord ("apud Dominum, judicem, eumque præsentem, reveriti, abstinent judicio," Bengel. It is to me on the whole more probable that the words παρὰ κυρίῳ should have dropped out, as not occurring in || Jude, than that they should have been inserted owing to any idea of a contention in the divine Presence being there intended: for no such intention is apparent there, but rather the contrary) a railing judgment (= κρίσιν βλασφημίας, Jude 9. βλάσφημον, in allusion to βλασφημοῦντες above.

As a curiosity in the way of erroneous rendering and more erroneous exegesis founded on it, we may notice the vulg. here:—"ubi angeli fortitudines et virtute cum sint majores, non portant adversum se execrabile judicium:" and Lyra's comment, "*ubi*, i. e. in pena inferni: *angeli*, scil. mali: *non portant*, i. e. vix sustinent: *execrabile judicium*, i. e. pœnam." Cf. Estius, b. l. and the extraordinary commentary of Feuardentius on this Epistle, in which he derives from this interpretation an argument *à fortiori*, "If angels cannot bear their punishment, how much less heretics, Luther, Calvin, Bucer, &c.).

12—22.] Further description and denunciation of these persons. 12.] Cf. Jude 10. In words this verse is very similar to that, but in meaning quite different: and this fact, so often occurring in the passage, strongly confirms the view of the common matter taken in the Prolegg., [ch. iv. § iii., and specially par. 11, p. 147.] See the separate sense of this verse and of

δέ, ὡς ἂλογα ὡς ζωα γεγεννημένα φυσικὰ εἰς ἄλωσιν καὶ τ = Jude 10
 x φθοράν, ὃ ἐν οἷς z ἀγνοοῦσιν a βλασφημοῦντες, b ἐν τῇ
 x φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καὶ b φθαρήσονται 13 de κομιούμενοι eis μισ-
 θὸν e ἀδικίας. h ἡδονὴν i ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν j ἡμέρᾳ k τρυφήν, u Heb. xiii. 11.
 1 σπῖλοι καὶ m ὠμῶι n ἐντρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς o ἀπάταις αὐτῶν Jude 10 only,
 v Rom. i. 26, 27 only t. (-κῶς, Jude 10.) w here only. Jer. l. (xxvii.) 46 only. Job xxiv. 5 Aq. Jos.
 Antt. ii. 10 2 al. x = here bis only (ch. i. 4 reff.) y constr., Heb. v. 8 al. Winer,
 § 24. 2. a (2nd). z = 1 Cor. xiv. 38 Sir v. 15. a w ἐν, here only. w eis, Luke xii.
 10 al. Bel and Dr 9 b so Jude 10. c Isa. xxiv. 3. d = 1 Pet. i. 8 reff.
 e 2 Macc. viii. 33 f Jude 11. Mac iii. 11. g ver. 15 h James v. 1, 3 reff.
 i Heb. x. 29 reff. j = (& w. ἐν) here only. Cf. δάκτυλος ἀμέρα, Frag. Lyr. k Luke vii.
 25 only. Gen. xlix. 20. Prov. xix. 10. (-φᾶν, James v. 5.) l Eph. v. 27 only + Jos. Antt. xiii.
 11. 3. (-λᾶς, Jude 12. -λοῦν, Jude 23.) m here only. Levit. xxi. 16—23 al. met., Sir. xviii.
 15 al. (-μεῖσθαι, 2 Cor. vi. 3.) n here only. Isa. lv. 2. Ivi. 4. o Heb. vi. 13 reff.

12. αὐτοὶ Ν. Steph γεγεννημενα, with A²KL^N rel syrr C^{ec}, γενημενα m : txt
 A¹BC[P] a [(spec æth)] Ephr, Thl. rec φυσικα bef γεγ-, with KL rel C^{ec} : om
 φυσικα 86 : txt ABC[P]^N a d h m 13 syrr [arm] Ephr Thl. for αγνοουσιν βλασ-
 φημοῦντες, αγνοουσιν βλασφημοῦσιν Ν. rec (for καὶ φθαρήσονται) καταφθαρησονται,
 with C²KL^N rel vulg [-ed (with demid tol)] spec syr-pk coptt [arm(?) Thl C^{ec} : txt
 AB[C¹P]^N am (with fuld harl¹) syr æth [-rom] Jer.
 13. for κομιούμενοι, ἀδικοῦμενοι B^N [P syr-pk (arm)]. for ἀπαταις, ἀγαπαῖς A-corr
 B vulg spec syr-pk syr-mg sah æth [Ephr.] Sing-cler. aft αὐτων ins σπιλαδες C.

Jude 10, in the notes on each verse. But (contrast to the angels, just mentioned) these, as irrational animals, born naturally (thus vulg. rightly, 'naturaliter,' according to the transposition in the text; φυσικὰ being nearly = ψυκικῶς. According to the other reading, φυσικὰ is a second epithet to ἄλογα ζωα, as C^{ec} : κατ' αἰσθησιν μόνον ζῶντα, οὐ κατὰ νοῦν κ. τὴν νοεράν (ζῶν) for (with a view to) capture and destruction (i. e. not to take and to destroy, but to be taken and destroyed. Wetst. quotes from the Rabbinical Bava Mezia, p. 85. 1, "Quidam vitulus, cum ad mactandum adduceretur, R. Judam accessit, caputque in ejus gremium reprensus flevit. Sed ille, Abi, inquit, in hunc finem creatus es"), speaking evil (as they do : the part. includes the ground of their perishing) in the matter of things which they know not (thus, viz., by ἐν τοῦτοις, ἃ ἀγνοοῦσι, βλασφ. and not by ταῦτα, ἐν οἷς ἀγνοοῦσιν, βλ., I prefer to resolve the attraction. We have βλασφημεῖν eis as anavelling to βλασφ. ἐν : on the other hand ἀγνοεῖν ἐν might be tolerated, as ἀγνοεῖν περί, 1 Cor. xii. 1; 1 Thess. iv. 13. But the former construction seems better; because, it being almost necessary to suppose οἷς neuter, not masculine, it is not so natural to have a neut. accus. after βλασφημεῖν, as a neut. dative with ἐν), in their corruption (in their practising, and following out, of this corruption to which they have devoted themselves) shall even perish (shall go on till they perish; not only being found in it, living in it, advancing in it, but going on also to its final issue, viz. eternal perdition). 13 a.] receiving as they shall (fut. part.) (the) reward of unrighteousness (not, as Wolf, = μισθὸν

ἄδικον, but exactly as in ver. 15, wages or retribution for unrighteousness : the only difference being that Balaam followed its temporal wages, they shall receive its eternal). 13 b, 14.] These verses most probably, as to construction, form an independent participial sentence, connected by apposition with what precedes. This is better than to consider them as all belonging to ἐπλανήθησαν in ver. 15, which clearly is confined in its reference to its own sentence,—or as giving the ground of φθαρήσονται above. Imagining a pleasure dictate living for a day (the interpretations of ἐν ἡμέρᾳ have been various. C^{ec} gives it, τὴν ἀληθῆ κ. ἐπέρστον εὐφροσύνην κ. ἡδονὴν ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμέραν τιθέμενοι τοῦ λαιμοῦ ἀπολαύσει. And similarly Thl., Beza, al. But this seems inadmissible for ἐν ἡμέρᾳ. Some, as Erasm., Benson, Morus, E. V., al., take it for "in the daytime," as implying absence of all shame; but this would give a very lame and frigid sense, and is inconsistent with τρυφήν, which is not revelling or rioting, but delicate living, which those who practise carry on as much in the daytime as by night, being the habit of their lives. Bede's explanation is remarkable : he understands "voluptas diei" to mean true pleasure, "qua sancti quoque delectantur in Domino," and "voluptas nocti" to be the unlawful pleasure of the ungodly. Then he takes ἡδονὴν τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ together as predicate, understanding, "cum deliciis . . . vacent . . . , has tamen ipsi optimas et quasi lucifluas judicent." Few will accept this, though it is very ingenious. There can be little doubt that the true rendering is as vulg. "voluptatem existimantes diei delicias." Grot., "in

p Jude 12
only t. Jos.
Antt. iv. 8. 7.
(εὐχ.,
Judith i. 16.)
q James ii. 8
ref.
r James iv. 4
ref.
s here only t.
Polyb. iv. 17.
t James i. 14. ver. 18 only t.
see note.
u ch. iii. 16 only t.
x Heb. vi. 8 ref.
y Luke iii. 3 ||, 4 (from Isa. xl. 3, 4).
z = Acts vi. 2. Gen. ii. 24
b Acts xiii. 10. c ch. i. 16 ref.
v Heb. v. 14 ref.
w ver. 3. gen.,
y 1 Pet. i. 14 (note).
ABCKL
P^a a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

13. 14. for μοιχαλίδος, μοιχαλίας AB 13.

13. 40 vulg syrr copt Thl Jer Sin-cler.

with a b f 36 sah: txt ABCKL[P]N rel vulg syrr copt [arm] Thl Ec.

15. καταλειποντες A[B']N 13.

ακαπαστος AB: ακαπαυστου b k

αμαρτίας N [spec].

rec πλεονεξίας,

rec ins την bef ευθειαν, with Thl Ec: om

diem, id est ad breve tempus:” Calv., Est., “Felicitatem statuunt in praesentibus deliciis.” And so Corn. a-Lap., De Wette, Huther, al. With this also agrees the article *τήν* and its position: “that delicate living which is but for a day”, spots (but σπιλίδες, Jude 12, where see note) and blemishes (disgraces, disfigurements, causing shame: *θέλεις δέ κε μῶμον ἀνάψαι*, Od. 8. 86), luxuriating in their deceits (i. e. as explained by Huther, in those things or materials of luxury, which they have fraudulently gotten, the abstract for the concrete. But, granting that interpretation as the words stand, there seems to be considerable doubt and difficulty about both reading and meaning. In Jude 12 they stand *οὗτοί εἰσιν ἐν ταῖς ἀγάταις ὑμῶν σπιλάδες συνευωχούμενοι ἀδόβως*, instead of, as here, *σπίλοι καὶ μῶμοι ἐν-τρυφῶντες ἐν ταῖς ἀπάταις αὐτῶν συνευωχούμενοι ὑμῖν*. It seems hardly possible to imagine that there has not been some error in reading which has now become inveterate. And to this conclusion tends very much the testimony of C, which reads *ἀπάταις* in both places, and is thus nearly neutralized here. While therefore reading *ἀπάταις*, in deference to the weight of MSS. combined with critical principles, I have the strongest suspicion that *ἀγάταις* is the original reading. The *αὐτῶν* is no witness against it, as De Wette thinks: the *ἀγάταις* become *αὐτῶν* by their perversion of them while they *συνευωχούνται ὑμῖν*. And on this supposition, the meaning will be, that in their love-feasts (see on || Jude) they find occasion of luxuriating and delicate living, while feasting with you. This view is favoured also by the emphatic position of *ἐντρυφῶντες*. On the verb, Loesner says, “Philo de Jos. (84, vol. ii. p. 70), Josephum ait epulas quibus fratres exceperit jussisse fieri modicas, quod noluerit *ταῖς ἐτέρωθεν ἀτυχίαις ἐντρυφῶν*, inter aliorum penuriam deliciis uti”) while they feast with you (this at all events refers to the love-feasts, whatever be read above. See on || Jude), 14.] having

eyes full of an adulteress (“quasi dicat, tam libidinosos eos esse, ut in ipsorum oculis quasi adulteræ habitent, seu ut adulteras semper in oculis ferant.” Huthenius, in Huther) and that cannot be made to cease from sin (cf. *ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκί, πέπνται ἁμαρτίας*, 1 Pet. iv. 1. Kypke quotes from Jos. B. J. vii. 37 (10. 2), *ἀκατά-πυστον νεωτεροποιῶν*), laying baits for (Demosth., p. 241. 2, speaks of *τῇ καθ’ ἡμέραν ῥαστώνῃ κ. σχολῇ δელαιζόμενοι*) unstable souls (ref. The word occurs in Musæus, 295: *βένθεα δ’ ἀστήρικτα καὶ ὑγρά θέμεθλα θαλάσσης*: the signification, as here, unstable, unfixed, “in fide et pietatis studio nondum satis fundatus et formatus”), having a heart practised in covetousness (this construction, a gen. after *γυμνάζεσθαι*, is not without example: see Thomas Magister sub voce, and Hemsterhuis’s note. So same in Acts xxii. 3 (see note there), cf. Hom.-Clem. iv. 7 (vol. ii. p. 123, Migne), *πάσης Ἑλληνικῆς παιδείας ἐησκημένος*. The phrases, *τῶν, οἰωνῶν, πολέμων, εἰδῶς*, are common in Homer: *σο οὐ πρὶν εἰδῶτα τόκοιο*, Il. p. 5: *διδασκόμενος πολέμοιο*, π. 811: *οὔτε τι ναυτιλῆς σεσοφισμένος*, Hesiod. *ἔργ. κ. ἡμ.* 649. The true account of such genitives seems to be, not, as Hemst. that the participles are taken as nouns, but as in *ἀκούειν, αἰσθάνεσθαι, τινός*, that they are partitive genitives), children of curse (i. e. as in ref. 2 Thess., *ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας*, John xvii. 12, persons devoted to the curse, accursed. But the E. V., “*cursed children*,” does not give the meaning, *τέκνα* being used in the original simply with reference to *κατάρas*. 15.] The last clauses, from *ὀφθαλμοῦς το τέκνα*, have no representatives in Jude. Now again the parallelism begins, cf. Jude 11: but the sentiment is more expanded here. The construction is altered, and becomes direct and regular, *καταλιπόντες . . . ἐπλανήθησαν*. Which have forsaken the right way (ref.) and are gone astray (the aor. part. and aor. verb are contemporary: and both require, as so often, to

τοῦ Βοσόρ, ὃς ἔμισθον ἑαδικίας ἡγάπησεν, ^{16 f} ἔλεξεν δὲ ^{e ver. 13} ἔσχεν ^{f here only.} ἰδίας ^{Job xxi 4.} ἃς ^{xxiii. 2 only.} παρανομίας· ^h ὑποζύγιον ⁱ ἄφωνον· ἐν ἀν-
θρώπων φωνῇ ^k φθεγξάμενος ^l ἐκώλυσεν ^{g here only.} τὴν τοῦ προφήτου ^{Prov. v. 22.}
^m παραφρονίαν. ¹⁷ οὗτοί εἰσι ⁿ πηγαὶ ^{h Matt xxi. 5} ἄνδρσι ^{(from Zech.} καὶ ^{i 9) only.} ὁμίχλαι ^{Gen. xxxiii.}

24 al. i Acts viii. 32 (from Isa. liii 7). 1 Cor. xii. 2. xiv. 10 only. Wind. iv. 19. 2 Macc. iii.
29 only. k ver 18 Acts iv. 18 only. Job xiii 7 al. l = Luke xiii. 2 al. Pa. xxviii. 9.
m here only (not elsw) (νεῦν, 2 Cor. xi. 23.) n Mark v. 20. John iv. 6 bis, 14. James i.
11 (12 v. r.). Rev vii. 17 al. Exod. xv. 27. o Matt xiii. 43 | L. Jude 12 only. Pa. xlii.
1. Jer. ii. 6. p here only. Job xxxviii. 9.

ABCKL[P]N rel. for βοσορ, βεωρ B 81 tol syr-pk sah arm: βεωροσρ N¹. om
os B N¹ arm. ἡγαπήσαν B arm.

16. om εν N¹ [vulg-ed (with demid harl) Eus, Orig-int.]. ανθρωπον C¹: ανθρωποις B.
17. rec (for και ομιχλαι) νεφελαι, with L rel syr-pk Thl: txt ABCN 13. 36 vulg syr
coptt æth [και ομιχλη and ελαυνομενη below P m syr-mg-gr]. (om και ομιχλ. to end
of ver K.)

be rendered by our English perfect; the English bare past not involving any present consequence, but rather leaving it to be inferred that the state predicated is over now), following out (this seems to be all that the ἐξ- implies; see on ch. i. 16. It is noticeable, that in || Jude the expression is ἐξεχύθησαν) the way of Balaam (τῇ ὁδῷ, not merely figuratively, the way (of life), but literally, seeing that it was by a journey that Balaam displeased God: cf. the frequent repetition of the word in Num. xxii. 23, and the words of the angel in ib. 32, οὐκ ἄσσεια ἡ ὁδός σου ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ) (the son) of Bosor (Grot. supposes Bosor to be a corruption of the name πηθρ, "Pethor," Num. xxii. 5: Vitringa, Observ. Sacrae, vol. i. pp. 936 f., maintains rightly that τοῦ βοσόρ rather signifies parentage than habitation, and that βοσόρ is a way of writing πηθρ, Beor, owing to a peculiar pronunciation of the π, which he traces in the formation of *salio* from πηθρ, and in the case of other sibilants from aspirates, as *sal* from ἄλς, *septem* from ἐπτά, *sisto* from ἴστημι. And he conjectures that, coupled with an intimation that the Galileans gave a softer sound than others to the π, this may have been connected with the Galilean dialect which betrayed Peter on a memorable occasion, Matt. xxvi. 73. So far well: but he goes on also to say, that the Apostle had a mystical reason for choosing this form, in allusion to the temptation which Balaam cast before Israel, because ψῶν signifies *flesh*, "elegante hoc lusu subinnuens, Balaam, suadendo voluptatum carnalium exercitium, merito dicendum esse filium βοσόρ, id est, carnis." It certainly is not beyond possibility that a Hebrew ear may have found such an allusion obvious: but the reference seems here rather to be to Balaam's attempt to curse Israel, than to his subsequent temptation of them), who loved the wages of unrighteousness (viz. which he vainly thought he might get by

disobeying the command of God. See Bp. Butler's masterly sermon on the character of Balaam, in his well-known volume),

16.] but had a rebuke for his own iniquity (what sort of a reproof, is shewn below. If any force can be given to ἰδίας, it will be found in the fact that the reproof came from an animal which was part of his own substance: he himself furnished the conviction of his own iniquity, from the animal on which he rode): a (or, "the:" we are never sure of our ground with anarthrous substantives in these later Epistles) dumb beast of burden (ὑποζύγιον is apparently used as synonymous with ὄνος in ref. Matt. If so, the universal practice of riding on the ass in Palestine must be regarded as the reason) speaking (aor. part. contemporary with aor. verb following) in man's voice (not, "by speaking in man's voice:" the participial clause brings into notice the miraculous character of the incident) hindered (not in matter of fact, for Balaam went on his way: but subjectively, more as the *imperfect* is often used: "withstood," or as E. V. "*forbade*") the madness of the prophet (a discrepancy has been discovered between this and the Mosaic account, seeing that it was the angel, and not the ass, from whom the rebuke came, the ass having merely deprecated ill-treatment at Balaam's hands. But the Apostle evidently regards not so much the words of rebuke uttered, as the miraculous fact, as being the hindrance. It was enough to have prevented his going onward, when the dumb animal on which he rode was gifted with speech to shew him his madness).

17, 18.] Further designation of these false teachers, and justification of it. Cf. Jude 12, 13, which is here much abridged.

17.] These are wells without water (in || Jude, clouds without water. Ec. understands this, ἐπεικάζει αὐτοὺς πηγαὶ ἀνδρσι, ὡς ἀπολωλεκότας τὸ τῆς ζωῆς ὕδωρ, τούτέστι, τὸ τοῦ κηρύγματος

q Mark iv 37 ὑπὸ ^aλαίλαπος ^rἐλαυνόμενοι, οἷς ὁ stζόφος τοῦ ^tσκότους ABCKL
 u L only. stτετήρηται. 18 ^uὑπέρογκα γὰρ ^vματαιότητος ^wφθεγ- P a b c
 Jer. xxxii. ^{ref.} (xxx.) 32 ^{ref.} ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 1 = James iii. 4 ^{ref.} ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 s ver 4 ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 t Jude 13 ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 u Jude 16 only ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 Exod. xviii ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 22 al. ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 v Rom. viii. 20. ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 Eph. iv. 17 ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 only. Ps. ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 xxx. 6. ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 w ver. 16. ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 x ver. 14. ^g ^h ⁱ ^j ^k ^l ^m ⁿ ^o
 y Gal v. 16. Eph. ii. 3. 1 John ii. 16. (Rom. xiii. 14. see 1 Pet. ii. 11) ^z ver. 2. ^a here only +.
 b ch. i. 4 reff ^c = Rom. i. 27. ch. iii. 17. Jude ii al 6 ^d = Heb xiii 15 reff. ^e see Rom viii. 21. ^f James
 e 1 Cor. x. 29. Gal. ii. 4. v. 1, 13 al ^g constr., James i. 12 reff ^h here bis ⁱ 2 Cor. xii. 13 only. ^j Isa. liv 17. ^k John viii. 34. ^l Rom.
 ii. 15 reff ^m ch. i. 4 reff ⁿ Acts viii 6 (from Gen. xix. 13). ^o Rom. vi.
 vi. 16. ^p ἐρωτι τῆς παιδὸς ἡγηθηθείς, Jos. Antt. i. 19. 4. ^q 1 Acts viii 6 (from Gen. xix. 13). ^r Rom. vi.
 18, 22 ^s 1 Cor. vii. 15. ix. 18. ^t Gal. iv. 3. ^u Tit. ii. 3 only. ^v Wisd. xix 13. ^w 1 Macc. viii. 11 only.

rec ins eis αιωνα bef τετηρηται (*from* || Jude), with ACL[P] rel aeth-pl Thl Ec: om
 BN vulg syrr coptt aeth-rom Jer Aug Bede.

18. ματαιότης B¹: μαθηταιοτήτος N¹ (but corrd). [αελαγείας (for -ais) P a vulg syrr
 coptt Ephr, Aug Jer.] for [1st] τους, του N¹. rec οντας (ΟΑΙΓΩΣ is easily
 mistaken for ΟΝΤΩΣ), with CKL[P] N¹ rel arm Thl Ec, οντας k: txt ABN³ 13 vulg
 syrr coptt [aeth] Jer Aug Bede, ολιγον a. rec αποφυγοντας, with KL[P] rel Ec
 Jer Aug: txt ABCN 13 vulg syrr Thl Bede.

19. N¹ repeats ελευθεριαν. [ins kai bef αυτοι B²(appy).] aft υπαρχοντες ins
 οντες A 27. om kai BN¹ [coptt aeth].

καθαρν κ. πότιμον ὕδωρ. But this is going
 too far into specialities: the comparison,
 in both Epistles, is simply to that which
 may be expected to yield water, and yields
 none. In this case the πηγὴ seems to be
 the spring itself, which ought to send
 forth water but does not), and mists (οὐκ
 εἰσι, φησί, διανγείς ὥσπερ οἱ ἅγιοι οἱ ὄντες
 νεφέλαι, ἀλλ' ὀμίχλαι, τούτέστι σκότους καὶ
 γνόφου μεσσοί, ὑπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ πνεύματος
 ἐλαυνόμενοι. Comm. in Catena) driven
 along by a whirlwind (λαίλαψ, according to
 Aristotle de mundo, is πνεῦμα βλαίων
 καὶ ἐλούμενον κατὰθεν ἄνω), for whom
 the blackness of darkness is reserved (see
 || Jude. It is obvious that no just charge of
 inappropriateness can be brought against
 our passage because this clause occurs in
 a different connexion from that in Jude.
 There it is said of wandering stars, here of
 driven clouds: of each, with equal appropriateness: darkness being predicable of
 clouds, as well as of stars extinguished).

18.] *Justification of the description.*
 For, speaking great swelling things
 (ὑπέρογκος is a classical word, occurring
 in Plato and Demosth., generally signify-
 ing excessive magnitude, as in μεγάλαι
 οὐσαί κ. ὑπέρογκοι, Plut. Ep. iii. p. 317 c.
 δυνάμεις ὑπέρογκος as opposed to ταπεινή,
 Dem. p. 46. 16. Xen. Hell. v. 4. 58,
 uses it in the literal sense, γενομένης δὲ
 τῆς κνήμης ὑπερόγκου: and Plut. Lucull.
 21, in a figurative,—φρόνημα τραγκὸν κ.
 ὑπέρογκον ἐν ταῖς μεγάλας εὐτυχίαις)
 of vanity (whose characteristic is μα-
 ταίτης: as in the genitive σώμα τῆς
 ἁμαρτίας, Rom. vi. 6, and the like: see
 Winer, § 30. 2. β) they allure (above,
 ver. 14) in lusts (ἐν ἐπιθ. describes the

state of the tempters, and the element in
 which their laying of enticing baits is
 situated) by licentiousnesses (ἀσελγ. are
 the instrument, the bait itself. Far better
 so, with Huther, than with De Wette to
 regard ἐν as = διὰ, and ἀσελγ. as in appo-
 sition with ἐπιθυμίας. Ec. inverts this
 construction, δειλεῖ(ζονσι διὰ τῆς σαρκικῆς
 ἐπιθυμίας ἐν ταῖς ἀσελγείαις) of the flesh
 those who are scarcely (οὐκ ὀλίγως occurs
 in the Anthol. xii. 205, in the sense of "not
 a little:" and as a var. read. in Plato,
 Alcib. ii. p. 149 A. It may signify here,
 by degrees, = κατ' ὀλίγον: but the other,
 = ὀλίγου, seems more generally accepted
 as the sense [with very little space, or very
 little time, for such escape]) escaping from
 them who live in error (some take τοὺς ἐν
 πλ. ἀναστρ. as a clause co-ordinate and in
 apposition with τοὺς ὀλίγως ἀποφεύγοντας:
 but the other rendering is far better:
 these unhappy persons who are but just
 escaping from the influence of those who
 live in error (the heathen), are then laid
 hold of by these deceivers, enticing them
 with licentiousness), 19.] promising
 them liberty (these are the great swelling
 things which they speak; holding out a
 state of Christian liberty, which proves to
 be the bondage of corruption) while they
 themselves are (all the while: ὑπάρχω,
 of previous entity: see on Acts xvi. 20)
 slaves of corruption (cf. the same words
 occurring together in ref. Rom., αὐτῇ ἡ
 κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας
 τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης
 τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ: which it is very
 likely St. Peter had in view: cf. ch. iii. 15.
 They promise that liberty of the sons of
 God, being themselves in the bondage of

d here only +.

(p^{an}, Lev. xiii. 28 Aq.)

e here only

Prov xi. 22

al3.

f Heb. x. 22

reff

g here only +.

Prov. ii. 18

Theod.

(λειν,

Mark ix. 20)

h here only.

Jer. xlv.

(xxxviii.) 6

bis only.

i Heb. vi. 9

reff.

k ch. i. 13 (reff.).

n Jude 17.

ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον ^d ἐξέραμα καί, ^e *Τς ^f λουσαμένη εἰς ^g κυλί-
σμων ^h βορβόρου.

ABCKL
PN abc
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

III. ¹ Ταύτην ἤδη, ¹ ἀγαπητοί, δευτέραν ὑμῖν γράφω

ἐπιστολήν, ἐν αἷς ^k διεγείρω ὑμῶν ἐν ^k ὑπομνήσει τήν

¹ εἰλικρινῇ ^m διάνοιαν ² ⁿ μνησθῆναι τῶν ^{no} προειρημένων

ⁿ ῥημάτων ὑπὸ τῶν ^p ἀγίων ^p προφητῶν καὶ τῆς τῶν ^q ἀπο-

στόλων ὑμῶν ^q ἐντολῆς τοῦ ^{na} κυρίου καὶ ^r σωτήρος, ^s τοῦτο

πρώτον ^s γινώσκοντες, ὅτι ἐλεύσονται ἐπ' ^t ἐσχάτων τῶν

k ch. i. 13 (reff.).

n Jude 17.

1. Acts v. 32

3 only

1 Phil i. 10 only +

o Heb. iv. 7 reff.

p ch. i. 1. ii. 20.

Jude 18.

Wisd. vii. 25 only. (-εἰα, 1 Cor. v. 8.)

p Luke i. 70. Acts ii. 21.

s ch. i. 20 (reff.).

m = 1 Pet. i. 13 reff.

q double gen. James ii.

t plur. (γ ἡμ.), James v.

ABN¹ am spec sah Salv₁ Promiss.rec κυλίσιμα, with AKL[P]N rel Cyr[-p₃Damasc₁ Anton₁ Max₁] Thl Ec: txt BC¹ a Ps-Chr [Ambr₁].

CHAP. III. 1. ἀγαπητοί bef ἡδη K.

2. rec ἡμων, with k Ec: txt ABCKL[P]N rel 36(sic) vulg arm Thl.

3. προγινώσκοντες C¹ [appy]. rec ἐσχατου, with KL[P] rel syr¹ Ec Aug₁: ἐσχατω

ἄφρων τῇ ἑαυτοῦ κακία ἀναστρέφας ἐπὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀμαρτίαν. It may seem however somewhat doubtful, whether the proverb, as here cited, be meant to be taken from Scripture, or rather not both of them from the popular parlance, as here expressed. ¹ἐξέραμα seems hardly to be found elsewhere than here (Schleusner cites Dioscorides vi. 19: adding "et alii," but qu. ?) the verb ²ἐξεράω occurs in ref., and Aristoph. Vesp. 993, Hippocrates, al. See Lobeck on Phryn. p. 64: and Schleusner in voce): and, The sow after washing (the middle sense must not be pressed: it is the word commonly used of men, transferred to an animal) to (ἐπιστρέψασα is generally understood before εἰς. But it seems better, with

Huther, to understand the proverb as self-contained, and elliptical, as in "Sweets to the sweet": so, "The washed sow to the mire" wallowing in the mire (if we read κύλισμα, we must render "the place of wallowing." In either case, the gen. βορβόρου imports that which characterizes the wallowing, and is a possessive gen. It is of, belongs to, mire).

CHAP. III. The general subject: THE CERTAINTY OF CHRIST'S COMING ESTABLISHED AGAINST CERTAIN SCOFFERS WHO SHALL CALL IT INTO DOUBT. EXHORTATIONS are intermingled, and follow as a CONCLUSION.

1.] This Epistle now, beloved, a second, write I unto you (or, "This second Epistle now write I unto you:" but the position of δευτέραν seems rather to shew that the emphasis of the sentence is on it): in which Epistles (E. V. well, "in both which:" viz. this and the first, implied in δευτέραν) I stir up your pure (see ref. Phil., note) mind (διάνοια is that aspect of the spiritual being of man, in which it is turned

towards the outer world; his mind for business and outer interests, guiding him in action: see Beck, Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre, p. 58. And this may be said to be εἰλικρινής, when the will and affection being turned to God, it is not obscured by fleshly and selfish regards: the opposite being ἐσκοτωμένοι τῇ διανοίᾳ, Eph. iv. 18. It seems impossible to reproduce in English these distinctions; we can only give them a general rendering, and leave all besides for explanatory notes) in reminding (see the same expression and note, ch. i. 13); 2.] that ye should remember (= εἰς τὸ μνησθῆναι:—compare the infinitives ποιῆσαι and μνησθῆναι abruptly introduced in a similar manner in Luke i. 72) the words spoken before by the holy prophets (i. e. the O. T. prophets, as referred to above ch. i. 19 ff. The vulg. has curiously misrendered: "eorum quæ prædixi verborum a sanctis prophetis"), and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour given by your apostles (as commonly taken, this sentence is made to contain a violent inversion, τοῦ κυρ. κ. σωτ. being taken out of its place after ἐντολῆς and attached to τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν. Any how, the construction is harsh, the double gen. being unavoidable: but it is surely much better to take ἐντολῆς in its most obvious connexion, and make τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑμῶν the second genitive—the command originating in our Lord, and given you by the Apostles who preached to you: τῶν ἀπ. ὑμῶν meaning "your Apostles" as we call St. Paul ἀπόστολον ἐθνῶν. It is quite impossible that ἡμῶν can stand: and difficult, even if it did, to render as E. V. "of us the Apostles." It is obvious, from the constant independence even in very similar sentences, of the two Epistles, that the || place in St. Jude, which it

ἡμερῶν ἐν ^u ἐμπαιγμονῇ ^v ἐμπαίκεται ^w κατὰ τὰς ἰδίας ἐπι- ^u here only [†].
 θυμίας αὐτῶν ^w πορευόμενοι καὶ λέγοντες ^{4x} Ποῦ ἐστὶν ἡ ^v Jude 18 only.
 ἐπαγγελία τῆς ^y παρουσίας αὐτοῦ; ἀπ' ^z ἧς γὰρ οἱ ^a πατέ- ^{Isa iii 4 only.}
 res ^b ἐκοιμήθησαν, πάντα οὕτως ^c διαμένει ^d ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ^{(-παῖδεν,}
^{de} κτίσεως. ⁵ ^f λαυθάνει γὰρ αὐτοὺς τοῦτο ^g θέλοντας, ὅτι ^{Matt xxvii.}
^{x = Luke viii 25 Gal iv. 15 Ps. xlii 3. lxxviii. 10. Mal. ii. 17.} ^{y = ch. i. 16. ver. 12.}
^{z ellips. of ἡμ., Luke vi 11, 45. John i. 29, 35. 1 Macc. i. 11.} ^{b Matt.}
^{xxvii. 52. Acts vii. 60. 1 Thess. iv. 13 al. Isa. xiv. 6.} ^{c Heb. i. 11 reff.} ^{d Mark x.}
^{6 xiii 19. see Rom. i. 20. e = Sir xlix. 16.} ^{f constr., Acts xxvi. 26. ver. 8. (Heb.}
^{xiii. 2 reff.) Levit. v. 3, 4. g see Col. ii. 18.}

C¹: txt ABC²N a d h k l vulg coptt [æth arm] Ps-Hip₁ Antech, Ps-Chr, Thl Jer.
 rec om en εμπαιγμονη, with KL rel Ps-Hip Thl Ec: [om en CP:] ins ABN 13 vulg syrr
 coptt æth Ps-Chr[-montf], εν εμπαιγμων 36. rec αυτων bef επιθυμιας, with AN
 a² m² 36 Ec: om αυτων a¹ [vulg Ps-Chr₁]: txt BCKL[P] rel Ps-Hip Thl.

stands ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρ. ἡμ. 'Iησ. χριστοῦ, is no guide here, nor reason why the same words should be joined together):— 3.] **knowing this first** (cf. reff., where the same phrase occurs. The nom. γινώσκοντες is joined loosely with μνησθῆναι. Jude introduces the same prophetic fact with ὅτι ἔλεγον ὑμῶν, ver. 18), that there shall come in the last of the days (see note on Heb. i. 1: and 1 Pet. i. 20. It slightly differs from ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμ., at the end of the days, as extending, by the plur., the expression, though perhaps not the meaning, over a wider space: = ἐπ' ἐσχάτου [τοῦ] χρόνου, Jude 18) scoffers in (their) scoffing (scoffers making use of scoffing: cf. Rev. xiv. 2, κιθαρῳδῶν κιθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις αὐτῶν: 2 Kings xx. 22, ἐλάλησεν (ἡ γυνὴ ἡ σοφὴ) ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτῆς: Dan. i. 4 Theod., γινέοντας ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, κ. γινώσκοντας γνῶσιν, κ. διανοομένους φρόνησιν.

On the sense, cf. Jude 18), walking according to their own lusts (so Jude 18 and 16, here combined), 4.] and saying, Where is the promise of His coming (ποῦ ἐστίν, implying that it is no where, has passed away and disappeared: cf. reff. αὐτοῦ, of Christ: whose name would be understood as of course) ? for from the day when (ἀπ' ἧς, sc. ἡμέρας: reff.) the fathers fell asleep, all things continue thus from the beginning of creation (the assertion is not easy to apportion grammatically. One thing is certain and may be first cleared away, that we cannot after οὕτως supply ὥς ἦν, "as they were," E. V.: οὕτως simply referring to the present; as they are, as we now see them, and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως belonging only to the verb, διαμένει. This being so, we still have two predicatory clauses following the verb: ἀπ' ἧς οἱ πατ. ἐκοιμ., and ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως. The way of explaining this must be, that the time of waiting for the promise necessarily dates from the death of the πατέρες, and the duration of things continuing as they are now extends back beyond the death of

the fathers: so that the meaning will be, ever since the death of those to whom the promise was made, things have continued as we now see them (and as they have ever continued even before those fathers) from the beginning of creation. So that πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως is a general proposition applicable to all time: ἀπ' ἧς οἱ πατέρες ἐκοιμήθησαν, the 'terminus a quo' this general proposition is taken up and applied to the case in hand. And now we have cleared the way to enquiring, who are meant by οἱ πατέρες. And the answer is plain: largely and generally, those to whom the promise was made: the same as are indicated Rom. ix. 5, ὧν οἱ πατέρες: yet not exclusively these, but simultaneously with them any others who may be in the same category,—e. g. those who bear to the N. T. church the same relation as they to that of the O. T. The assertion, as coming from the ἐμπαίκεται, must not be pressed to any particular date, but given that wide reference which would naturally be in the mind of one making such a general charge). 5—10.] *Refutations of this their scoffing inference.*

5—7.] *First refutation:* from the biblical history of the creation. 5.] **For** (i. e. they speak thus, because) this (viz. this fact which follows) escapes them (passes unnoticed by them) of their own will (i. e. they shut their eyes to this fact. So we have θέλων in Od. γ. 272, of Paris and Helen, τὴν δ' ἐθέλων ἐθέλουσαν ἀπηγάγεν ὅνδε δόμονδε; Il. δ. 300, al. Some, among whom are Rosenmüller, Pott, Bretschneider, Huther, take τοῦτο to refer to the saying of ver. 4, and render θέλου-τας 'meaning,' 'supposing,' as in Herodian, v. 3. 11, εἰκόνα τε ἡλίου ἀνέργαστον εἶναι θέλουσι. But besides that this would introduce an unusual meaning for θέλω, and that meaning not in its usual application to an hypothesis or assumption, but to an asserted fact,—a stronger objection is, that thus the sentence becomes a very flat one, and quite out

h ch. 11. 3 only 7.
 i Col. i. 17 only 7.
 εκ γης...
 ὕδατος...
 ἀέρος...
 πυρός,
 συνέστη δὲ ὁ κόσμος, Philo de Plant. Noe, 2, vol. 1. p. 330.
 m here only. Ps. lxxvii. 20. n = 2 Cor. vii. 14. 1 Tim. iv. 8. o so (art bef aut.) Heb. ii. 4 James i.
 18. 1 John ii. 27 p GEN. ix. 11 q Matt vi. 19, 20 Luke xii. 21. Rom ii. 5. 1 Cor xvi.
 2. 2 Cor xii. 14. James v. 3 only. Micah vi. 10. r dat., Jude 13.

5. ins η bef γη C[P]. υδατων P.] δια Ν. συνεστωσης B: συνεστωσης
 K: συνεστωσα Ν¹.

7. Steph om τω, with Ec-ed: txt ABCKL[P]N rel Thl. elz αυτω, with AB
 [P] a¹ vulg coptt Did-int, Aug₂ Jer: txt CKLN rel syrr aeth Thl. ins en bef

of place among the sharp and nervous denunciations of the passage. The other is the rendering of almost all Commentators and versions. The vulg. is ambiguous, "latet enim eos hoc volentes"), that the heavens (οὐρανοὶ = οἱ οὐρανοί, see Winer, § 19. 1) were from of old (ref.: "jam inde a primo rerum omnium initio," Gerh.) and the earth (ἡσαν, above, serves for γῆ also) formed (συνεστῶσα, 'consists,' see reff.) out of water and by means of water (ἐξ ὕδατος, because the waters that were under the firmament were gathered together into one place and the dry land appeared: and thus water was the material, out of which the earth was made: δι' ὕδατος, because the waters above the firmament, being divided from the waters below the firmament, by furnishing moisture, and rain, and keeping moist the earth, are the means by which the earth συνίσταται. This is the simplest rendering, and very nearly that given by Huther. De Wette goes 'in omnia alia' after traces of far-fetched cosmogonical references, Indo-Aegyptian and Greek: but the whole interpretation of our passage lies in the book of Genesis. Ec., without mentioning the reference to the waters above and beneath the firmament, gives a similar explanation of the ἐκ and διὰ, ἐξ ὕδατος μὲν, ὡς ἐξ ὑλικοῦ αἰτίου· δι' ὕδατος δέ, ὡς διατελικού by the word of God (not of its own will, nor by a fortuitous concurrence of atoms), 6.] by means of which

(viz. the waters under the firmament and the waters above the firmament: for in the flood (1) the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and (2) the windows of heaven were opened, Gen. vii. 11. The interpretations of δι' ὧν have been very various. Ec. understands ὧν to refer to the heavens and the earth, τῆς μὲν τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπικλυσάσης, τῶν οὐρανῶν δὲ τοὺς καταβραχτάς αὐτῶν ἐπαφέντων: and so Bede (but giving a curious meaning to δι' ὧν: not, as Huther states, 'in quibus partibus,' but grammatically, though strangely, 'by means of which (its parts perishing), the world, which was made up of heaven and earth, perished': "per hæc enim perditā

mundus qui in his constiterat, perit"), Beza, Wolf, Horneus, De Wette, al. Again Grot., Piscator, Dietlein, al., take δι' ὧν for 'quomodo', i. e. because the world was ἐξ ὕδ. κ. δι' ὕδ., or because it was τῷ θεοῦ λόγῳ. Luther renders wrongly, dennoch, nevertheless. Calvin, Pott, al. and recently Huther, understand δι' ὧν of waters; and account for the plur. by the ὕδωρ as material and the ὕδωρ as medium, above, or as Gerhard by understanding "things," and taking in also the word of God as comprehended) the then world (i. e. the whole state of things then existing. The Apostle's argument is, as against the assertors of the world's endurance for ever, that it has once been destroyed, so that their assertion is thereby invalidated. The expression ὁ τότε κόσμος must neither be limited, as Ec., τὸ ἀπώλετο μὴ πρὸς πάντα τὸν κόσμον ἀκουστέον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς μόνα τὰ ζῶα, ἃ τὸν ἅπαντα κόσμον οἰνοῖ εἰδοποιεῖ: nor strictly pushed to its utmost extent, as Huther, who maintains that it must be exactly identical with οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ ἡ γῆ below. The analogy is not exactly, but is sufficiently close: and κόσμος, as an indefinite common term, takes in the οὐρανοὶ κ. γῆ, which were then instrumental in, and purified by, the destruction, if not altogether swept away by it. Nay the analogy is closer than this: for just as Noah stepped out of the Ark on a new world, the face of the heavens clear, and the face of the earth renewed, so we look for a new heavens and earth (ver. 13), yet like these others constructed out of the materials of the old) being inundated with water, perished (ἀπώλετο, see last note; not, was annihilated, but lost its then form and subsistence as a κόσμος, and passed into a new state. Only thus, as Huther observes, does the verse come in logically as a contradiction to the saying of the scoffers, πάντα οὕτως διαμένει ἀπ' ἀρχῆς κτίσεως):

7.] but the new heavens and earth (contrast to ὁ τότε κόσμος: the postdiluvian visible world) by His (God's: if αὐτῷ be read, it must not be pressed to signify any one saying, but must refer generally

ABCKL
 PN a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m n o
 13

⁸ τηρούμενοι ⁸ εἰς [†] ἡμέραν [†] κρίσεως καὶ [‡] ἀπωλείας τῶν [§] ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων. ⁸ ἐν δὲ [¶] τοῦτο μὴ [×] λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, ἀγαπητοί, ὅτι ^γ μία ἡμέρα ^z παρὰ κυρίῳ ὡς χίλια ἔτη, καὶ χίλια ἔτη ὡς ἡμέρα μία. ⁹ οὐ ^a βραδύνει κύριος τῆς ^b ἐπαγγελίας, ὡς τινὲς ^c βραδυτῆτα ^d ἡγούνται, ἀλλὰ ^e μακροθυμεῖ εἰς ὑμᾶς μὴ ^f βουλόμενος τινὰς ^g ἀπολέσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντας εἰς μετάνοιαν ^h χωρῆσαι. ¹⁰ ἵξει δὲ ^k ἡμέρα

vii. 10. Sir. xxxii. (xxxv.) 18. b gen., see note and Winer, § 30. 5. b. c here only + Xen. Hell. iv. 6. 5. d constr., Heb. x. 29 reff. e Heb. vi. 15 reff. see note. f of God, James i. 18 reff. g = James iv. 12 reff. h = & w. eis, Matt. xv. 17 only + 19 reff. i = Luke xiii. 35. John ii. 4. Ps. xxxvi. 13. k Acts ii. 20, from Joel ii. 31. 1 Thess. v. 2 (1 Cor. i. 8. 2 Cor. i. 14. 2 Thess. ii. 2) only Isa. ii. 12.

πυρί: C¹[P] 27-9.

for ἀπωλείας, ἀσεβείας A.

8. *thas C.* *κυρίου N.* *om και χίλια ετη (homaeolē) N.*
9. rec ins o bef *κύριος*, with KL rel Thl Ec: om ABC[P]N h j n 13. 36 [arm].
for 1st *eis*, δι' AN a 13 vulg spec syrr sah æth Aug Fulg Fast: εφ c. rec *thas*,
with KL rel copt Thl Ec: txt ABC[P]N c m 13 vulg spec syrr sah Aug Fulg Fast.
[τινα (for -vas) P 13 am (and tol) spec copt arm Thl Aug Fulg.] πάντες N.

10. rec ins η bef *ἡμερα*, with AKL[P]N (Tischdf, expr) rel [Damasc.] Thl Ec: om

(as with αὐτοῦ) to the prophetic word, which has announced that which comes to be mentioned) word are treasured up (perf. "have been, and are still," kept in store, put by, against a certain time: see especially ref. Rom. Dietlein fancies that the idea of *θησαυρός* must be kept hold of, the οὐρανοὶ κ. γῆ being the stored-up material for wrath to be exercised on: but this is mere fancy, and is contradicted by Rom. ii. 5, where the reference is the same), being kept (present, denoting that it is only God's constantly watchful Providence which holds together the present state of things till His time for ending it) for fire (πυρί, dat. commodi) against the day of judgment and perdition of impious men (τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων does not, as Dietlein imagines, import that οἱ ἄνθρωποι, mankind, are ἀσεβεῖς: but = τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις). 8—10.]

Second contradiction to the scoffers: *we are not to judge God*, in the case of *delay*, as *we do men*, seeing that His thoughts are not as our thoughts. 8.] But let

this one thing not escape you, beloved (ἐν τοῦτο, as especially important: λανθανέτω ὑμᾶς, in allusion to ver. 5), that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day (the saying is the completion of that in Ps. xc. (reff.), setting forth also in a wonderful way, that one day may be in God's sight as productive of events as a millennium: in other words, when both clauses are considered, placing Him far above all human limits of time. "Summa: Dei æonologium (sic appellare liceat) differt ab horologio mortalium. Illius gnomon omnes horas simul indicat in summa actione et in summa quiete. Ei nec tardius nec celestius labuntur tempora, quam Ipsi et cœconomix ejus aptum sit. Nulla causa est cur

finem rerum aut protelare aut accelerare necessum habeat. Qui hoc comprehendemus? Si comprehendere possemus, non opus foret a Mose et Petro addi, *apud Dominum*." Bengel). 9.] The Lord (i. e. God, the Father, as so often in this and in the first Epistle) is not tardy (βραδύνει, not merely to *delay*, but to *be late*, beyond an appointed time; so Gerh.: "discrimen est inter tardare et differre: is demum tardat, qui ultra debitum tempus quod agendum est differt") concerning his promise (so, connecting the gen. with the verb, and not with δ κύριος, must the words be taken. The gen. is one of partition, as in *ὁστερεῖν τινος*, 2 Cor. xi. 5, xii. 11,—*παύεσθαι τινος*, 1 Pet. iv. 1,—&c., the being late implying a falling short) as some (viz. the scoffers in question, who are pointed at) account (His conduct) tardiness (better thus, making βραδυτῆτα predicate, than to render νομίζουσιν "think concerning," "define," "explain," and make βραδυτῆτα object only): but He is long-suffering towards you (μακροθυμεῖν with eis here only: with ἐπί, Matt. xviii. 26, 29; Luke xviii. 7; James v. 7; with πρός, 1 Thess. v. 14:—ὑμᾶς, the readers of the Epistle; not as a separate class, but as representing all, cf. πάντας below), not willing that any should perish, but (willing) that all should go forward (reff.) to repentance (Calvin is quite wrong in his rendering, "omnes ad penitentiam recipere:" equally wrong, in his alternatives, "aut colligi, vel aggregari." Plutarch has the very expression, De flum. p. 19 (Wetst.), *ὀλίγον δὲ σωφρονήσας, καὶ εἰς μετάνοιαν ἐπὶ τοῖς πραχέουσιν χωρήσας*).

10.] Assertion of the conclusion as against the scoffers—the certainty, suddenness, and effect of the day of the Lord. But (notwithstanding the delay) the day

11 THESS. v. 2. ^k κυρίου ὡς ^l κλέπτῃς, ἐν ^η οὐρανοῖς ^m ροιζήδον ⁿ παρελεύ- ABCKL
 1 Pet. iv. 10 ^{reff} P a b c
 m here only +. d f g h j
 -(-εἶν, Cant. k l m n o
 iv 15 -ζος,
 Wisd. v. 11.] 13
 o = ver. 12 only +. Wisd. xx. 18. (Heb. v. 12 reff.) ⁿ = Matt. v. 18. xxiv. 34. 35 ff. ² Cor. v. 17. James i. 10 Ps lxxxix. 5 Esdr. i. 55 (52).
 14 vv 11, 12. 1 John iii. 8 plur. Rev. i. 19 reff. ^p ver. 12 only +. ^q = John ii. 18. Ep. (ii. 12. Ezech. xx. 47. form also, see 1 Cor iii 16 Rev. vii. 7. Isa. xlvii. 14 A. ^r = Heb. i. 10. iv. 3. ^s = Matt. iii.

BCN(Treg) k l 36 Cyr₂. rec aft κλεπτῃς ins εν νυκτι, with CKL rel syr Thl Gc:
 om AB[P]N k 13 vulg spec syr-pk coptt [æth] arm Cyr[-p] Did-int, Aug Pelag.
 om oi KLN a d h j k l m [Cyr₂ Damasc-ms.], aft ουρανοῖς ins μεν N d j.
 ροιζήδον [AK]N. om 1st και N [Cyr₂]. λυθησεται BCN Cyr₂[-p(txt₂)]. ins η
 bef γη C[P] m. for κατακαήσεται, ευρεθησεται BK[P]N syr-mg (sah) [arm]:
 αφανισθσονται C syr-pk.

11. ins δε bef ουτως C[P]. rec (for ουτως) ουν, with AKLN rel vulg [syr-pk
 copt arm(Treg)] Thl Gc [Pelag: ουν ουτως syr-mg sah arm(? Tischdf or as CP above)]:
 txt BC[P] a syr[-txt].—ουν παντων ουτως m [Aug₁]: om ουν παντων a. [απαντων

(the art. is not needed for definiteness in the later Epistles, cf. ver. 7; Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16) of the Lord (= τοῦ θεοῦ, below, ver. 12) shall come (ἥξει has the emphasis, as opposed to all the doubts of the scoffers. It is more than merely "shall come," though no one word will give the exact force in English: "shall be here," "shall be upon you") as a thief (ref. 1 Thess.: from which place probably the expression is taken, as reference is made below to the Epistles of St. Paul); in which the heavens shall pass away (reff. Matt.; and Rev. xxi. 1) with a rushing noise (ροιζήδον, τὸ μετὰ ἥχου ἵδιος δὲ δ τοιούτος ἥχος πυρὸς ἐν τοῖς ὑπὸ πυρὸς καταβροσκομένοις, Gc. βοῆς is the rush of a bird, ref. Wisd., of an arrow, Il. π. 361, of the music or a shepherd's pipe, Od. i. 315: and, see Palm and Rost's Lex., of any thing rapidly moving. Some understand it of the actual noise of the flames which shall consume the heavens: others, as De W., of the 'ruina,' or crash with which they shall fall: "magno impetu," vulg.; "in modum procellæ," Calv.: "cum stridore," Beza: alii aliter), and the heavenly bodies (στοιχεῖα, according to Bede, the four elements, fire, air, earth, and water: but he is obliged to modify the meaning or λυθήσονται, inasmuch as fire cannot dissolve or consume fire: according to Bengel, the sun, moon, and stars, defending it by this word being often used in that sense by Theoph. of Antioch and others in Suicer sub voce. Certainly Justin Martyr so uses the word several times: cf. Apol. ii. 5, p. 92, τὰ οὐράνια στοιχεῖα εἰς ἀβύσσιν καρπῶν κ. ὥραν μεταβολὰς κομισσας; and Dial. Tryph. 23, p. 122, Epist. ad Diognet. 7 (Migne, Patr. Gr. vol. ii. p. 1177), and Otto's notes. And considering that this clause, on account of the δέ, followed presently by the και when we come to speak of the earth, necessarily belongs to the heavens,—considering also that the mention of the heavenly bodies as affected

by the great Day is constant in Scripture, cf. Matt. xxiv. 29; Isa. xiii. 9, 10, xxiv. 23, xxxiv. 4, &c., I should be inclined on the whole to accept this interpretation, feeling that the above-named reasons overbear the objection alleged by De Wette, that the word does not bear this sense in any other passage of Scripture. This objection is also weakened by remembering, 1. that it occurs in a physical sense here only: 2. that in Gal. iv. 3, where it is clearly not in a physical sense, the Greek interpreters give it this meaning: see in Suicer sub voce, and mine and Bishop Elliott's notes on Gal. i. c., and note on Matt. xxiv. 29) being scorched up (καυσόμεναι, classically, to suffer from excessive heat: to be in a burning fever. The pres. part. gives the ground and reason of the following verb) shall be dissolved (not literally, melt [that is expressed by τήκεται below]: cf. λυόμενων next verse, and reff. here), and the earth and the works in it (ἔργα may mean either the works of men, buildings and the like,—or, the works of the Creator: perhaps both of these combined, "opera naturæ et artis," Bengel. Estius's sense, "opera peccatorum," is out of the question: nor does 1 Cor. iii. 15 &c. apply here, any further than that the same purifying fire is spoken of) shall be burned up (the var. readd. are very curious. That of BK[P]N, εὐρεθησεται, has plainly arisen from the Latin urentur. That it has so arisen, is a most instructive fact, and leads to inferences which cannot be here followed out).

11—18.] EXHORTATIONS WITH REFERENCE TO THE APPROACH OF THE DAY OF GOD. 11—13.] In direct reference to what has just been said, waiting and eager expectation is enjoined. 11.] These things being thus to be dissolved (τούτων, this heaven and earth which surround us. According to the reading in the text, there is no particle of inference: but the inference is all the more vivid. οὕτως: viz. in the manner just described.

^a λυομένων, ^u ποταπούς δεῖ ^v ὑπάρχειν ὑμᾶς ἐν ἀγίαις ^t pres. part., =
^w ἀναστροφαῖς καὶ ^x εὐσεβείαις ^{12 yz} προσδοκῶντας καὶ ^{63. John}
^a σπεύδοντας τὴν ^b παρουσίαν τῆς τοῦ ^c θεοῦ ^{xxi. 23.} ἡμέρας, δι'
^u ἣν οὐρανοὶ ^d πυρούμενοι ^e λυθήσονται καὶ ^e στοιχεῖα ^e καν-
^{Gal. iii. 8.} σούμενα ^f τήκεται. ^{13 g} καινοὺς δὲ ^h οὐρανοὺς καὶ ^g γῆν ^h και-
^{Mark xiii. 27.} ^{1 bis. Luke i.} ^{20. vii. 39.} ^{1 John iii. 1} ^{only t.} ^{v James ii.}

^{13 reff.} ^{above (w).} ^{14. elsw (see above, y) Gosp. & Acts only.} ^{16 xxii 18) only.} ^{17, 8 reff.} ^{18 only.} ^{15a. lxxv. 5.} ^{16. Hom. ii v 236.} ^{18 only. Prov x 20.} ^{15a. lxxv. 17. lxxvi. 22.} ^{Rev. xxi. 1.} ^{w 1 Pet. i. 13 reff. plur. here only.} ^{y see Matt. xxiv. 50.} ^{Luke xii. 46.} ^{(Acts xxvii 33.} ^{Lam ii. 16.)} ^{a transit., heie (Luke ii. 16. xix. 5. 6. Acts xx.} ^{b = 2 Cor. vii. 6.} ^{Phil i. 26. ii. 12.} ^{James v.} ^{d 1 Cor. vii. 9.} ^{2 Cor. xi. 29.} ^{Eph. vi. 16.} ^{Rev. i. 16. ii. 1.} ^{f here only.} ^{Isa. lxxiv. 1, 2 al.} ^{Isa. xxxiv. 4.} ^{x ch. i 3 reff. plur., as} ^{2 vv. 13.} ^{Acts xx.}

P. δειν P.] for υμας, ημας N¹: om B: υμας bef υπαρχειν d.
 12. [ins τους bef προσδ. P m.] om και σπευδοντας N¹. for θεου, κυριου
 C[P] d 27-9 vulg(not fuld) spec [Pelag₁]. for τηκεται, τακτησεται C 36. 137:
 tabdescent vulg [syrr] lat-ff [τακτησονται P Thl].
 13. καιηνν bef γην AN 13 vulg æth [Tischdf] Cyr-p₆ Thl] Cosm.

λυομένων, the *present* implying destiny, as *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, He that should come: cf. Winer, § 40. 2. a. It *might* be, with *οὐν*, a present *proper*, "are in course of dissolution;" but *οὕτως* forbids this: for they are *not* in course of dissolution by fire *ροιζήδον* &c.), *what manner of men* (if we take *ποταπούς* interrogatively, we must not, as some (Pott, Meyer in his translation), put our interrogation at *ὑμᾶς*, or as others (Griesb., al.) at *εὐσεβείας*: far better carry on the question to the end of ver. 12, as more like the fervent style of our Epistle. But (reff.) *ποταπός* seems in the N. T. never directly to ask a question, but always to belong to an exclamation. Certainly reff. Luke are close approaches to the interrogatory sense, so that I would not, as Huther, altogether exclude it, but only protest against dividing the sentence. Still I prefer the non-interrogatory form, as in the other reff. On the word, see note, 1 John iii. 1) *ought ye to be* (when the event comes: *ὑπάρχειν* seems to imply some fact supervening upon the previously existing state: see Acts xvi. 20, 21, 37 and notes) in holy behaviours and pieties (the plurals mark the holy behaviour and piety in all its different forms and examples. The words *may* be referred to *ὑπάρχειν*: but thus the strong *ποταπούς* would only be weakened, and it stands far better alone. So that I would join *ἐν ἀγίαις κ.τ.λ.* with what follows) 12.] *looking for and hastening* (the older Commentators mostly supplied *eis* after *σπεύδοντας*. So E. V., "*hastening unto*;" but there seems no reason for this. Two meanings are possible, regarding the accus. as in direct government by the participle: 1. '*busied about*;' so in reff.; also Pind. Isthm. v. 22, *σπεύδειν ἀρετάν*. But in each of these, the object of *σπεύδειν* seems more properly to belong to the action than here. In Isa., and in Pind., it is an abstract substantive: in Hom., it is *ταῦτα*, matters within the power and

personal employment of the speakers. And so in the numerous other examples in Palm and Rost. Whereas the *παρουσία* κ.τ.λ., a future thing, no matter of human practice, does not appear with equal propriety to be in this sense an object of *σπεύδειν*. 2. We have the other and cognate meaning of *σπεύδειν* transitive, to "*hasten*," "*urge on*;" which I agree with De Wette in adopting, and in understanding as he does, "They hasten it by perfecting, in repentance and holiness, the work of the Gospel, and thus diminishing the need of the *μακροθυμία* ver. 9," to which the delay of that day is owing. Huther's objection to this is not difficult to answer. It is true, that the delay or hastening of that day is not man's matter, but God's: but it is not uncommon in Scripture to attribute to *us* those divine acts, or abstinences from acting, which are really and in their depth, God's own. Thus we read, that "He could not do many mighty works there because of their unbelief," Matt. xiii. 58 compared with Mark vi. 5, 6: thus repeatedly of man's striving with, hindering, quenching, God's Holy Spirit) the advent (*παρουσία* elsewhere commonly used of a person, and most usually of the presence or advent of the Lord Himself) of the day of God (= *ἡμέρας* κυρίου above. De W. compares Clem.-rom. Ep. ii. ad Cor. 12, p. 345, *ὅκ οἶδαμεν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ θεοῦ*. See also Tit. ii. 13), by reason of which (δὲ ἦν, scil. *ἡμέραν*; or, but not so well, *παρουσίαν*, on account of, for the sake of, which) the heavens being on fire (the pres. part. gives the reason of the fut. verb following) shall be dissolved, and the heavenly bodies being scorched up are to be melted (*τήκεται*, the pres. of destiny: see above on *λυομένων*, ver. 11. De Wette thinks the meaning is not to be literally pressed, as if the *στοιχεῖα* were a solid mass which would actually liquefy: but why not? The same liquefaction has actually taken

h ch. i. 4
only t.
Demosth.
397. 3.
i ver. 12.
] = Eph. iii.
17. Isa.
xxiii. 16.
k ch. i. 10 reff.
l 1 Tim. v. 14.
James i. 27.
1 Pet. i. 19
only. Job
xv. 15 Symm.
m here (Phil iii. 15 v. r.) only t.
v. 3. Phil. iii. 9.
s so Eph. vi. 21. Col. iv. 7, 9. see James i. 16 reff.

νὴν κατὰ τὸ ἡ ἐπάγγελμα αὐτοῦ ἰ προσδοκῶμεν, ἐν οἷς
δικαιοσύνη ἰ κατοικεῖ. 14 διό, ἀγαπητοί, ταῦτα ἰ προσδο-
κῶντες κ σπουδάσατε ἰ ἀσπιλοι καὶ ἰ ἀμώμητοι ἰ αὐτῷ ὁ εὐ-
ρεθῆναι ἰ ἐν εἰρήνῃ, 15 καὶ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν ἰ μακρο-
θυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἰ ἡγήσθε, καθὼς καὶ ὁ ἰ ἀγαπητὸς ἡμῶν
ἰ ἀδελφὸς Παῦλος κατὰ τὴν ἰ δοθείσαν αὐτῷ σοφίαν ἔγρα-

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

n dat., Luke xxiv. 35. 2 Cor. xii. 20. o = 2 Cor.
q 1 Pet. ii. 20 reff. r = ver. 9.
p = Acts xvi. 36. James ii. 16. q 1 Pet. ii. 20 reff.
t Rom. xii. 3, 6. xv. 15 al.

for κατὰ το ἐπάγγελμα, καὶ τα ἐπάγγελα A am (with demid fuld harl) sah [Cyr-p₂]
Jer₁ Bede; : κατὰ τα ἐπάγγελα K [vulg copt Cyr-ed, Did, Aug, Promiss.]
ενοικεῖ A a 13. 14. ἀμώμοι A d 13 Phot₁.

15. [om 1st ἡμῶν P syr-pk arm Damasc.] for ἡγήσθε, ἀγείσθαι K¹.
[2nd ἡμ. bef ἀδελφός K a o.] rec αυτα bef δοθείσαν, with L rel (C: txt ABCK
[P]K a b d m o 13. 36 vulg syrr coptt Phot Thl. In K the σ of δοθείσαν is written
over the line.

place in the crust of the earth wherever the central fires have acted on it. All our igneous rocks have been in a liquid state: why should not that day, in its purifying process, produce a similar effect on the earth again, and on her cognate planets, if they are to be included?

In this recapitulation, the Apostle mentions that part only of the destruction of that day which concerns the heavens: arguing à majori. The similarity to Isa. xxxiv. 4 can hardly escape notice, καὶ τακῆσονται πάντα αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν. See also Micah i. 4). 13.] *The positive result of that day, as regards the church.*

But (contrast to the destructive effects of the day lately dwelt on: not "*nevertheless*" as E. V., which looks as if the two effects were in antagonism, and the earth were to be *annihilated*, of which idea there is no trace. The flood did not annihilate the earth, but changed it; and as the new earth was the consequence of the flood, so the final new heavens and earth shall be of the fire) according to His (God's) promise (viz., that written in ref. Isa.) we (no stress, as is almost unavoidable in the E. V. "*Nevertheless we, according to his promise*" there is no ἡμεῖς, nor is the distinction drawn between us and any other class of persons) expect new heavens and a new earth, in which (heavens and earth, plur.) righteousness dwelleth (ref. Isa., cf. also οὐκ ἄδικήσουσιν, . . . ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ μου, λέγει κύριος, of Isa. lxxv. 25).

14.] *Exhortation founded on this expectation.* Wherefore, beloved, expecting (as ye do) these things (the pres. part. gives the reason of the verb following: and does not, as Luther and Dietlein, belong to the exhortation, προσδοκῶντες σπουδάσατε: for the Apostle has just assumed προσδοκῶμεν as a patent fact), be earnest (σπουδάσατε, aor.: not the daily habit so much, as the one great life-effort which shall accomplish the end, is in the Apostle's mind) to be found (at

His coming. This word shews plainly enough that a personal coming of the Lord, as in ver. 4, is in the view of the Apostle throughout, as connected with the proceedings of the great Day. The form of expression reminds us forcibly of Matt. xxii. 11 ff.) spotless (reff.) and blameless (cf. 2 Cor. vi. 3, viii. 20; also σπιλοι κ. μώμοι, the contrast, above, ch. ii. 13. From the connexion there with a feast, it seems very probable that in both passages the parable of the wedding garment was floating before the Apostle's mind) in His sight (so, and not, "*by Him*," or "*of Him*," as E. V., must we render: see reff.) in peace (second predicate after εὐρεθῆναι: the ἀσπιλοι κ. ἀμώμοι were with reference to God (αὐτῷ); this, in reference to your own state and lot: in peace among yourselves, in peace with yourselves, in peace for yourselves, with God. But perhaps an expression so familiar to the Eastern tongue as ἐν εἰρήνῃ, may have an onward as well as a present meaning, as in πορεύεσθαι ἐν εἰρήνῃ and εἰς εἰρήνην (reff. and Luke vii. 50, viii. 48): and be taken of that eternal peace, of which all earthly peace is but a feeble foretaste).

15.] and account the long-suffering of our Lord (τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, thus expressed, is hardly to be disavowed from Him who is expressly thus named below, ver. 18. And if so, then, throughout this weighty passage, the Lord Jesus is invested with the full attributes of Deity. It is He who waits and is long-suffering: He, in His union and co-equality with the Father, who ruleth all things after the counsel of His own will) salvation (contrast to βραδυτῆτα ἡγούνται, ver. 9): even as also (besides myself) our beloved brother (this term is probably used in a closer sense than as merely signifying fellow-Christian: our beloved fellow-Apostle) Paul according to the wisdom given to him (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 10, κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθείσάν μοι, ὡς σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων κ.τ.λ. Also Gal. ii. 9; Eph. iii. 2, 7, 8; Col. i. 25)

ψεν ὑμῖν, ¹⁶ ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις ἐπιστολαῖς, λαλῶν ἐν ^{u here only +}
 αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, ἐν αἷς ἐστιν ^{v here only +} ^{Ps. xlviii. 11} δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ^{Symm.}
^v ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ^w ἀστήρικτοι ^x στρεβλοῦσιν, ὡς καὶ τὰς ^{wh. ii. 14}
 λοιπὰς ^y γραφάς, πρὸς τὴν ^z ἰδίαν ^z αὐτῶν ^{2 Kings xxii.} ἀπώλειαν. ^{27 B only.}
^{y = ch. i. 20 al.}
^{a = ver. 7 ref.}

x so John x. 12. Acts i. 19. ii. 8. Demosth. 1244. 24.

16. rec aft *πασαις* ins *ταις*, with KL[P]N rel Phot Thl (C: om ABC 13. αυτοις
 A l 9. 21. 47. rec (for *αἷς*) *οἷς*, with CKL[P] rel Phot, (C: txt ABN a d j m 13 syrr
 Thl. for *εστ.*, *εἰσιν* A c d h l 13 sah. [στρεβλοῦσιν C l P d : στρεβλωσιν C 2.]

wrote to you (What? Where? to whom? By some the reply to the first has been found in the preceding clause, τὴν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν μακροθυμίαν σωτηρίαν ἡγείσθαι: which, in sense, is almost identical with Rom. ii. 4, ἀγνοῶν ὅτι τὸ χρηστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς μετάνοιάν σε ἄγει. So (Cec., Grot., al., and more recently Huther, Dietlein. But surely the reference is too narrow to satisfy what follows here, λαλῶν ἐν αὐταῖς περὶ τούτων, where the reference must be to ταῦτα, which we Christians προσδοκῶμεν, viz. to the coming of the day of the Lord. Thus then we should interpret the καθὼς καὶ &c. of some particular passage in which St. Paul had exhorted to readiness in expectation of that day, and the ὡς καὶ ἐν πάσαις κ.τ.λ., ver. 16, of the frequent mention of that day in his other Epistles. In searching then, 2. for some passages which may fulfil the above condition, it seems to me that we need not go beyond the earliest Epistle of St. Paul, viz. 1 Thessalonians. There, in ch. iv. 13—v. 11, we have a passage on this very point, and the more satisfactory, because St. Peter seems, in our ver. 10, to have had 1 Thess. v. 2 before his mind. And as to, 3. ὑμῖν, there seems no need to press it as identifying any particular church, seeing that this our Epistle is addressed to all Christians alike: cf. ch. i. 1. All that follows from ὑμῖν is what may also be gathered from ver. 16, that our Epistle belongs to a date when the Pauline Epistles were no longer the property only of the churches to which they were written, but were dispersed through, and considered to belong to, the whole Christian Church. What date that is, I have discussed in the Prolegomena. There have been very various opinions as to the passage and Epistle meant: Estius, Calov., Spanheim, Bengel, Gerhard, al., think it to be the Epistle to the Hebrews, on account of ch. ix. 26 ff., x. 25, 37 (see on these in the Prolegg. to the Hebrews, § i. par. 6): Jachmann, the Epistles to the Corinthians, especially 1 Cor. i. 7—9, finding an allusion to 1 Cor. ii. 1 ff. in κατὰ σοφίαν κ.τ.λ.: Benson, the Epistles to the Gal., Eph., Col., being addressed to Asia Minor churches, as he holds this to be: Augusti, referring ἐν εἰρήνῃ to the difference be-

tween Paul and Peter, the Epistle to the Gal.: Pott, and Morus, some Epistle which has not come down to us), 16.] as also in all (his, but not expressed: with the ταῖς it would mean, in all his Epistles as a finished whole: without it, in all Epistles which he writes, leaving room for the possibility that the number of those Epistles was not complete, but still being added to) Epistles, speaking in them (as he does: the pres. part. contains the justification of the assertion: not as Huther, "when he speaks") of these things (viz. the coming of our Lord, and the end of the world), in which (Epistles, if αἷς be read: if οἷς, "in which sayings of his:" not, "in which things," "in which subjects," as some (e. g. Bengel) have rendered by way of escape from the supposed difficulty: for οἷς is correlative with τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς, and must therefore designate some writings previously mentioned: or else the sentence is stultified) are some things difficult to understand (De W. especially refers to 2 Thess. ii. 1 ff.: and it is not improbable that this may have been particularly in the Apostle's mind. See note on 2 Tim. ii. 18. Grot. is clearly wrong in extending the list to difficulties about faith and works, &c.), which the ignorant (unintelligent, uninformed: hardly, as De W., with an understood meaning of rebellion and unbelief: for that would be too much here. ἀμαθία may arise from many causes: but the misunderstanding of difficult Scriptures is common to the ἀμαθεῖς in general) and unstable (ref.: those who, wanting firm foundation and anchorage, waver and drift about with every wind of doctrine. Such persons are stirred from their Christian stability by every apparent difficulty: are rendered anxious and perplexed by hard texts: and shewing more anxiety to interpret them somehow, than to wait upon God for their solution, rush upon erroneous and dangerous ways of interpretation) distort (στρεβλῶ, properly, to twist with a handscrew or windlass, στρέβλη: σκάφος στρέβλαισι ναυτικαῖς προσηγγέρον, Aesch. Suppl. 441. Hence to torment with the στρέβλη: and then met., to distort, pervert, strain, in meaning. (Cec. gives for it ἐνδιαστρόφως ἐξαγγέλ-

b vv. 1, 14. 17 ὑμεῖς οὖν ὁ ἀγαπητοί, ὁ προγινώσκοντες ὁ φυλάσσεσθε ἵνα
 c Acts xxvi. 5. Rom. viii. 29. xi. 2. 1 Pet. i. 20 only. f. Wisd. vi. 13. viii. 3 xliii. 6 only. d constr., here only. see Job xxxvii. 21. Sir. xxii. 13. elsw. w. ἀπό, as Luke xii. 16, or acc. as Acts xxi. 25 al. 13 only Exod. xiv. 6 only. e ch. ii. 7 (reff.) only. f ch. ii. 18 reff. g Rom. xii. 16. Gal. ii. 1 only t. Isa. iiii. 1 Symm. Diodor. Sic. i. 81. (-ἔξεν, ch. i. 12.) h = Gal. v. 4. (James i. 11 reff.) i intrant. Matt. vi. 26. Eph. iv. 15 al. j here only t. Isa. iiii. v. 10. Jude 4. m = Phil. iii. 8. n ch. i. 1 reff. o Rom. xv. 36. Eph. iii. 21. Rev. i. 6. p here only. see Isa. xlviii. 7. (Micah iv. 7.)

ΠΕΤΡΟΥ Β.

17. προγινώσκοντες bef ἀγαπητοί C: om ἀγαπητοί a. προγιν. A: γινώσκοντες m.
 18. αὐξανέσθε C[P] 15. 40. [om δε P a. for γινώσκει, πιστεῖ P m.]
 om αμην B o 10 harl¹ Aug Bede.

SUBSCRIPTION. om a b c d f g l m o: ἐπιστολαὶ πετροῦ α' καὶ β' 13: του αγίου
 ἀποστολου πετροῦ ἐπιστολὴ δευτέρα L: [πετροῦ . . . επ. καθολικη β' P:] ἐπιστολὴ
 πετροῦ β' n: πετροῦ καθολικη C: txt ABN.

λεῖν), as also the other Scriptures (or, passages of Scripture having reference to this great subject: as we have *ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει* John xix. 37, *πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος* (see note) 2 Tim. iii. 16. Whichever be understood, it is plain, 1. that by these words St. Paul's Epistles are reckoned among the Christian scriptures: 2. that there were at this time besides those Epistles, other writings holding a similar place, known as *γραφαί*; probably, at least, the three Gospels (and Acts?), and some of the earlier written catholic Epistles. That by *τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς* should be meant the O.T. scriptures, is not probable: these would have been more fully designated than by being placed in the same category with the inspired writings of recent or living men), to (as a contribution to—towards,—so as to help towards) their own perdition (*τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν*, more strongly reflective than with one of these merely).

17, 18.] *Concluding exhortations*: conveyed first in the form of a caution (ver. 17), then in that of a positive exhortation to increase in grace and wisdom. 17.] Ye therefore, beloved, knowing (as ye do) beforehand (viz. the whole announcement of which this chapter has been full; the certainty that such false teachers will arise, and the course which they will take), take heed (be on your guard) lest (*ἵνα μὴ* aft. *φυλάσσεσθαι*, here only. In Xen. Mem. i. 2. 37, we have, in Charicles's famous answer to Socrates, *φυλάττον ὅπως μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐλάττωσ τοὺς βούς ποιήσης*) being led away together with (it is a remarkable coincidence, that St. Peter, well acquainted as he was with St. Paul's writings, should have written this word, which is the very one used by that Apostle (ref. Gal.) of Barnabas, at Antioch, when he *συναπῆχθη* with the hypocrisy of Peter and the other Jews) the error (not, *the deceit*, act., deceiving

others: but the aberration, wandering out of the right way, so as to follow it and become partakers with it) of the lawless (reff.) ye fall from (reff.: aor., because the fall would be one and decisive) your own steadfastness (contrast to *ἀστήρικτοι* above: see note there): 18.] but (contrast to the fall just predicated as possible) grow (not only do not *ἐκπέσῃτε τοῦ στηριγμοῦ*, but be so firmly rooted as to throw out branches and yield increase. “*Hæc unica est perseverandi ratio, si assidue progredimur.*” Calv.) in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ (the gen., *τοῦ κυρ. κ.τ.λ.*, belongs to both *χάριτι* and *γνώσει*, as is sufficiently shewn by the preposition extending over both. The common rendering, “*in grace and in the knowledge of . . .*” would more naturally be *ἐν χάριτι καὶ ἐν γνώσει*. Taken as above, the genitive stands in somewhat different relation to the two datives. As regards *χάριτι*, it is a subjective gen.,—the grace of which Christ is the author and bestower; of which it is said, *ἡ χάρις διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ἐγένετο*: as regards *γνώσει*, it is an objective genitive,—the knowledge of which Christ is the object).

Concluding doxology: “hymnus Christo quasi Deo,” as Pliny's letter. To Him [be, or is] the glory (*the glory*—i. e. all glory that is rendered: the sum total of glory) both now and to the day of eternity (*ἡμέρα αἰῶνος*, the day which shall dawn at the end of time, and being eternal, itself know no end: “*tota æternitas una dies est,*” as Estius. Bengel takes it to mean “*dies sine nocte, merus et perpetuus.*” and so Calov.: but this idea does not seem so congruous here, as that of mere duration. Grot., Beza take *ἡμέρα* for *time*. But considering how frequent *ἡμέρα* has been in this chapter, we have no right to seek for an unusual meaning, when the common one suits so well). [Amen (cf. Jude 25).]

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Α.

ABCKL
P^a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

I. 1 ^οΟ ^αἦν ^βἀπ' ἀρχῆς, δ ἀκηκόαμεν, δ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ^aJohn i. 1.
^{Rev} 1, 4 reff.
^b = 2 Thess. ii.
13. ch. ii. 13, 14 (iii. 8. John viii 44). Hab. i. 12.

TITLE. Steph *ἐπιστολὴ ἰωάννου καθολικῆς πρώτης*: elz *ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐπιστολῆς καθολικῆς πρώτης*, with rel: *βροντῆς υἱὸς ἰωάννης ταδε χριστιανοῖσιν* f: *ω. του ἀποστόλου και ευαγγελιστου ἐπιστολὴ α' η*: [*ω. τ. ευαγ. κ. ἀποσ(τολου επ.) α* P:] *ἰωάννου ἐπιστολὴ α' ευαγγελικῆς θεολογίας περὶ χυ* 13; *ἐπιστολὴ καθολικῆς του αγίου ἀποστόλου ἰωάννου* L: *ἰωάννου ἐπιστολὴς πρώτης* K^h(α') j l m o: *καθ. α' επ. ω. h: επ. ω. πρ. k*: the title has perished in C: txt AB.

CHAP. I. 1. [*εωρακαμεν* B¹ (so vv 2, 3, and A ver 1).] Tischendorf [ed 7] edits *εωρακαμεν*, but, apparently, on insufficient grounds. The following is a statement of the evidence. The tense occurs six times in this epistle and once in 3 Jn, in all of these B¹ has *εωρ.*, in addition to this B¹ has *εωρ.* in Jn ix. 37; xx. 26; 1 Cor ix. 1; and Col ii. 18; A has *εωρ.* once (or perhaps twice); C, twice (Lu ix. 36; Col ii. 1); D, once (Acts vii. 44); and N thrice (1 Cor ix. 1; Col ii. 1, 18). On the other hand the word occurs in 23 other passages, in all of which B has *εωρ.* (so Vercellone, nemine contradicente [except Tischdf who (Nov. Test. Vat.) assigns *εωρ.* to B¹ in Lu i. 22; Jn i. 18; vi. 46 bis; viii. 57; xx. 25]: he seems to have paid especial attention to this point in preparing the 2nd edition [in ed 8 Tischdf has *εωρ.*].)

CHAP. I. 1—4.] INTRODUCTION: THE PERSONAL AUTHORITY OF THE WRITER, AND OBJECTS OF THE EPISTLE. This Epistle does not begin with an *address*, properly so called. But there is in this sentence the latent form of an address: the *ὑμῖν* of ver. 3, and the *ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ . . . πεπληρωμένη*, answering to the more usual *χαρεῖν*, seem to shew that what follows is an Epistle, not a treatise. The construction of these verses is difficult, and has been variously given. The simplest view, and that generally adopted (Syr., Vulg., Ec., Bullinger, Calv., Beza, Socinus, Grot., Calov., Fritzsche, Lücke, De Wette, Huther, &c.) is, that in ver. 1 a sentence is begun, which is broken off by the parenthetical ver. 2 inserted to explain ver. 1, and carried on again in ver. 3, some words being, for the sake of perspicuity, recited again from ver. 1. This construction was doubted by Winer in the earlier editions of his Grammar, but has now in the 6th edit. been adopted (§ 63, i. 1, note). The smaller clauses, δ ἦν, δ ἀκηκόαμεν, &c., are co-ordinate with each other, not to be arranged as subject and predicate, as Ca-

pellus, "quod erat ab initio, hoc ipsum est, quod audivimus, &c." or, as Paulus, who begins his predicated apodosis at *καὶ αἱ χεῖρες*, "*that which, &c., &c., our hands also have handled.*" So that there is no need to adopt Calvin's solution of "*abrupta et confusa oratio*:" the sentence and construction flow smoothly and regularly.

That which was (not '*took place*,' as Crell., Schöttg., al. ἦν is not = *ἐγένετο*, as their very marked distinction in John i. 1 ff. might have shewn. See this idea discussed and refuted in a note to the dissertation de Epist. Johannearum locis difficilioribus, in the Fritzschorum Opuscula, p. 284 ff.: and in Düsterdieck's Comm. in loc. (Ec. and Thl. say well, τὸ δὲ ἦν τοῦτο οὐ χρονικὴν παρίστησιν ὑπαρξιν, ἀλλ' ἐνυποστάτου πράγματος οὐσίαν) from the beginning (ἀπ' ἀρχῆς) is not synonymous with *ἐν ἀρχῇ*, though in the depth of its meaning it is virtually the same. It sets before us the terminus a quo, but without meaning strictly to define it as such exclusively. So μέχρι, ἄχρι, and words of this kind are not unfrequently

c Luke xiv. 39 Acts xvii. 27. Heb. xii. 18 only. Gen. xxvii. 12 d Phil. ii. 16 only. see Acts v. 20. John vi. 68. e = John i. 4. ABCKL
FN a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

used: see Fritzsche on Matt. p. 53 f. and cf. Acts xx. 6, Rom. viii. 22, 2 Cor. iii. 14. The interpretation, "*Since the beginning of the Gospel*," is connected with the misunderstanding of the whole passage by the Socinian interpreters, and cannot stand for a moment when we consider the context with ver. 2, and the use of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς by St. John when applied to Christ or to supernatural beings: see reff. Wherever he uses it of the preaching of the Gospel, it is definitely marked as bearing that meaning: cf. ch. ii. 7, 24, iii. 11. On the meaning of this clause, see below), **that which we have heard** (the perfect extends the reference of the verb from the beginning, and that which the Apostle might have heard concerning Christ, e. g. from John the Baptist, down to the time when he was writing; regards his hearing as a finished and abiding possession. This verb, ἀκηκόαμεν, rules the form of the sentence: hence *περί* below: see more there), **that which we have seen with our eyes** (the same is true again. The seeing as well as the hearing is a finished and abiding possession. The clauses rise in climax: seeing is more than hearing: τοῖς ὀφθ. ἡμῶν emphasizes the fact of eye-witness), **that which we looked upon** (now, the tense is altered: because the Evangelist comes from speaking of the closed testimony which abode with him as a whole, to that of the senses actually exercised at the time when Christ was on earth. Notice the climax again: θεᾶσθαι, 'intueri,' to look upon: ὁρᾶν, merely 'videre,' to see: so Beza here: "quod ego his oculis vidi, idque non semel nec obiter, sed quod ego vere et penitus sum contemplatus." See more below), and our hands handled ("attulerunt viri docti Joh. xx. 20, 27: Luc. xxiv. 39. Sed nihil huiusmodi opus est. An probandum, Johannem, amatissimum et ἐπιστήθιον Christi discipulum, Dominum suum manibus contrectasse?" Fritzsche, Opusc. p. 295. These words are not for a moment to be washed out with a 'veluti' or 'quasi': they are literal matter of fact, and form one of the strongest proofs that what is said, is said of no other than the personal incarnate Son of God) concerning the Word of life (the construction seems to be this: the *περί* depends strictly upon ἀκηκόαμεν, loosely upon the other clauses. The *exegesis* turns wholly upon the sense which we assign to the words τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς: and here there has

been great diversity among Commentators. This diversity may be gathered under two heads: those who make λόγου the personal hypostatic Logos, who is ζωῆ, and those who make it the account, or preaching, or doctrine, concerning ζωῆ. Of this latter number, are for the most part, Socinus and his school (see an exception below), and some few other expositors, e. g., Grotius, Semler, Rosenmüller. Of recent writers, the most distinguished is De Wette. The former, including (Ec., Thl., Aug. ("forte de verbo vitæ sic quisque accipiat quasi locutionem quandam de Christo, non ipsum corpus Christi quod manibus tractatum est. Videte quid sequatur: et ipsa vita manifestata est. Christus ergo verbum vitæ." In Ep. Joh. Tract. i. 1, vol. iii. p. 1978), Bede, Calvin (gives both), Beza, Luther, Schlichting ("id est de Jesu quem suo more Sermonem appellat"), Episcopius (who however strikes a middle course, "utrumque simul intelligi, Evangelium, quatenus partim ab ipso Christo revelatum est, partim de ipso Chr. J. agit"), Calov., Bengel, Wolf, Lücke, Fritzsche, Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Huther, al., have been most worthily represented among modern Commentators by O. F. Fritzsche, in his Commentatio I. de Epistolarum Johannearum locis difficilioribus, in the Fritzschorum Opuscula, pp. 276 ff. And with his interpretation, in the main, I agree, diverging from him in some points of more or less importance. And as this *περί τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς* is the keystone of the sentence, it will be well to set out the interpretation once for all. I regard then ὁ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς as the designation of our Lord Himself. He is the λόγος, and is the λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, this gen. being one of apposition, as He describes Himself as being the ζωῆ, John xi. 25, xiv. 6,—the ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς, vi. 35, 48: the φῶς τῆς ζωῆς, viii. 12: cf. also i. 4. This being so, the δ —, δ —, δ —, δ —, are all matters concerning, belonging to, regarding, Himself, the Lord of Life: all zeugmatically predicated of Him by the *περί*, which more properly belongs to the one verb ἀκηκόαμεν (notice that in ver. 5, where the nature of the ἀγγελία is stated, ἀκηκόαμεν alone, of all these verbs, is repeated). The δ ἡν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is His eternal præ-existence and inherent Life and Glory with the Father: this is what, in a sense slightly, though but slightly differing from the common one, may be said to have been ἀπ' ἀρχῆς *περί* τοῦ

^f ἔφανερώθη, καὶ ἑώρακαμεν, καὶ ^g μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ^h ἀπ- ^f = John i. 31
 αγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν τὴν ζῶν τὴν αἰώνιον, ⁱ ἥτις ἦν ^j πρὸς ^h ἀπ-
 al¹⁹. ch. ii. 19
 al¹⁶. Heb. ix.
 26 al¹ f. (Jer.
 xl. [xxxiii].)

6 only) g = John i. 7, 15 & passim. Acts xxiii. 11. 1 Tim. vi. 13. h John iv. 51, and
 here bis only (Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 25. 2 Thess. i. 9 only. Heb. ii. 12. Gospp. Acts and LXX passim.)
 i = Heb. viii. 6. Rev. i. 12, xi. 8, xii. 13, xix. 2. j = John, i. 1. Mark u. 8 [Mt. ix. 19] L. 2 Thess.
 u. 8. (see 1 Cor. xvi. 8, 7. Gal. i. 18. iv. 18.)

2. ins o bef *εωρακαμεν* B 40.

[om την ζων K (at end of page).]

λόγον τῆς ζωῆς: that which was inherent indeed in Him, but by being announced to you, takes the form of being περί Him; His well-known character and attribute. The δ ἀκηκόαμεν, δ ἑώρακαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς. ἡμῶν, hold a middle place between the eternal and prae-existent and the cosmical and human things περί τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς: the hearing of the ear embracing δ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, and the seeing of the eye taking in both His glory, as on the Mount of Transfiguration, and the human Body which He assumed, with all its actions and sufferings: cf. John xix. 35. Then, still lingering on the combined testimony to his prae-existent glory and His human presence in the flesh, he adds, δ ἑθεασάμεθα, which 'contemplari,' as he himself tells us, saw through the human into the divine, John i. 14 (so Bede: "perspexerunt, cujus divinam quoque virtutem spiritualibus oculis cernebant"), besides its earnest and diligent observation of His human life ('mit allem Fleiß und genau beobachtet und betrachtet,' Luther. But when Ec. and Thl. say θεᾶσθαι ἐστὶ τὸ μετὰ θαύματος κ. θαμβοὺς ὄραν, it is more than is in the word or in the context). Finally, he comes down to that which though the most direct and palpable proof for human testimony, is yet the lowest, as being only material and sensuous, the (δ) αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν. All this concerning Him, who is δ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, as recapitulated again in ver. 3 under its two great heads, δ ἑώρακαμεν κ. ἀκηκόαμεν, we ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν. I would refer the reader who wishes to see the various other interpretations discussed, to the dissertation of Fritzsche before named: to Huther's Commentary: to Brückner's ed. of De Wette's Handbuch, where the other view from that taken here is ably defended: and to the Commentary of Düsterdieck, who has gone at great length into the history of the exegesis. Lücke, in loc., has very fairly stated, and refuted, the Socinian view which makes δ to be the teaching of Jesus from the beginning of His official life onwards, and (cf. Socinus in loc.) δ λόγος τῆς ζωῆς, as in ch. ii. 7, δ λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε: rightly stating the fatal and crucial obstacle to this view to consist in αἱ χεῖρες

ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν, which none of its advocates can in any way get over: from Ec. and Thl. who interpret it μετὰ πολλὴν ψηλάφησιν (τούτέστι συζήτησιν, adds Ec.) ἐρευνῶντες τὰς περὶ αὐτοῦ μαρτυρούσας γραφάς, to Grot., who supplies "panes multiplicatos, Lazarum," &c., and De Wette, who explains it to mean "die Bestätigung des Geschehenen zur vollen Realität mit demjenigen Sinne, welcher keine Täuschung zuläßt," evading the direct application of the words to the human body of Jesus). And the life (i. e. the Lord Himself who is the Life, — ἡ αὐτοζωή, ἡ πηγέζουσα τὸ ζῆν, as Matthai's Catena: cf. John i. 4, ἐν αὐτῷ ζῶη ἦν. This verse is parenthetical, taking up the last clause, and indeed the whole sense, of ver. 1, and shewing how the testimony there predicated became possible) was manifested (from being invisible, became visible: see reff.), and we have seen (it), and bear witness (of it), and declare (the verb ἀπαγγέλλομεν does not, either here or below, refer to the declaration in this present Epistle: it is the general declaration, in word and writing, of which the γράφομεν below, ver. 4, is the special portion at present employed) to you that life which is eternal (it is better thus, with Fritzsche, to supply an object for ἑώρακαμεν and μαρτυροῦμεν from ἡ ζωὴ above, than, with Lücke, to carry on the sense from them to τὴν ζῶν τ. αἰώνιον below: for if this latter be done, 1) the sentence drags, by the verbal portion of its last clause being overdone; 2) the middle term between the manifestation and the announcement, viz. the sight and testimony of the announcer, would be wanting: 3) it is not the ζωὴ αἰώνιος, but the ζωὴ in Christ, which the Evangelist saw and of which he witnessed, and the predicative epithet ἡ αἰώνιος first comes in with the verb ἀπαγγέλλομεν), the which (ἥτις identifies not the individual only, but the species also: and thus gives a sort of causal force, 'quippe quæ.' The force of this here, as Düsterdieck remarks, is to refer the ἦν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα back to the δ ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς: q. d. "that very before-mentioned life, which was with the Father") was with the Father (see on John i. 1. The prep. implies not juxtaposition only, but relation: hardly

^k — (absol), ^k τὸν ^k πατέρα, καὶ ^f ἐφανερώθη ἡμῖν) ³ δ' ἑώρακαμεν καὶ ^{ABCKL} ^{John passim.} ^{elsw., Matt} ^{xx. 27 bss. l.} ^{xxiv. 36 'Mk.} ^{xxviii. 19.} ^{Luke ix. 26.} ^{Acts i. 4, 7.} ^{ii. 33. Rom.} ^{vi. 4. 1 Cor.} ^{vii. 6. Eph. ii. 18.} ^{Col. i. 12.} ^{1 constr., w. μετά, v. 6, 7 only. (Acts ii. 42. 1 Cor i. 9 al fr. Lev.} ^{ins ABC[P] N 13. 40 harl syr-w-ast æth arm Did Augi, so Syr sah but om kai follg; kai} ^{βεβ. 13.} ^{ἀκηκόαμεν, ^h ἀπαγγέλλομεν καὶ ὑμῖν, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ¹ κοινωνίαν ἔχητε μεθ' ἡμῶν. ^m καὶ ἡ ¹ κοινωνία ^m δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα μετὰ ^k τοῦ ^k πατρὸς καὶ μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ} ¹³ ^{Heb. 12.}

3. rec om 2nd καὶ, with KL rel [vulg-ed] (with demid tol) copt [Dion] Ec Augi, Bede: ins ABC[P] N 13. 40 harl syr-w-ast æth arm Did Augi, so Syr sah but om kai follg; kai bef απαγ. k am Thl. — N reads ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ ἑώρακαμεν καὶ ἀπαγγέλλομεν ἵ καὶ ὑμῖν (but ἵ erased by N¹). om δε C¹[P] a¹-13 syr sah arm (Orig-int). aft ἡμετέρα ins υμῶν N¹(N³ disapproving).

however, as some here, *love*: at the same time it sets forth plainly the distinction of Persons: as Basil: ἵνα τὸ ἰδιόζων τῆς ὑποστάσεως παραστήσῃ . . . ἵνα μὴ πρόσφασιν δὲ τῇ συγχύσει τῆς ὑποστάσεως), and was manifested to us (here the parenthesis ends, and the construction of ver. 1 is resumed. But on account of the distance at which that verse now stands, the leading particulars of its sense are recapitulated. Huther objects to the parenthetical view, that δ' ἑωρ. κ. ἀκηκ. is not a full resumption, δ' ἦν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς not appearing in it. But it is included in the hearing, as the other sensuous clause in the seeing): that which we have heard and seen, we declare to you also (the καὶ of the old mss. here seems to give to the Epistle the character of being addressed to some special circle of Christian readers, beyond those addressed at the conclusion of the Gospel, ch. xx. 31, or we may, with Socinus (in Huther), take the καὶ as indicating "vos, qui nimirum non audistis, nec vidistis, nec manibus vestris contrectastis verbum vitæ." But the other is more likely: a supposition which is confirmed when we look further into it: see the Prolegomena. It is quite beyond all probability that the καὶ should have been inserted to suit καὶ ὑμεῖς which follows, as De Wette imagines: far more probable that the very occurrence of those words so near made it seem superfluous, or even that it was erased to give the Epistle a more general character, as ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, ἐν Πρώπῳ, at the opening of those Epistles), in order that ye also (see above) may have communion with us (not,—as Socinus ("non nos solum, sed vos etiam nobiscum eam communionem cum patre et filio habetis"), Episcopus ("τό nobiscum nihil aliud sibi vult, quam 'sicut nos habemus'"), Bengel ("eandem, quam nos, qui vidimus"),—the same communion which we have, viz. that presently mentioned: but in the sense of κοιν. μετὰ immediately following, and in vv. 6, 7, communion with us, the Apostle and eye-witnesses (for thus I would take the ἡμεῖς throughout,

and not, as Fritzsche, al., of the Evangelist himself only: "nobiscum, i. e. mecum"): τὸ γενέσθαι ἡμῶν κοινωνοί, as Schol. in Cramer's Catena; being bound in faith and love to them, as they were to Christ. ἔχειν must not be taken, with Corn.-a-lap., for "*pergere et in ea proficere et confirmari*," nor with Fritzsche, for "*to obtain*," "*assequi*," but in its simple meaning, *to have, to possess*. It may be very true, as Fr. insists, that here the Evangelist is speaking of his general work in the world, and below, ver. 4, the special object of writing this Epistle comes in: but even thus, the end proposed is simply that they might κοινωνίαν ἔχειν in the ordinary sense, of course by acquiring it; but this is not of necessity in the word ἔχειν): and indeed (see reff. for καὶ δέ. Here its use is to bring up something connected with what went before by καὶ, but contrasted with it by the δέ: the contrast here lying in the immeasurably more solemn and glorious character of the second κοινωνία, as compared with the first, which is the inlet to it: q. d. "and this κοινωνία μεθ' ἡμῶν will not stop here: for we are but your admitters into &c." See this same coupled contrast in reff.) our communion is ("pessime vulg. Grot., al. sit." Fritz. Even Augustine, Bede, Erasmus. (paraphr., not in notes), Luth., Calv., take this: against which the δέ is decisive) with the Father and with (observe the repeated μετὰ, distinguishing the Personality, while the very fact of the κοινωνία with Both unites the Two in the Godhead. It is not, communion with God and us, but with us, whose communion is with God, the Father and the Son) His Son Jesus Christ (the personal and the Messianic Names are united, as in John i. 17, where He is first mentioned, as here. The question has been sometimes asked, why we have not here καὶ μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου? The answer to which is not, as Lücke, because the divine Personality of the Holy Ghost was not found in the apostolic mode of thought ("scheint mir nicht in der apostolischen

χριστοῦ. ⁴ καὶ ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἡ ⁿ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ⁿ John ii. 29.
^ἡ ⁿ πεπληρωμένη. ⁵ καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ ^o ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκη- ^{av. 11. xvi.}
^{24. xvi.}
^{13 2 John}
^{12. Phil ii.}

2. (Acts xiii. 52 al.)

o ch. iii. 11 only. Prov. xii. 25. xxvi. 16. (-λλειν, John xx. 18 only.)

4. rec (for ημεῖς) μιν, with CKL rel vss Ec Thl Aug Bede: txt B[P]N 13 harl¹ sah. (υμιν A. "v, i, et v rescripta sunt a prima ut videtur manu. Olim ημεῖς" Woide.) elz υμων, with A(C)K[P] rel demid syr copt æth arm Aug Bede: txt BLN b f g h k l m n o (40 ?) am fuld harl tol (Syr) sah Ec-comm Thl-comm.—aft πεπλ. ins εν ημιν C¹: εν υμιν Syr.

5. rec αὕτη bef εστιν, with A rel syr-mg: txt BCKL[P]N a c f g h k l m n 40 syr-txt Ec Thl. rec επαγγελια, with C[P] rel syr copt: txt ABKLN³ c d f g h j k l n 36 vulg Syr æth arm Did-comm Thl-comm Ec-comm.—N¹ has α(γαπη της ε)παγγελιας, the portion in brackets being a correction above the line.

Denkweise zu liegen"), but because, the blessed Spirit being God dwelling in man, though we may be said to have τὴν κοινωνίαν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, 2 Cor. xiii. 13,—we would hardly be said to have κοινωνίαν μετὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος). And these things (i. e. this whole Epistle: not, as Sander, the foregoing, nor as De Wette (altern.), and Düst., the immediately following) we write (the reading ἡμεῖς finds no favour with most of the modern critical editors, as neither does ἡμῶν below. It is objected to the former, that thus an irrelevant emphasis will be introduced into the clause. But it has not been observed, that it is in St. John's manner thus to use ἡμεῖς with a verb, perhaps without any especial emphasis being conveyed: e.g. John viii. 48, οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς . . ., where as here the pron. follows the verb: ib. vi. 42, ix. 24, 29 (1 John iii. 14), al. Besides which, the ἡμεῖς is by no means otiose here, whether we read ἡμῶν or ἡμῶν below. If the former, the contrast would be plain: if the latter, we must take this ἡμεῖς to be the apostolic first person—"I, as one of the eye and ear witnesses:" and the ἡμῶν following in a wider sense, "our joy"—"the joy of us and you:"—or, it may be, our joy in accomplishing the end and bringing you into communion with us and through us with the Father and the Son: so Thl.: ἡμῶν γὰρ ὑμῖν κοινωνούντων πλείστον ἔχομεν τὴν χαρὰν ἡμῶν, ἣν τοῖς θερισταῖς ὁ χαίρων σπορεὺς ἐν τῇ τοῦ μισθοῦ ἀντιλήψει βραβεύσει χαίρωντων καὶ τούτων ὅτι τῶν πόνων αὐτῶν ἀπολαύουσι. Similarly Ec.: Schol. in catena, ἐπειδὴν δὲ ταύτην ἔχρητε κοινωνίαν, χαρὰς ἐσόμεθα μεσοί, ὅτι τῷ θεῷ ἐκολληθήμεν: Bede, "gaudium Doctorum sit plenum, cum multis prædicando ad sanctæ Ecclesiæ societatem, atque ad ejus per quem Ecclesia roboratur et crescit, Dei Patris et Filii ejus Jesu Christi, societatem perducunt:" referring to Phil. ii. 2, πληρώσατέ μου τὴν χαρὰν, κ.τ.λ. As regards possibility of change of reading, it is far more probable that the not very obvious ἡμεῖς

and ἡμῶν should have been altered to the very obvious ὑμῖν and ὁμῶν, so exactly correspondent to John xv. 11, xvi. 24), that our (see above) joy may be full (this rendering better represents the perfect than "may be filled up," which would indicate the process rather than the completion. The joy spoken of is the whole complex of the Christian life here and hereafter; its whole sum is, JOY. As Düsterdieck beautifully says, "The peace of reconciliation, the blessed consciousness of sonship, the happy growth in holiness, the bright prospect of future completion and glory,—all these are but simple details of that which in all its length and breadth is embraced by one word, Eternal Life, the real possession of which is the immediate source of our joy. We have joy, Christ's joy, because we are blessed, because we have Life itself in Christ." He quotes Augustine, Confess. x. 22 (32), vol. i. p. 793: "Est enim gaudium quod non datur impiis, sed eis tantum qui te gratis colunt, quorum gaudium tu ipse es. Et ipsa est beata vita gaudere ad te, de te, propter te, ipsa est et non altera." It has been noticed before, sub initio, that this verse fills the place of the χαίρειν so common in the opening of Epistles, and gives an epistolary character to what follows).

5—II. 28.] FIRST PART OF THE EPISTLE: the message, that, if we would have communion with Him who is Light, we must walk in light, keeping His commandments. See the discussion on the division of the Epistle, in the Prolegomena.

5.] In each of these divisions, the first verse contains the ground-tone of the whole. And so here—GOD IS LIGHT. And (καί is not a sequence on what goes before (igitur, Beza) any further than it refers back by the words ἀγγελία ἣν ἀκηκόαμεν to ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν ἀπαγγέλλομεν above. It serves to introduce the new subject) the message (De Wette supposes ἀγγελία to be a correction from the more difficult ἐπαγγελία. But as Düsterdieck has well argued, the great manuscript authority for ἀγγ., com-

p John i. 25 al. 2 Cor. i. 7 al. Josph. iv. 10. q = John i. 7. u. 19. ch. ii. 8-10 (John only.) see James i. 17. f John i. 5 al. John only, exc. Matt. iv. 16. x. 27 f L Job xxii. 3 only. see Rom. xii. 12 Eph v. 8, 11. 1 Thess. v. 4. s ver. 8. see Acts xii. 15. t ver. 3. u John, here and John ii. 19 only. see (r) above v John i. 9, 10. xii. 35. Eph. v. 2. ch. ii. 11 al. 4 Kings xx 3. (see Isa. ii. 5. ix. 2.; w = Rom ix. 1. Rev. ii. 9 al. Prov. xiv. 5. x John iii. 21. ABCKL PNa b c d f g h j k l m n o 13

οὐκ ἐστὶν bef εν αυτω B m 13. 180 Syr coptt æth Clem Orig₄[and int₁ Cæs]: txt ACKL[P]N rel vulg syr arm Orig₅.

6. ins γαρ bef ειπωμεν A. ποιωμεν A.

bined with the fact that in ch. iii. 11 ἐπαγγ. is also read, and with this also, that ἐπαγγ. is a very common word in the N. T., whereas ἀγγ. occurs only in these two places, precludes De W.'s supposition. The correction from ἀγγ. to ἐπαγγ. was very obvious from ch. ii. 25, which also suggested transposing ἐστὶν αὐτῇ to αὐτ. ἐστ.) which we have heard from Him (viz. from Christ), and announce to you ("quod filius annuntiavit a patre, hoc apostolus acceptum a filio renunciat nobis." Erasmus. Dusterd. remarks that St. John seems every where to observe the distinction between ἀν- and ἀπ-αγγέλλειν, to announce and to declare. And to this distinction ἀγγελία here exactly corresponds (as Bengel, "quæ in ore Christi fuit ἀγγελία, eam Apostoli ἀναγγέλλουσι: nam ἀγγελίαν ab ipso acceptam reddunt et propagant"); whereas ἐπαγγελία, which means in the N. T. nothing but "promise" (neither in 2 Tim. i. 1, nor in Acts xxiii. 21 has it any other sense; see note on the latter place), seems to carry no meaning here, and has, as above, evidently crept in from ch. ii. 25), is this (αὐτῇ predicate, as always in such sentences): that God is light (not, as Luther, "a light:" φῶς is purely predicative, indicating the essence of God: just as when it is said in ch. iv. 8, ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν. There it is true the predicative is purely ethical, and thus literal, when used of God who is a Spirit, whereas here, φῶς being a material, not an ethical object, some amount of figurative meaning must be conceded. But of all material objects, light is that which most easily passes into an ethical predicative without even the process, in our thought, of interpretation. It unites in itself purity and clearness and beauty and glory, as no other material object does: it is the condition of all material life and growth and joy. And the application to God of such a predicative requires no transference. He is Light, and the Fountain of light material and light ethical. In the one world, darkness is the absence of light: in the other, darkness, untruthfulness, deceit, falsehood, is the absence of God. They

who are in communion with God, and walk with God, are of the light, and walk in the light), and there is not in Him any darkness at all (it is according to the manner of St. John, to strengthen an affirmation by the emphatic negation of its opposite; cf. ver. 8: ch. ii. 4, 10, 27, &c. Of the ethical darkness here denied, the Schol. says, οὐτε γὰρ ἄγνοια, οὐτε πλάνη, οὐτε ἁμαρτία, οὐτε θάνατος. The οὐδεμία strengthens the negative—"no, not even one speck." The Greek expositors ask the question respecting this message, καὶ πού τοῦτο ἤκουσε;—and answer it, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ, ἐγὼ εἶμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου λέγοντος. Their reply is right, but their reference to those words of our Lord is wrong. It was ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ χριστοῦ: viz. from the whole revelation, in doings and sufferings and sayings, of Him who was the ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης of the Father. With that revelation those His words admirably and exactly coincided: but they were not the source of the message, referring as they did specially to Himself, and not directly to the Father. In His whole life on earth, and in the testimony of His Spirit, ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο αὐτόν. So that this message is the result of the whole complex of ver. 1).

6.] None can have communion with Him who walk in darkness. If we say (the hypothesis is not assumed,—"If we say, as we do:"—but is purely hypothetical, "say who will and when he will." This εἰάν with the subj. is repeated in every verse as far as ch. ii. 1. The 1st pers. plur. gives to the sayings a more general form, precluding any from escaping from the inference: at the same time that by including himself in the hypothesis, the Apostle descends to the level of his readers, thus giving to his exhortations the "come," and not "go," which ever wins men's hearts the most) that we have communion with Him (see on ver. 3. "Communion with God is the very innermost essence of all true Christian life." Huther), and walk in the darkness (περιπατῶμεν, as so often in N. T., of the whole being and moving

τὴν ^{xy} ἀλήθειαν ἡ ἐὰν δὲ ἐν τῷ ^a φωτὶ ^v περιπατῶμεν ὡς ^γ = John
 αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, ^t κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν ^t μετ' ἀλλήλων,
 καὶ τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ ^z καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ
 z John, here bis only. = Acts xv. 9. Eph v. 26. Tit. ii. 14. Heb ix. 14, 22, 23. Ps. xviii. 13.

7. om εστιν L Clem. for ἀλλήλων, αὐτου tol aeth-pl Clem Tert Did-int: *inter*
nos cum eo aeth-rom: cum deo harl. (A deficient.) rec aft ιησ. ins *χριστου*, with
 AKL rel vulg syr-w-ast copt Ec Thl Tert Aug Bede: om BC[P]N a fuld Syr sah aeth-
 rom arm Clem Jer Fulg Leo. (om ιησ. Aug₁: om τ. vi. au. aeth.)

and turning in the world: as Bengel, "actione interna et externa, quoquo nos vertimus:" see reff. τῷ σκότει, τῷ φωτὶ, mark off the two more distinctly than could be done without the art., as two existing separate ethical regions, the God and no-God regions of spiritual being), we lie (ψευδόμεθα is used with reference to εἰπωμεν: our assertion is a false one), and do not the truth (this clause is not a mere repetition, in a negative form, of the preceding ψευδόμεθα, as e. g. Episcopus, "hoc dicentes non facimus quod rectum est:" but is an independent proposition, answering to ἐν τῷ σκότει περιπατῶμεν, and asserting that all such walking in darkness is a not-doing of the truth. Christ is "the Truth:" and all doing the Truth is of Him, and of those who are in union with Him. So that ἡ ἀλήθεια is objective, not as ἀλήθεια alone might be, subjective, and imports "God's truth," καθώς ἐστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ, Eph. iv. 21. We may observe how closely the teaching here as to φῶς and ἀλήθεια resembles that in Eph. iv. v. See also John iii. 21.) 7.] (is not merely the contrasted hypothesis to ver. 6, but together with that contains a further unfolding of the subject): but if (see on ἐάν with the subj. above) we walk in the light (this walking in the light is explained by what follows, ὡς αὐτός ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, and by the apodosis, which gives the result of so walking,—viz. communion, &c. See Eph. v. 8 ff. for the ethical details), as He (God) is in the light (because the Christian is made θέας κοινωνὸς φύσεως, 2 Pet. i. 4. ἐστιν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ is parallel with φῶς ἐστίν above, ver. 5. ἐστιν, as of Him who is eternal and fixed; περιπατῶμεν, as of us who are of time, moving onward: so Bede, "notanda distinctio verborum, quia Deum esse in luce dicit, nos autem in luce ambulare debere. Ambulant enim iusti in luce, cum virtutum operibus servientes ad meliora proficiunt:" see note on ch. ii. 6: τὸ φῶς is the element in which God dwelleth: cf. 1 Tim. vi. 16. Notice that this walking in the light, as He is in the light, is no mere imitation of God, as Episcopus, al., but is an identity in the essential element

of our daily walk with the essential element of God's eternal being: not imitation, but coincidence and identity of the very atmosphere of life), we have communion with one another (these words, κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων, are to be taken in their plain literal sense, and refer, not to our communion with God, which is assumed in our walking in the light as He is in the light, but to our mutual communion with one another by all having the same ground-element of life, viz. the light of the Lord, Isa. ii. 5. This has been very commonly misunderstood: e. g. by Ec. (ὥστε τῆς κοινωνίας ἐχόμενοι τῆς ἀλλήλων, δῆλον δὲ ὅτι τῆς ἡμῶν τε καὶ τοῦ φωτός, so Thl. also), Schol. in Oxf. Cat., Aug. ("ut possimus societatem habere cum illo"), Beza ("interpretor cum illo mutuam: agitur enim nunc de communione non sanctorum inter se, sed Dei et sanctorum"), Calv., Socinus, al.: even De Wette interprets "Gemeinschaft unter einander, nämlich mit Gott:" and Bengel wavers between the two. The words are taken rightly by Bede (who however regards them as putting forward mutual love as the necessary result of walking in the light), Erasmus, Lyra, Luther, Grot., Estius, (Bengel,) Lücke, Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Sander, Düsterd., al. The words are evidently an allusion to ver. 3, and as there communion with God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ is expressed, so here it lies in the background, but need not be supplied. De Wette's remark is most true; Christian communion is then only real, when it is communion with God), and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin (in order to understand rightly this important sentence, we must fix definitely two or three points regarding its connexion and construction. First then, καὶ connects it, as an additional result of our walking in the light, as He is in the light, with κοινωνίαν ἔχομεν μετ' ἀλλήλων: just as in ch. iii. 10, end, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. Consequently, the proposition contained in it cannot be as Ec., Thl., Beza, Wolf, Sander, al., imagine, the ground (καὶ γάρ) of the former one, that "if we walk, &c., we have communion,

a John ix. 41.
xv. 22, 24.
xix. 11.
(Acts xxiii. 29. 1 Tim. v. 12.)

πάσης ἁμαρτίας. 8 ἐὰν εἴπωμεν ὅτι ^a ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

&c.” but follows as a co-ordinate result with *κοιν.* ἔχ. κ.τ.λ. Secondly, *καθαρίζει* is the present tense, and must be kept to its *present* meaning. This consideration precludes all such meanings as the former of the two given by Jerome (“quod scriptum est ‘et sanguis Jesu filii ejus mundat nos ab omni peccato’ tam in confessione baptismatis, quam in clementia poenitentis accipiendum est,” adv. Pelag. ii. 8, vol. ii. p. 750), and Bede (“sacramentum namque (*κατ*) dominicæ passionis et præterita nobis omnia in baptismo pariter peccata laxavit (notice the past tense), et quidquid quotidiana fragilitate post baptismum commissimus ejusdem Redemptoris nostri gratia dimittit”): and as that of Calvin (“hæc igitur summa est, ut certo statuunt fideles se acceptos esse Deo, quia sacrificio mortis Christi illis placatus est”), Calvinus, Episcopus, al. *Thirdly*, the sense of *καθαρίζει* must be accurately ascertained and strictly kept to. In ver. 9, *ἡ καθαρίσις ἡμῶν ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας* is plainly distinguished from *ἡ ἀφῆ ἡμῶν τὰς ἁμαρτίας*: distinguished, as a further process; as, in a word, sanctification, distinct from justification. This meaning then, however much it may be supposed that justification is implied or presupposed, must be held fast here. *Fourthly*, the sense of *τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ* must be also clearly defined. The expression is an objective one, not a subjective: is spoken of that which is the objective cause ab extra, of our being cleansed from all sin. And this is the material Blood of Jesus the personal Redeemer, shed on the cross as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sin of the world. So we have the same Blood said in Col. i. 20 to be the great medium of pacification between God and the world: so in Eph. i. 7, to be the means of our *ἀπολύτρωσις*: so in Heb. ix. 14, which approaches very nearly to our passage, to cleanse (*καθαρίειν* as here) our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. In all these places, and similar ones, whatever application to ourselves by faith or otherwise may lie in the background, it is not that which is *spoken of*, but the Blood of Christ itself, as the actual objective cause, once for all, of our reconciliation and sanctification. These considerations remove much of the difficulty and possible misunderstanding of the sentence. Thus understood, it will mean, much as in the second clause of Bede’s interpretation, that this our walking in light, itself necessarily grounded in communion with the Father

and the Son, will bring about, that whatever sins we may still be betrayed into by the infirmity of our nature and the malice of the devil, from them the Blood of Jesus purifies us day by day. Observe, not, the *application* of that Blood: for we are speaking of a state of faith and holiness, in which that blood is continually applied: the *περιπατεῖν ἐν τῷ φωτί* is, in fact, the *application*: is that, which, as a subjective conditional element, makes that Blood of Christ’s cross to be to us a means of purifying from all sin. The whole doctrine of this verse is fully and admirably set forth in Dürstiedick. The sum of what he says may be thus stated. St. John, in accord with the other Apostles, sets forth the Death and Blood of Christ in two different aspects: 1) as the one sin-offering for the world, in which sense we are justified by the application of the Blood of Christ by faith, His satisfaction being imputed to us. 2) as a victory over Sin itself, His blood being the purifying medium, whereby we gradually, being already justified, become pure and clean from all sin. And this application of Christ’s blood is made by the Spirit which dwelleth in us. The former of these asserts the imputed righteousness of Christ put on us in justification: the latter, the inherent righteousness of Christ, wrought in us gradually in sanctification. And it is of this latter that he here is treating. Cf. next verse). 8—II. 2.]

Unfolding of the idea of purification from sin by the blood of Christ, in connexion with our walking in light. This last is adduced in one of its plainest and simplest consequences, viz. the recognition of all that is yet darkness in us, in the confession of our sins. “Si te confessus fueris peccatorem, est in te veritas: nam ipsa veritas lux est. Nondum perfecte splenduit vita tua, quia insunt peccata: sed tamen jam illuminari cœpisti, quia inest confessio peccatorum.” Aug. The light that is in us convicts the darkness, and we, no longer loving nor desiring to sin, have, by means of the propitiatory and sanctifying blood of Christ, both full forgiveness of and sure purification from all our sins. But the true test of this state of communion with and knowledge of God is, the keeping of His commandments (ii. 3—6), the walking as Christ walked: and this test is concentrated and summed up in its one crucial application, viz. to the law of love (ii. 7—11). 8.] If we say (see on ἐάν with subj. above, ver 6) that we have not sin (i. e. in the course and abiding of our

^a ἔχομεν, ^b ἐαυτοὺς ^c πλανῶμεν καὶ ἡ ^d ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν ^e ἐν ἡμῖν. ^f ἐὰν ^g ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ^h ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, ⁱ πιστός ^j ὁ Θεός.

c = ch. ii. 26, iii. 7. John vii. 12. Matt. xxiv. 4. 1 Cor. vi. 9. Isa. xlvii. 8. d John v. 38. Acts xiii. 15. 2 Cor. xi. 10. e here only. (Susan 14 Theod j elsw., ἔξομολ., as Matt. iii 6 Mk. James i 1 al. fr Gen. xliii. 22. f = 1 Cor. i. 9 x. 13. 2 Cor. i. 15. 1 Thess. v. 24. 2 Thess. iii. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 13 v 16. al. Deut. xxxii 4.

8. *εν ημιν* bef *ουκ εστιν* ACK[P] a d j m¹ 13. 36(υμιν) vulg spec syr arm Thl Opt er Aug ^{sape} Oros (so also al am syrr Thl in ver 10) : txt BLN rel Syr coptt Ec Tert.

walking in light : if we maintain that we are pure and free from all stain of sin. St. John is writing to persons whose sins have been forgiven them (ch. ii. 12), and therefore necessarily the present tense ἔχομεν refers not to any previous state of sinful life before conversion, but to their now existing state and the sins to which they are liable in that state. And in thus referring, it takes up the conclusion of the last verse, in which the onward cleansing power of the sanctifying blood of Christ was asserted : q. d. this state of needing cleansing from all present sin is veritably that of all of us : and our recognition and confession of it is the very first essential of walking in light. The Socinian interpreters, Socinus, Schlichting, and following them Grotius, go in omnia alia, and understand the passage of sins before conversion, or of the general imputation of sin. And our own Hammond has been entirely led away from the sense of the passage by the unfortunate notion of Gnostics being every where aimed at in this Epistle : imagining that their profession of perfection while living impure lives was here intended. See these erroneous interpretations refuted at length in Lücke and Düsterdieck, **we are deceiving ourselves** (causing ourselves to err from the straight and true way), **and the truth** (God's truth, objective) **is not in us** (has no subjective place in us. That truth respecting God's holiness and our own sinfulness, which is the very first spark of light within, has no place in us at all. It would be mere wasting of room and of patience, at every turn to be stating and impugning the inadequate interpretations of the Socinian Commentators and of their followers, Grotius, Semler, &c. It may be sufficient here just to notice Grotius's "non est in nobis studium veri," and Semler's "castior cognitio." Even Lücke has gone wrong here; "die Selbsttäuschung verfährt auf Mangel an innerem Wahrheitsfinn und ist dieser Mangel selbst." **ἐαυτοὺς** = ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς, (see Winer) : **if we confess our sins** (it is evident, from the whole sense of the passage, which has regard to our walking in light and in the truth, that no mere outward lip-confession

is here meant, nor on the other hand any mere being aware within ourselves of sin (as Socinus : "confiteri significat interiorem ac profundam suorum peccatorum cognitionem"), but the union of the two, an external spoken confession springing from genuine inward contrition. As evident is it, that the confession here spoken of is not confined to confession to God, but embraces all our utterances on the subject, to one another as well as to Him; cf. James v. 16 : and see more below), **He** (God, the Father; not, Christ, though this may at first sight seem probable from ver. 7 and ch. ii. 1; nor, the Father and Christ combined, as Lange and Sander hold. God is the chief subject through the whole passage: cf. δ θεός, ver. 5 : μετ' αὐτοῦ, ver. 6 : αὐτός, and τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ, in ver. 7. It is ever God's truth (1 Cor. i. 9, 10, 13; 2 Cor. i. 13; 1 Thess. v. 24) and righteousness (John xvii. 25; Rom. iii. 25; Rev. xvi. 5) that are concerned in, and vindicated by, our redemption) **is faithful and just** (His being faithful and just does not depend on our confessing our sins : He had both these attributes before, and will ever continue to have them : but by confessing our sins, we cast ourselves on, we approach and put to the proof for ourselves, and shall find operative in our case, in the ἀφῆ and καθάρσις, &c., those His attributes of faithfulness and justice.

On the former of these adjectives, **πιστός**, almost all Commentators agree. It is, faithful to His plighted word and promise : see ref. and citations above. Ec. and Thl. alone have given a singular and not very clear interpretation : πιστὸν δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀληθῆ εἶρηκε. πιστὸς γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τοῦ πεπιστευμένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πιστωτικοῦ εἶρηται, ὅς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ ἀληθοῦς πρόπου ἔχει καὶ τὸ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦ-του μεταδιδόναι. The latter, **δίκαιος**, has not been so unanimously interpreted. The idea of God's *justice* seeming strange here, where the remission of and purification from sin is in question, some Commentators have endeavoured to give δίκαιος the sense of *good, merciful*: so Grot., Rosenm.; or, which amounts to the same, *fair, favourably disposed*: so Semler, Lange, Carpzov Bretschn. Lex. But Lücke has

g = John viii. 56. xi. 15. xii. 23. h John ix. 23. ch. ii. 12. Matt. ix. 2 || al. fr. Ps. xxiv. 18. i ch. v. 17. k John viii. 44. 55. ch. ii. 4, 22. iv. 20. v. 10. Rom. iii. 4 al. Ps. cxv. 2. 1 ch. v 10 only.

ἔστιν καὶ δίκαιος, ἵνα ἁ ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ ἁ καθάρισή ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁ ἀδικίας. 10 ἔαν εἴπωμεν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμαρτήκαμεν, κ ψεύσθην 1 ποιοῦμεν αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἁ ἐν ἡμῖν.

ABCKL
PN a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

9. om ἔστιν N¹.
[Damasc Jer Aug].

aft 2nd αμαρτίας ins ημων CN a j vulg syrr coptt æth arm
[καθαρισει AC² 13.] om ημας C.

shewn, that in none of the O. T. passages which are cited to substantiate these meanings, have they really place; but in all, righteousness, justice, is the fundamental idea, and the context only makes it mean, justice in this or in that direction. See note on Matt. i. 19. The meaning then being just, we have still to decide between several different views as to what particular phase of the divine justice is meant. Some, as Calov., Wolf, al., understand that God's justice has been satisfied in Christ, and thus the application of that satisfaction to us if we confess our sins, is an act of divine justice: is due to us in Christ. But this is plainly too much to be extracted from our verse. In Rom. iii. 26, where this is asserted, the reason is given, and all is fully explained: whereas here the ellipsis would be most harsh and unprecedented, and thus to fill it up would amount to an introduction into the context of an idea which is altogether foreign to it. (The notion that δίκαιος = δικαίων need only be mentioned to refute itself: Rom. iii. 26 is decisive against it.) The correct view seems to be, that δίκαιος as well as πιστός here is an attribute strictly to be kept to that which is predicated of it under the circumstances, without entering upon reasons external to the context. God is faithful, to His promise: is just, in His dealing: and both attributes operate in the forgiveness of sins to the penitent, now and hereafter; and in cleansing them from all unrighteousness. The laws of His spiritual kingdom require this: by those laws He acts in holy and infinite justice. His promises announced it, and to those promises he is faithful: but then those promises were themselves made only in accordance with his nature, who is holy, just, and true. In the background lie all the details of redemption, but they are not here in this verse: only the simple fact of God's justice is adduced) to forgive us our sins (ἵνα here is not = ὥστε: it is not "so as to forgive, &c.," but "that He may forgive, &c.," His doing so is in accordance with, and therefore as with Him all facts are purposed, is in pursuance of, furthers the object of, His faithfulness and justice. "So that He is faithful and just,

in order that He may, &c.," See John iv. 34 note: reff. here: and Winer, § 44. 8 c. With regard to the particular here mentioned, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας is the continued remission of the guilt of each committed sin, which is the special promise and just act of God under the Gospel covenant: see Heb. x. 14, 18), and cleanse us from all unrighteousness (the explanation of the sense, see above. Here ἀδικίας is used, in reference to δίκαιος above, as corresponding to ἁμαρτίας in ver. 7. The divine δικαιοσύνη is revealed in God's law: every transgression then of that law (ἁμαρτία, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν τοῦ σκόπου: cf. Theodorus Abukara in Suicer, s. v. ἁμαρτία) is of its nature and essence an ἀδικία, an unrighteousness, as contrary to that δικαιοσύνη. Observe, the two verbs are aorists, because the purpose of the faithfulness and justice of God is to do each as one great complex act—to justify and to sanctify wholly and entirely.

10.] Not a mere repetition, but a confirmation and intensification of ver. 8. Huther well remarks, that this verse is related to ver. 9 as ver. 8 to ver. 7. If we say that we have not sinned (if we deny, that is, the fact of our commission of sins in our Christian state. The perf., so far from removing the time to that before conversion, brings it down to the present: had it been ἡμαρτήσαμεν, it might have had that signification. ἡμαρτήκαμεν answers in time to ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔχομεν: the one representing the state as existing, the other the sum of sinful acts which have gone to make it up), we make Him (God, see above) a liar (this is the climax, gradually reached through ψευδομεθα ver. 6, and ἔαντοὺς πλανῶμεν ver. 8. And it is justified, by the uniform assertion of God both in the O. T. and N. T. that all men are sinners, which we thus falsify as far as in us lies), and His word is not in us (cf. John v. 38. ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ may be interpreted generally,—"that which He saith." "Deus dixit 'peccasti': id negare nefandum est. Verbum nos vere accusat, et contradicendo arcetur a corde." Bengel. οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν, as in John i. c., has no abiding place in, within, us: is something heard by the ear, and external to us, but

II. ¹ ^m Τεκνία μου, ταῦτα γράφω ὑμῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἀμάρ- ^m John (xiii.
33. vv. 12,
28. ch. iii 7,
19 iv. 4. v.
21) only,
Job xvi. 2 Aq.
τητε. καὶ ἐάν τις ἀμάρτη, ⁿ παράκλητον ἔχομεν ὁ πρὸς
exc. Gal. iv. 19†. n (see note.) John xiv. 16, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7 only †.

not finding place among the thoughts and maxims of our heart and life. God declares that to be true which we assume to be untrue. It is evident that with Ec., Grot., De Wette, to understand the O. T. by δ λόγος αὐτοῦ is to miss the connexion, seeing that it is of the sins of *Christians* that St. John is treating, to whom δ λόγος αὐτοῦ has become a far higher revelation of His will, viz. that given by Christ, and brought home to the heart by His indwelling Spirit. This final revelation of God includes the O. and N. T., and all other manifestations of His will to us: and it is this as a whole, which we reject and thrust from us, if we say at any time that we have not sinned, for its united testimony proclaims the contrary). CHAP. II. 1.] The connexion is thus given by Augustine: "Et ne forte impunitatem videretur dedisse peccatis (but see below) quia dixit: fidelis est et justus qui mundet nos ab omni iniquitate, et dicent jam sibi homines: peccemus, securi faciamus quod volumus, purgat nos Christus:—tollit tibi malam securitatem et inserit utilem timorem. Male vis esse securus, sollicitus esto: fidelis enim est et justus ut dimittat nobis delicta nostra, et semper tibi displiceas, et miteris donec perficiaris. Ideo quid sequitur? Filioli, &c. Sed forte surrepit de vita humana peccatum. Quid ergo fiet? Jam desperatio erit? Audi. Si quis, inquit, peccaverit, &c." See more below. So also Bede, Calvin, Luther, Calov. But there is more in the connexion than this. It is not corrective only of a possible mistake, but it is progressive—a further step taken in the direction of unfolding the great theme of this part of the Epistle, enounced in ch. i. 5. The first step for those walking in the light of God was, that they should confess their sins: the next and consequent one, that they should forsake them, and, agreeably to their new nature, keep His commandments. This verse introduces that further unfolding of our subject, which is continued, and especially pressed as regards the one great commandment of love, in our vv. 3—11.

1.] **My little children** (see reff.: the diminutive expresses tender affection: perhaps also is used in reference to his age and long standing as a father in Christ. Compare the beautiful legend in Eus. H. E. iii. 23, where St. John calls back the young man to him with the words τί με φεύγεις, τέκνον, τὸν σαυτοῦ πατέρα;) **these things I**

write unto you, that ye may sin not (at all) (this exclusive meaning is given by the aor. implying the absence not only of the habit, but of any single acts, of sin. ταῦτα γράφω, not as Bengel, *that which follows*; nor, as Grot., both the preceding and the following: but as most Commentators, the preceding only, viz. the concluding verses 8—10 of the former chapter, not in their details merely, but as Düsterd., "in seiner lebendigen Harmonie." The object of writing that passage was, to bring about in them the forsaking of sin. The very announcement there made, that if we confess our sins He in His faithfulness and righteousness will *cleanse us from all sin*, sufficiently substantiates what the Apostle here says, without, with Aug., al. (see above), bringing out too strongly the contemplation of a supposed misunderstanding on the part of the readers. To do this is to miss the deeper connexion in which these words stand to the great whole in its harmony, and to give instead only an apparent and superficial one. The reference of this exhortation to the unconvinced among them, and rendering of ἵνα μὴ ἀμάρτητε, "ne maneatis in peccato," maintained by Socinus and his followers, need only be mentioned to be refuted. The aor. alone, ἀμάρτητε, may serve to shew its utter untenableness). **And if any man have** * sinned (aor., have committed an act of sin: still speaking of those spots of sin which owing to the infirmity of the flesh remain even in those who are walking in the light. By this ἐάν τις ἔμ, there is not, as Benson objects to this interpretation, any doubt expressed that all do occasionally sin, but the hypothesis is made, as ever by this formula, purely and generally. The resumption of the first person immediately, makes it evident that the hypothesis is in fact realized in us all), **we have an Advocate with** (here the sense of πρὸς, as a prep. of reference, is more brought out than when it is joined with a merely essential verb, as in John i. 1, and our ch. i. 2) **the Father, Jesus Christ** (the principal word requiring elucidation here is παράκλητον. There are two classes of interpretations of it, which, as already remarked (on John xiv. 16), by no means exclude one another. Of these, that one which may be summed up under the meaning "COMFORTER," has already been treated, on John, l. c. With the other we have now to deal. ADVOCATE, advocatus, παράκλητος, 'causæ patronus,' is the

p = Mntt. 22. u 19. Luke xxiii. 47. Acts vii. 52. xxi. 14. 1 Pet. ii. 18. Zech. ix. 9. q ch. iv. 10 only. Num. v. 8 B (ἐξῆλ. A) Ps cxxix. 4. Ezek. xlv. 27. r so w. ἰδῶσκεσθαι, Exod. xxxii. 14 A. ABCKL
P^a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

CHAP. II. 2. *εστιν* bef *ιλασμος* A 180 vulg Syr Cyr Hil Aug^{alic}: txt B(sic: see table)

commoner sense of the word, answering as it does more closely to its etymology. It is found in Demosth. (p. 343. 10) and the orators: and occurs frequently in Philo in the same peculiar reference as here: e. g. in Flacc. 3, vol. ii. p. 519, where Macro is called the *παράκλητος* of Caius with Tiberius: de Jos. 40, p. 75: and most notably for our present place, de vita Mos. iii. 14, p. 155, *ἀναγκαῖον γὰρ ᾗ τὸν ἱερόμενον τῷ τοῦ κόσμου πατρί, παρακλήτῳ χρῆσθαι τελειοτάτῳ τὴν ἀρετὴν υἱῷ πρὸς τὴν ἀμνηστίαν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ χορηγίαν ἀφθονωτάτων ἀγαθῶν*. In patristic literature, Düsterd. cites the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne (Eus. H. E. v. 1), where a young Christian, named Vettius Epagathus, *ἤξιον καὶ αὐτὸς ἀκουσθῆναι ἀπολογοῦμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, . . . ἀνελήφθη καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον τῶν μαρτύρων, παράκλητος χριστιανῶν χρηματίας, ἔχων δὲ τὸν παράκλητον ἐν ἑαυτῷ*: where Ruffinus's version, "habens in se advocatum pro nobis Jesum," is certainly not right; *τὸν παράκλητον* meaning the Holy Spirit. Cyril Alex. in the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, p. 164 (Suicer), says, *παράκλητος καὶ ἰλαστήριον ὁ υἱὸς ὀνόμασται καθίστησι γὰρ τοῖς ἐπὶ γῆς εὐμενῇ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ παντὸς ἡμῶν ἐνρίσκειται πρόξενος ἀγαθοῦ*. Augustine gives the sense thus, in words following those above cited: "Ille est ergo advocatus: da operam tu ne pecces: si de infirmitate vitæ subreperit peccatum, continuo vide, continuo displiceat, continuo damna; et cum damnaveris, securus ad iudicem venies. Ibi habes advocatum: noli timere ne perdas causam confessionis tuæ. Si enim aliquando in hac vita committit se homo disertæ linguæ et non perit: committit te verbo, et periturus es?" There is no discrepancy between this passage, where the Son is our *παράκλητος*, and John xiv. 16, where the Holy Spirit is called by the same name: rather is there the closest accordance, seeing that there our Lord says He will pray the Father and He will send us *ἄλλον παράκλητον*: Himself, the Son of God, being thus asserted to hold this office in the first place, and the Holy Spirit to be His Substitute in His absence. See on the definite idea of the detail of the advocacy of the Son of God, Huther's important note here) (being) righteous (the adj. *δίκαιον*, with-

out the art., carries a ratiocinative force; "in that He is righteous," as a contrast to *ἐάν τις ἁμάρτη*. In a strict rendering, this force of the anarthrous adj. should be kept, and pointed out in exegesis: in an English version, it is hardly possible to render it otherwise than our translators have done, "the righteous," though it is not *τὸν δίκαιον*. The definite art. in English calls attention at once to the predicate, as does the omission of the definite art. in Greek: and thus the purpose of the writer is answered. And this is often the case: a vernacular version, in order to bring out in English the same idea which is expressed by the Greek, is constrained to adopt a phrase which is not in the Greek, and which sometimes looks as if the translators had made a blunder in grammar. It would be well if this were always carefully kept in mind by those who would revise our authorized version. No supposed by-sense of *δίκαιος*, bonus, lenis (Grot.), or = *δικαίων* (see Wolf), must (see above on ch. i. 9) be for a moment thought of. "The righteousness of Christ stands on our side: for God's righteousness is, in Jesus Christ, ours." Luther):—

2.] and He ("idemque ille," as Lücke. *καί* is merely the copula, not = *quia*, as Corn.-a-lap.; nor *γάρ*, as Syr. (not in Etheridge), Beza; it serves to bind the fundamental general proposition which follows, to the resulting particular one which has preceded) is a propitiation ("the abstract verbal substantive in -μος betokens the intransitive reference of the verb," see Kühner's Gr. Gr. vol. i. § 378. So that *ἰλασμός* is not, as Grot., in his notes, = *ἰλαστής*, but is abstract, as *ἁγιασμός* applied to Christ 1 Cor. i. 30, *ἁμαρτία* 2 Cor. v. 21. Düsterdieck here has given a long and able exposition of the word and idea, in refutation of Socinus, and of Grotius's notes. Grot. himself, being suspected of Socinianism, wrote his "Defensio fidei catholicæ de satisfactione Christi adversus Faustum Socinum," in which, ch. vii.—x., he gives a full and satisfactory explanation "de placatione et reconciliatione, de redemptione, de expiatione nostra per Christi mortem facta." Socinus had maintained that *ἰδῶσκεσθαι* does not mean "ex irato mitem reddere," but merely "declarare quod pertinet ad pœnas peccatorum, ejus animum cujus est eas sumere

ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνων, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ^s ὅλου του κόσμου. ^{s constr., John v. 38. 1 Cor. i. 25. 1 John xiii. 35.}
³ καὶ ^t ἐν τούτῳ ^t γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν, ἐὰν ^{passum. Gen. xlii. 33. see 1 Cor. iv. 6. ch. ii. 10 al.}
 CKL[P]N rel Clem Orig^{sæpe} Petr Ath₂ Thl Œc Tert Aug₅ Vig. ^{μονων B 80¹ coptt}
 Orig₁. [του κόσμου bef ολου P m.]
 3. γινώσκουμεν Α.

atque repetere, mitem atque pacatum: *declarare*, fore ut peccata meritis poenas non luant." But against this Grot. shews that *ἰδασκεσθαι*, as *εἰρηνοποιεῖν* and *καταλλάσσειν*, imports 'placare,' i. e. 'iram avertere;' and Christ has, as our *ἱλασμός* or *ἱλαστήριον*, i. e. as a sin-offering, reconciled God and us by nothing else but by His voluntary death as a sacrifice: has by this averted God's wrath from us. According to the constant usage of Scripture, God is in so far *ἡλεος* in regard to the sins of men, as He suffers His *ἔλεος* to prevail instead of His *ὀργή*. See LXX in 2 Chron. vi. 25, 27, Jer. xxxviii. (xxx.) 34, xliii. (xxxvi.) 3, Num. xiv. 18 ff. And the Greek usage entirely agrees; see Hom. II. a. 147, ὅφρ' ἡμῖν ἐκάεργον ἰλάσσει, and Alberti's note on Hesych. s. v. *ἰλάσκεισθαι*. Hesych. gives the sense of *ἰλάσκεισθαι*, ἐ-ἱλεῖσθαι, and of *ἱλασμός*, εὐμένεια, συγχώρησις, διαλλαγή, πραότης for (περί, as so often in similar connexions, cf. Heb. x. 6, 8, and reff., concerning, i. e. in behalf of; not so strong as *ὑπέρ*, which *fixes* the latter meaning, excluding the wider one) **our sins: yet not for ours only, but also for the whole world** (in the latter clause there is an ellipsis very common in ordinary speech in every language: "for the whole world" = "for the sins of the whole world." See besides reff., Rev. xiii. 11, 2 Pet. i. 1; and Winer, edn. 6, § 66. 2 f. "Quam late patet peccatum, tam late propitiatio," Bengel. But this has been misunderstood or evaded by many interpreters. Cyril and Œc. (alt.) explain *ἡμετέρων* to refer to the Jews, *ολου τοῦ κόσμου* to the Gentiles. And many others, taking the former in its true sense, yet limit the latter, not being able to take in the true doctrine of universal redemption. So Bede, "non pro illis solum propitiatio est Christus quibus tunc in carne viventibus scribebat Joannes, sed etiam pro omni Ecclesia quæ per totam mundi latitudinem diffusa est, (a) primo nimirum electo usque ad ultimum qui in fine mundi nasciturus est porrecta . . . Pro totius ergo mundi peccatis interpellat Dominus, quia per totum mundum est Ecclesia, quam suo sanguine comparavit." (This latter part is an evident reference to Augustine; but it is remarkable that on referring to Augustine we find "Ecce habes Ecclesiam per totum

mundum;" but he ends, "... sed et totius mundi, quem suo sanguine comparavit.") Similarly Calvin: "neque enim aliud fuit consilium Johannis, quam toti Ecclesiæ commune facere hoc bonum. Ergo sub *omnibus*, reprobos non comprehendit: sed eos designat qui simul credituri erant, et qui per varias mundi plagas dispersi erant." But this unworthy and evasive view is opposed by the whole mass of evangelical expositors. The reason of the insertion of the particular here, is well given by Luther: "It is a patent fact that thou too art a part of the whole world: so that thine heart cannot deceive itself and think, The Lord died for Peter and Paul, but not for me").

3—11.] *This communion with God consists, secondly, in keeping His commandments, and especially the commandment to love one another.* No new division of the Epistle begins, as in Sander: ver. 3 is closely joined to ch. i. 5, 6, which introduced the first conditional passage i. 7—ii. 2. The great test of communion with God, walking in the light, first requires that we confess our sins: next requires that we keep His commandments. So in the main Œc.: *εἰρηκῶς ἄνω τοὺς εἰς τὸν κύριον πεπιστευκότας κοινωνίαν ἔχειν πρὸς αὐτόν, πιστωτικά τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς πρὸς αὐτόν παρατίθεται.* And in this (ἐν, of the conditional element: in this is placed, on this depends, our knowledge. In ch. iii. 24 (see below), the ἐν τούτῳ is resumed by ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος οὗ ἡμῖν ἔδωκεν) **we know** (pres.: from time to time, from day to day) **that we have the knowledge of him** (perf.: have acquired and retain that knowledge: and this *ἐγνώκεναι* is not, as some (Lange, Carpzov., Wahl) make it, the *love* of God, as neither of course is it mere theoretical knowledge: but is that inner and living acquaintance which springs out of unity of heart and affection), if ("St. John uses the formula ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν first as referring the demonstrative pronoun back to what has gone before, as e.g. in our ver. 5, and in ch. iii. 10. If however the demonstrative pronoun in this or a like formula looks onward, and the token itself, with the circumstance of which it is a token, follows, he expresses this token variously and significantly, according to the various shades of meaning to be conveyed. Some-

u Matt. xix. 17. τὰς ἔντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἡ τηρῶμεν. 4 ὁ λέγων ὅτι ἔγνωκα
John xiv. 15. αὐτόν, καὶ τὰς ἔντολὰς αὐτοῦ μὴ ἡτηρῶν, ψεύστης ἐστίν, ABCKL
xv. 10, ch. PN a b c
iii 22, 24. d f g h j
Rev. xii. 17 al. see k l m n o
1 Cor. vii. 10. καὶ ἔν τούτῳ ἡ ἀλήθεια οὐκ ἔστιν 5 ὃς δ' αὖ ἡτηρῇ
Sir xxxv. (xxxii) 23. αὐτοῦ τὸν ὅλον, ἀληθῶς ἐν τούτῳ ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ
v ch. iv. 6 reff. x ch. i. 8. y John viii. 51, 52, 55. xiv. 23, 24. xv. 20 xvii. 6. Rev. xiii.
w ch. i. 10 reff. 8, 10 xxii. 7, 9. J. 1 Kings xv. 11 B. z = John iv. 42. viii 31. a = John v. 42. ver.
15 ch. iii. 17. iv. 12 v. 3. Luke xi. 42. 2 Thess. iii. 5.

for τηρῶμεν, φυλαξόμεν N¹.

4. rec om ὅτι, with CKL[P] rel copt æth arm Clem, Œc Lucif; ins ABN a j syrr
sah Clem, Thl Cypr Lucif, Tich. om 2nd καὶ A[P] 13. 27-9. om εν τούτῳ N.
aft αληθεια ins του θεου N 25 æth.

[5. η ἀγάπη του θεου bef εν τούτῳ P.]

times the token implied in the demonstrative follows in a separate sentence, as in ch. iv. 2: sometimes the construction is slightly changed, and the sentence begun with ἐν τούτῳ is not regularly brought to a close, but continued in a new and correlative form: e.g. ch. iii. 24, where ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκ. is taken up by ἐκ τοῦ πν. And this way of expression is closely parallel to that where ὅτι completes the construction begun with ἐν τούτῳ. So ch. iii. 16, 19; iv. 9, 10, 13. In these cases, the full objective reality of the token as a fact, is set forth. It is an undoubted fact that He has given us of His Spirit, that He has sent His Son: and from these facts our inference is secure to the other facts in question, that He abideth in us, &c. But in other passages, we find instead of this ὅτι, an ἵνα, as ch. iv. 17 (but see note there: the case surely is not quite parallel, H. A.), or an εἰν, as here, John xiii. 35, or ὅταν, ch. v. 2. This εἰν, ὅταν, mark the token implied in ἐν τούτῳ as one not actually existent, an historical or objectively certain fact; but as a possible contingency, something hypothetically, and conditionally assumed: in other words as ideal." Düsterdieck, pp. 172 f. And so here: the token, that we have the knowledge of Him, is present, *if*, *posito* that) we keep (pres. as a habit, from time to time, ἐντολαί being necessarily prescriptions regarding circumstances as they arise) His commandments (first as to the expression. St. John never uses the word νόμος for the rule of Christian obedience: this word is reserved for the Mosaic law, John i. 17, 46, and in all, fifteen times in the Gospel: but almost always ἐντολαί,—sometimes λόγος θεοῦ or χριστοῦ, John viii. 51 f., xiv. 23 f., xvii. 6, our ver. 5. And as a verb he always uses τηρεῖν, very seldom ποιεῖν (only in the two converted places, ch. v. 4, Rev. xxii. 14 v. r.: ch. i. 6, ii. 17 are not cases in point). τηρεῖν keeps its peculiar meaning of *watching*, guarding as some precious thing, "observing to keep." Next, *whose* commandments? The older expositors for

the most part refer αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ, vv. 3—6, to Christ: so Aug., Episcop., Grot., Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Wolf, Lange, Bengel, Sander, Neander. Socinus inclines to this view, but doubtfully; Erasmus understands αὐτός vv. 3, 4, of God, αὐτός and ἐκεῖνος vv. 5, 6, of Christ. Most modern Commentators understand αὐτόν, αὐτοῦ, αὐτῷ throughout of God, and ἐκεῖνος of Christ. So Lücke, Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Huther, Brückner, and in old times Bede and Œc. That this latter is the right understanding of the terms, is supposed to be shewn by the substitution (?) in ver. 5 of τοῦ θεοῦ for αὐτοῦ, and its taking up again by ἐν αὐτῷ in ver. 6, followed by καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιπατήσεν. But of this I am by no means thoroughly persuaded: see note, ver. 6).

4.] *Assertion*, parallel with ch. i. 8, of the *futility of pretending to the knowledge of God where this test is not fulfilled*. The man saying (ὁ λέγων answers to εἰν εἴπωμεν, ch. i. 8. ὅτι recitants cannot be expressed in English), I have the knowledge of Him (see above) and not keeping His commandments, is a liar (answers to ἐαυτοὺς πλανῶμεν ch. i. 8), and in this man the truth is not (see above on ch. i. 8, where the words are the same: 5.] *assertion of the other alternative*, not merely as before, but, as usual, carried further and differently expressed: "oppositio cum accessione," as Grot.):—but *whosoever* keepeth His word (synonymous with τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ, considered as a whole: on the mode of expression, see above), of a truth in him is the love of God perfected (why should this transition be made from knowledge to love? "Amor præsupponit cognitionem," as Grot.: and is a further step in the same κοινωνία with God: not indeed that the former step is passed through and done with, but that true knowledge and love increase together, and the former is the measure of the latter, just as keeping God's commandments is the test and measure of true knowledge of Him. And thus in the

^a θεοῦ ^b τετελείωται. ^t ἐν τούτῳ ^t γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ^c ἐν αὐτῷ ^b ἐσμέν. ⁶ ὁ λέγων ^c ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν ^d ὀφείλει καθὼς ^c ἐκείνος ^e περιεπάτησεν καὶ αὐτὸς [οὕτως] ^e περιπατεῖν. ⁷ ^f ἀγαπητοί, οὐκ ^g ἐντολήν ^g καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν-
11. 3 John 8:1. xii. 19. Jude 3, 17, 20. e absol., 1 Cor. vii. 17. see ch. 1 6 reff. g here bus. John xiii. 34. 2 John 5 only. f John, ch. iii. 2, 21 a17. Rom. b = ch. iv 12, 17, 18. John iv. 34 al. see James ii 22. c John xv. 2, 4, &c. d = John xiii. 14. xix. 7. Rom. xv. 1. ch. iii. 16. iv.

6. rec ins *οὕτως*, with CK[P]N rel syr (copt) arm Thl Ec: om AB d vulg Syr sah æth Clem Cyr Cypr Cæs-arel.—om *καὶ αὐτ.* (*οὐτ.*) *περιπ.* L.

7. rec (for *αγαπητοί*) *ἀδελφοί*, with KL rel æth Ec: in red, beg of pericope, a: om j: txt ABC[P]N d 13. 36. 40 vulg syrr coptt arm Thl Did-int Aug Bede.

final and perfect ideal, the two are coincident: the perfect observation of His commandments is the perfection of love to Him. It is manifest, from what has been said, that ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ must be our love towards God, not His love towards us: τοῦ θεοῦ a gen. objective, not subjective. Some Commentators have held the other meaning: partly because τετελείωται seemed better to be interpreted thus, and partly from doctrinal motives, as in the case of Flacius and Calovius, to keep out the Romish folly of supererogation. But the explanation, though the words themselves admit it (see ch. iv. 9), is manifestly alien from the context. And of any foolish dreams of perfection or super-perfection there is no fear, if we understand the passage as intended by the Apostle, as setting forth the true ideal and perfection of knowledge and love to God, as measured by the perfect keeping of His word: which though none of us can fully reach, every true Christian has before him as his aim and final object. So that there is no need again to depart from the meaning of τετελείωται, as has been done by Beza ("itaque τελειοῦν hoc in loco non declarat perfecte aliquid præstare, sed mendacio et simulationi, inani denique speciei opponitur: ut hoc plane sit quod dicimus in vulgato sermone, mettre en exécution"). In this (in the fact of our progress towards this ideal state of perfection of obedience and therefore of love:—thus assured that the germ of the state is in us and unfolding) we know that we are in Him (this completes the logical period which began in ver. 3, by reasserting that verse, carrying however that assertion yet deeper, by substituting ἐν αὐτῷ ἐσμέν for ἐγνώκαμεν αὐτόν. This "being in Him" is in fact the Christian life in its central depth of κοινωνία with God and with one another: the spiritual truth corresponding to the physical one enunciated by St. Paul, Acts xvii. 28, ἐν αὐτῷ ὧμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν).

6.] The state of being in Him is carried forward a step further by the expression "abide in Him:—" (*Synonyma cum gradatione: Illum nosse: in*

Illo esse: in Illo manere: cognitio: communio: constantia." Bengel:) and the way is prepared, by what follows, for the coming exhortation vv. 7—11, to walk in love. The man saying that He abideth in Him (God, as above) ought (see reff. Luther well remarks, that the obligation is grounded on the λέγειν, the profession, being one of consistency with it; not on the μένειν, which would imply that which follows, as matter of necessity), even as He (Christ: by ἐκείνος (see above) a third person is introduced: not necessarily, see 2 Tim. ii. 26 and note, but apparently by the requirements of this passage, αὐτός having come down all the way from ch. i. 5 as referred to God. I say *apparently*: because I do not regard it as by any means a settled matter that this αὐτός does not throughout apply to Christ, and then this ἐκείνος will merely refer to a different phase of predication respecting the same person as the ἐν αὐτῷ designates, as in the examples produced in the note as above) walked (during His life upon earth: see below), himself also thus to walk (not any one particular of Christ's walk upon earth is here pointed at, but the whole of his life of holiness and purity and love. This latter, as including all the rest, is most in the Apostle's mind. So in Eph. v. 1, 2, where St. Paul exhorts us to be followers of God, he adds, καὶ περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ, καθὼς καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἡγάπησεν ὑμᾶς. Luther simply but appositely remarks, that it is not Christ's walking on the sea, but His ordinary walk, that we are called on here to imitate).

7—11.] *The commandment of Love.* The context see below. Beloved, I write not to you a new commandment, but an old commandment, which ye had from the beginning: the old commandment is the word which ye heard (on the right understanding of this verse, very much depends. The great question is, To what commandment does ἐντολή refer? Does it point forward to the commandment of brotherly love, in ver. 9, or back to that of walking as Christ walked, in ver. 6? One

h Rom. vi. 6. ¹τολὴν ^hπαλαιάν, ἣν εἶχετε ⁱἀπ' ⁱἀρχῆς. ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ABCKL
¹Cor. v. 7, 8. ^hπαλαιὰ ἔστιν ὁ ^kλόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε. ⁸πάλιν ^εἐντολήν P8 a b c
²John. iii. 14. John, here bis only k l m n o
¹— John xv. 27, ch. iii. 11. 2 John 5. 6. see Isa. xlii. 16. k = Acts xiii. 15. ch. i. 1 al. 13

rec aft ηκουσατε ins απ' αρχης (see ver 24, ch iii. 11, εφε), with KL rel Ath Ec Did-int : om ABC[P]N d j 13 vss Thl Aug Cassiod Bede.

or other of these views has generally been taken decidedly, and exclusively of the other. The former view has been upheld by Aug., Bede, Ec., Thl., Luther, Calv., Grot., Wolf, Bengel, Knapp, Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Neander, Sander, Dusterdieck, al.; the latter by Beza, Socinus, Seb.-Schmidt, Piscator, Episcopius, Flacius, Calov., Lücke, Fritzsche, Jackmann, al. Of these, some on both sides may fairly be dismissed, as maintaining preposterous meanings for some of the terms used. Thus Flacius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., understand ἐντολή to be, not a *commandment*, which from usage and from ver. 3 and ch. iii. 23, v. 3, it must be, but the whole “doctrina de Christo ejusque beneficiis,” including the forgiveness of sins, vv. 1, 2, 12. Then thus taking it, the epithets “old” and “new” become the O. T. prophecies of Christ, and their N. T. fulfilment. Thus on the other side some, e.g. Aug., Bede, Beza, Luther (2), Seb.-Schmidt, Wolf, al., understand “new” and “old” not of time, but in a tropical meaning, with reference to the old Jewish or heathen darkness and the new light of Christ: a view which cannot possibly be maintained in the face of so plain a token of time as is furnished by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and by the aor. εἶχετε and ἠκούσατε. These being so far set aside, the above classes of interpreters are again divided as to their understanding of the epithets “old” and “new.” Those who understand the ἐντολή vv. 7, 8, of the command of love, mostly explain the oldness and newness of the difference between O. and N. T. revelation (so the Greeks, Grot., and Wolf), and some go on to understand the ἀπ' ἀρχῆς of the original obscure and imperfect command to love one another in the O. T. which failed in the crowning particular of love towards enemies. Of these, the Greeks, holding not Jewish Christians alone, but Gentile also to be addressed, interpret παλαιὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς and ἠκούσατε of the testimony of conscience to the law of love among the Gentiles: so Ec. and the Scholl. speak of ἡ κατὰ τὰς φυσικὰς ἐννοίας φιλικὴ διδάσκεις. Wolf tries to distinguish the two by referring εἶχετε to the Jews, ἠκούσατε to the Gentiles. On the other hand, those who refer ἐντολή in vv. 7, 8, to ver. 6, mostly understand the “old” and “new” of the different aspects in which

the following the example of Christ would be regarded, within the limits of the N. T. period, since the readers had begun their Christian lives: so Socinus, Jackmann, Piscator, Episcopius, Lücke. The last-named reference of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς to the beginning of the Christian life of the readers, and the corresponding explanation of the “oldness” of the commandment, is combined by De Wette and Neander only with their view of ἐντολή as the law of love. Dusterdieck, from whom the above particulars are mainly taken, finds fault with the exclusive reference maintained for the most part by the interpreters on both sides, and believes that a via media may be found more agreeable to the ethical habits of thought of the Apostle, and to the context of the passage. This context requires, 1) that we maintain a logical connexion between ver. 6 and ver. 7, as indicated by ἀφ' αὐτοῦ and ἐντολή; 2) that we maintain the like logical connexion between ver. 8 and ver. 9, as indicated by the figure common to them both, of the darkness and the light. Now, of these, 1) is neglected by those who understand the ἐντολή barely as the law of love; 2) is neglected by those who understand it barely of following Christ's example. The former make ver. 7 spring out of no contextual development: the latter treat similarly ver. 9. And the true view is to be found as thus indicated: the walk of Christ, which is our example, is essentially and completely summed up in one word, Love: and so the command, to walk as he walked, essentially and completely resolves itself into the law of brotherly love: for this last, taken in all its depth, includes not one special detail in a holy Christian life, but the whole of that life itself. Taking then this view, how are we to interpret in detail? What is καὶ νῦν? what is παλαιάν? what is ἀπ' ἀρχῆς? For these clearly all hang together. If ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is to signify ‘from the beginning of O. T. revelation,’ or ‘from the beginning of God's testimony in man's conscience,’ we seem to be doing violence to the simple mode of address which is prevalent in our Apostle's style. The εἶχετε and ἠκούσατε, especially the latter, will hardly bear interpreting of the remote forefathers of the readers, as on this hypothesis they must, but require to be confined to the readers themselves, especially as

⁸ καινήν γράφω ὑμῖν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀληθὲς ¹ ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ¹ ἐν ¹ = ver. 3.
 ὑμῖν, ὅτι ἡ ^m σκοτία ⁿ παράγεται καὶ τὸ ^{mn} φῶς τὸ ^o ἀλ- ^m so John i 5.
 λ- ^{iii. 19, see}
^{n = (mid.) ver.}
^{o = John i. 9, iv 23 al. fr.}

17 only 4. intr., John [viii. 59] ix. 1 al. Ps. cxviii. 8.

8. *εν αυτω βεφ αληθες Α.* *aft αληθες ins και Ν.* *for 2nd υμιν, ημιν*
Α c m tol syr-mg Jer: txt BCKL[P]N rel vss Thl Gc Aug Bede. *for σκοτια,*
σκια Α. *for 2nd το, τον(sic) Ν¹*

they are aorists and not perfects. And if so, the meaning of ἀπ' ἀρχῆς is fixed to be, from the beginning of the Christian lives, from the time when τὸν λόγον ἤκουσαν. Then as to καινήν, and παλαιά, the explanation will be simple enough. The command to love one another cannot be said to be new, for it forms a part of the λόγος ὃν ἠκούσατε, nay, is the very sum and centre of that λόγος: but again, it may be said to be new, inasmuch as it ever assumes new freshness as the Christian life unfolds, as the old darkness is more and more cleared away and the true light shineth: in that light we see light; in the light of Him who maketh all things new.

That the ἐντολή as such refers to the law of love, thus indeed connected with Christ's example here, but still to the law of love and no other, is plain from the whole usage of the Apostle; compare especially 2 John 4—6, where the very same train of thought occurs as here, the περιπατεῖν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ being = περιπατεῖν ἐν φωτί here, being followed up by καθὼς ἐντολὴν ἐλάβομεν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, and that ἐντολή being characterized, as here,—οὐχ ὡς ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καινήν, ἀλλὰ ἣν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, and finally being stated to be ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους. Indeed the whole process of that passage from this point is most instructive as to our present one: καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστίν, καθὼς ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατῇτε: where the same complex of the whole Christian walk is included in the one idea of love, and ἀγάπη identified with walking according to His commandments. Again in ch. iii. 11, the same formula is used in speaking of the law of love—αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγγελία ἣν ἠκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους: cf. also ch. iv. 21, v. 3, iii. 22—24: again ch. iii. 14, iv. 16, John xiii. 35; ch. v. 1, 2, John xv. 10.

To recapitulate: on the interpretation here adopted, which is also that of Düsterdieck and Huther, the ἐντολή is the command to walk as Christ walked, passing as the passage advances into the law of love. This ἐντολή is no καινή, but παλαιά, seeing that they had it ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, from the beginning of their faith, and it was in fact the sum of the λόγος which they

ἤκουσαν). 8.] Again (this πάλιν is what is called ἐπανορθωτικόν; takes up and contravenes what has been as yet said: q. d., “in another view of the subject,” “et contrarietatem declarat et iterationem, hic autem non repetitionis sed contrarietatis est declaratio,” as Erasm. It refers to the whole sentence, not merely to γράφω. The emphasis is on καινήν) a new commandment write I unto you (“new,” in three possible ways of interpretation: 1) “novum dicit quod Deus quotidie suggerendo veluti renovat: . . . Joannes negat ejusmodi esse doctrinam de fratribus diligendis, quæ tempore obsolescat: sed perpetuo vigere,” Calvin: or 2) “illam præceptionem quam vobis dudum cognitam esse dixi, sic vobis denuo commendo atque injungo, tanquam si nova esset, nec vobis antehac unquam cognita,” Knapp, and so Neander; or 3) in that it was first promulgated with Christianity and unknown before. The two first are condemned by the fact, that the word in each case on which the stress of the interpretation rests, is not expressed in the text: there is for 1) no δελ, for 2) no νῦν. The third agrees well both with the context and with St. John's habit of thought, as well as with matter of fact, and our Lord's own words, John xiii. 34, xv. 12. When Lücke objects to it that thus we have to take παλαιά and καινήν in two different senses, he hits in fact the very point in which this interpretation approves itself the most to those who are familiar with the oxymoron of St. John's style. As Düsterd. replies, “when I stand at the point of time indicated by ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, and look forwards on the Christian life of the readers, the ἐντολή appears as one long known; the readers have known it from the beginning as an essential commandment, they have had it as long as they have been Christians: on the other hand, if I look backward on the life of the readers before that ἀρχή, whether they were before that Jews or Gentiles, this same commandment of necessity appears as a new one, essentially Christian, first beginning for the readers with that beginning; for even for the Jewish Christians the command of brotherly love is a new one, seeing that it is ordained in imitation of Christ, John xiii. 34”), which (thing, viz

^p act., John i. 4. v. 35. ^θινὸν ἤδη ^p φαίνει. ⁹ ὁ λέγων ^a ἐν τῷ ^a φωτὶ εἶναι καὶ ABCKL
P^a a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13
² Pet. i. 19. ^{Rev.} i. 16. viii. 12. xxi. 23. Gen. i. 17. always intr. in N. T. and LXX. q ch. i. 7. Col. i. 12. Isa. ii. 5.

the fact that the commandment is a new one: see below) is true in Him and in you: because the darkness is passing away, and the true light is now shining (i. e. the commandment is a new one, and this is true both in (the case of) Him (Christ) and in (the case of) you: because (ἐν ὑμῖν) the darkness is passing away, and (ἐν αὐτῷ) the true light is shining: therefore on both accounts the command is a new one: new as regards you, because you are newly come from darkness into light: new as regards Him, because He uttered it when He came into the world to lighten every man, and began that shining which even now continues. This reference of the two clauses I hold fast against Dusterdieck, who maintains that the δ refers to the content of the ἐντολή, viz. walking in brotherly love: that the commandment finds its fulfilment (ἀληθές ἐστιν) in the walk of Christians in union with Christ. But to this there are several objections which he has not noticed: 1) the probable logic of the sentence. The Apostle has made what is apparently a paradoxical assertion. He has stated that the commandment is not new but old, and then has, notwithstanding, asserted its newness. Then he proceeds δ ἐστιν ἀληθές . . . ὅτι κ.τ.λ. Is it not probable that this form of sentence introduces the explanation of the paradox? Is it probable, as would be the case on the other view, that so startling a proposition (after ver. 7) as πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, would remain altogether unexplained? 2) the word ἀληθές. Dusterd. says, "The Apostle calls that which is enjoined in the ἐντολή, ἀληθές, because it finds its truth in its living activity, in its practical reality: it is in deed and truth (ἀληθῶς, ver. 5, John iv. 42, (vi. 55)) living and present, and so far true, real." But even granting this sense of ἀληθής to be possible (which may be doubted: ἀληθῶς is clearly no case in point, its adverbial character removing it into another phase of predication), is it likely that so unusual and harsh a word would be chosen as the adj. ἀληθές (rather than the adv. ἀληθῶς) when the obvious sense of ἀληθές would so naturally refer it, in the reader's mind, to the καινότης just asserted? 3) Dusterd. has entirely neglected the repetition of the prep. ἐν, which fact separates off ἐν αὐτῷ and ἐν ὑμῖν as two distinct departments, and prevents their being considered in union. "Him," Christ, the Head, and

"you," the readers, as the members, which depend on the Head as the grapes on the true vine, the Apostle regards as united in the real community of life (ch. i. 3 f.), &c. But this would require ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ὑμῖν: and accordingly a little below he says, "Ihm und Euch ist es wahr, was Johannes fördert." 4) The strict present παράγεται is disregarded by D.'s explanation. He upholds indeed a present sense, as against the "*transierunt tenebræ*" of the vulgate ("the darkness is *past*," E. V.), but makes no further remark, not seeing apparently how peculiarly this present fits the application of the sentence to accounting for the newness of the commandment—"You are living in a time when the darkness is rolling away, even now passing:" so that the command, which is of the Light, is well said to be "*new*."

As in almost every verse of this difficult portion of the Epistle, the divergencies of interpretation are almost endless. Some few only of them can be mentioned here. That recently defended (as above) by Dusterdieck, was before taken by Ec., Luther, Grot., Knapp, Baumg.-Crus., Semler, &c.: that which I have maintained, by Calvin, Socinus, Flacius, Calov., Morus, Horneius, De Wette, Lucke, Neander, Huther. Some take the δ ti as declarative: "it is true, that the darkness," &c.: so Castello, Socinus, Bengel, " δ τι, quod: hoc est illud præceptum, amor fratris, ex luce." Erasm., Episcopus, Grot., separate the words δ ἐστιν ἀληθές ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν into subject and predicate: "quod verum est in illo (Christo), id etiam in vobis verum est," or "esse debet." The whole discussion, carried into most minute detail, may be seen in Dusterdieck's note. To mention two matters of verbal nicety: 1) παράγεται need not be pressed, with Bengel, to its passive meaning: "non dicit παράγει, transit, sed -εται, traducitur, commutatur, ut tandem absorbeat. Idem verbum, ver. 17, ubi opponitur mansioni." But the passive is not necessary for this sense: nay, in ver. 17 it is hardly admissible, and there can be no doubt that the middle was intended, in the same sense as the intr. act., 1 Cor. vii. 31: 2) ἤδη φαίνει, joined with the present παράγεται, is best taken to mean, not the full and entire shining of the true light, but its beginning to shine: its full light at the coming of the Lord, is indeed close at hand, ver. 18, and to that the ἤδη φαίνει looks on.

τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ μισῶν ἐν τῇ ¹σκοτίᾳ ἐστὶν ²ἕως ³ἄρτι. ⁴10 ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ⁵ἐν τῷ ⁶φῶτι ⁷μένει, καὶ ⁸τὸ σκάνδαλον οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ. ⁹11 ὁ δὲ μισῶν

¹ ch. i. 5 reff. ² John ii. 10. ³ v. 17. xvi. 24. ⁴ Matt. xi. 12. ⁵ 1 Cor. iv. 13. ⁶ viii. 7. xv. 6 only. ⁷ John. Rev. ii. ⁸ 14 only. = Matt. xvi. 23. xviii. 7 al. Ps. cxviii. 165. ⁹ Judith v. 20.

9. αὐτὸ μισῶν ins ψευστῆς ἐστὶν καὶ N 15. 43. 98. 137 æth arm Cypri.

10. rec εν αυτα bef ουκ ἐστιν, with BKL[P] rel vulg syr arm Thl Œc Aug Fulg Bede: txt ACN j spec Syr (copt) sah Lucif.

* 9, 10.] We now come to the *enunciation of the law of brotherly love*, and in a form resembling that used in ch. i. 8, 10: and in vv. 4 f. First is asserted the incompatibility of living in hatred and walking in the light: then the identity of walking in love and walking in the light: then lastly as a contrast to the last (ὁ ἀγαπῶν . . . ὁ δὲ μισῶν), the same fact with regard to hatred and the darkness, and the blinding effect on him who walks in it. The φῶς is as before, the light of Christ, now partially shining, but one day to be fully revealed: the σκοτία is the darkness of this present world, now passing away). **He that saith that he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in the darkness until now** (Düsterd. has very properly protested against the softening down of μισεῖν into “minus diligere, posthabere, non colere,” &c. “Nothing,” he says, “can be more shallow and weak as compared with the ethics of the whole Scripture. All the truth, depth, and power of Christian ethics rests on the ‘aut . . . aut,’ so distinctly insisted on by St. John. On the one side is God, on the other the world: here is life, there is death (ch. iii. 14): here, love; there, hate, i. e. murder (ch. iii. 14 ff.), there is no medium. In the space between, is nothing. Life may as yet be merely elementary and fragmentary. Love may be as yet weak and poor, but still, life in God and its necessary demonstration in love is present really and truly, and the word of our Lord is true, ‘He that is not against me is with me,’ Luke ix. 50: and on the other side, the life according to the flesh, the attachment to the world, and the necessary action of this selfishness by means of hatred, may be much hidden, may be craftily covered and with splendid outer surface; but in the secret depth of the man, there where spring the real fountains of his moral life, is not God but the world; the man is yet in death, and can consequently love nothing but himself and must hate his brother: and then that other word of the Lord is true, ‘He that is not for me is against me,’ Luke xi. 23. For a man can only be either for or against Christ, and consequently can only have either love or hate towards his brother.” Bengel says

well, on ver. 11, “*oppositio immediata: ubi non est amor, odium est: cor enim non est vacuum.*” It has been questioned, who is meant by τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. It seems plain that the expression here is not = τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, seeing that St. John is writing to Christians, and treating of their κοινωνία μετ’ ἀλλήλων. On the other hand, if we are to restrict the meaning, as is done by most modern Commentators, to Christian brotherhood, it is plain that we cannot understand strictly τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ in vv. 9, 11, seeing that the man there spoken of is in reality not a Christian at all. So that either we must enlarge the sense of ἀδελφός, or suppose some impropriety of language in the use of the term in these verses, q. d. him who ought to be loved by him as a Christian brother, supposing himself to be really a Christian. This difficulty does not seem to have struck any of the Commentators: but it is one which certainly will not allow us to confine the term to its utmost strictness of meaning. **ἕως ἄρτι, up to this moment:** notwithstanding any apparent change which may have taken place in him when he passed into the ranks of nominal Christians). 10.] **He that loveth his brother abideth in the light** (i. e. the continuance of the habit of brotherly love is a measure of and a guarantee for his continuance in that light whose great command is Love), and there is no occasion of stumbling in him (so E. V., excellently. For it is clear by the parallel in ver. 11, that this is what is meant, and not that he gives no occasion of stumbling to others, as Calov., al., “Qui fratrem odit, ipse sibi offendiculum est, et incurrit in seipsum et in omnia intus et foris; qui amat, expeditum iter habet.” Bengel. Cf. also John xi. 9, 10, which is in more than one respect the key-text here. For it also explains the apparently difficult ἐν αὐτῷ, occurring as it does there in ver. 10, ἐὰν δὲ τις περιπατῇ ἐν τῇ νυκτί, προσκόπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ. The light, and the darkness, by which we walk safely, or stumble, are within ourselves; admitted into us by the eye, whose singleness fills the whole body with light). 11.] **But (= whereas) he that hateth**

u JOHN xii. 35. v ch. i. 6, 7 reff. w as above (u).
 JOHN iii. 8. viii. 14 bis. xii. 36. xiv. 5. xvi. 5.
 x of motion, as above (u, w).
 JOHN xi. 34. xii. 2, 13, 15. Heb. xi. 8. Gen. xiv. 8.
 y JOHN xii. 40 (cf. Isa. vi. 10). 2 Cor. iv. 4 only. Isa. xlii. 19 only. z ver. 1 reff. a ch. i. 9
 reff. b JOHN xv. 21. Matt. x. 22. xxiv. 9 ||. (Acts iv. 30. 1 Cor. i. 10) Rev. ii. 3 only. c see
 Acts vii. 2. xxii. 1.

[11. for *εστιν, μενει* (see ver 9) P.]

his brother (see above) is in the darkness (has never come out of it: corresponds to *ἐν τῇ φωτὶ μένει* above: denotes his state, whereas *περιπατεῖ* indicates more his outward acts), and walketh in the darkness, and knoweth not where (see reff. *ποῦ* with a verb of motion obviously *includes* that motion: but it includes also the spot on which the motion is taking place: e. g., here, not only the destination to which, but also the way by which, he is going. In some places, this cannot be pressed, as in John viii. 14, where *πόθεν ἤλθον* and *ποῦ (ποῶ)* *ὑπάγει* are opposed to one another) he goeth, because the darkness blinded (it is a matter of old standing: "blinded," and not "hath blinded," because it is no new effect of a state into which he has lately come, but the long past work of a state which is supposed to be gone by, and is not) his eyes.

12—14.] *Threefold address to the readers, accompanied by a threefold reason for writing to them; all repeated by way of parallelism, with some variations and enlargements.* On the connexion and explanation of these verses, it may be observed, 1) that we have three classes of readers, denoted the first time by *τεκνία, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι*, and the second time by *παιδιά, πατέρες, νεανίσκοι*. 2) that all three are addressed the first time in the present *γράφω*, the second time in the aorist *ἔγραψα*. 3) that while to the *πατέρες* and *νεανίσκοι* the same words are each time used (to the latter with an addition the second time), the *τεκνία* and *παιδιά* are differently addressed. The first question arising is, what do these three classes import, and how are they to be distributed among the readers? It is obvious that the chief difficulty here is with *τεκνία* and *παιδιά*. The former word is used by our Apostle once with *μου*, ver. 1, and six times without *μου*; ver. 28, ch. iii. 7, 18, iv. 4, v. 21; but always as importing the whole of his readers; and once it is reported by him as used by our Lord, also in a general address to all His disciples, John xiii. 33. *παιδιά* is used by him similarly in our ver. 18, and reported by him as used by

our Lord in a general address, John xxi. 5. These facts make it very probable that both the words are here used as general designations of all the readers, and not as a designation of any particular class among them. And this is made more probable, by the fact that if *τεκνία* and *παιδιά* did point out the children among them, properly or spiritually so called, the rank of classes would be different from that which would occur to any writer, viz. neither according to ascending age nor to descending, but children, fathers, young men. We seem then to have made it highly probable that *τεκνία* and *παιδιά* address all the readers alike. Now if we lay any stress on the third circumstance above mentioned, that *τεκνία* and *παιδιά* are differently addressed, and not so *πατέρες* and *νεανίσκοι*, and endeavour therefrom to deduce any distinction between *τεκνία* and *παιδιά* in the age or qualities expressed by them, I conceive that we shall establish nothing satisfactory. If a reason for this variation of address is to be discovered, it must be sought in the parallelism of the passage. With these preliminary remarks, we come to the details. I write to you, little children (see above), because (Socinus, Seb.-Schmidt, Schött., Bengel, Paulus, Sander, Neander, render *ὅτι* "that." But the meaning seems determined for us by ver. 21, where it is quite impossible thus to render it: although even there Bengel tries to be consistent. It is manifest that we must keep the same rendering throughout. The particle then gives the reasons why he writes (*what*, see below on the first *ἔγραψα*) to each class among them) your sins have been (perf.: see note on Matt. ix. 2) forgiven you for the sake of His (Christ's) name (*Ἰησοῦς χριστός*, the Saviour, the anointed one, bringing to mind all the work wrought out by Him for us, and all the acceptance of that work by the Father: so that it may be well said that on account of, for the sake of, that Name which the Father hath given Him, which is above every name, our sins are forgiven).

13.] I write to you, fathers, because ye know Him that was (cf. *ὁ ἦν ἂν ἄρ.*

ABCKL
 PN abc
 d f g h j
 k l m n o
 13

ὅτι ^d ἐγνώκατε τον ^e ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. γράφω ὑμῖν, ^f νεανίσκοι, ^d ch. iv. 6 reff. ^e see ch. i. 1
ὅτι νενικήκατε τὸν ^g πονηρόν. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ^h παῖδια, ὅτι ^f Matt. xix. ^(reff.) ^h = John
ii. 17, from Joel ii. 28. g masc., Matt. xiii. 19, 38 Eph. vi. 16. ch. iii. 12. v. 18, 19. 20. Acts

13. rec (for ἐγραψα) γράφω, with K rel Orig-int, Ec: txt ABCL[P]N a j o 13. 86. 40 syrr coptt aeth Orig-int, Cyr Phot Thl.—om from ἐγραψα to αρχης ver 14 vulg(not demid fuld harl).—fuld demid harl have scribo 5 times, am in the 5th place has scripsi.

χῆς, ch. i. 1) from the beginning (i.e. in St. John's usage of speech, Christ; see ch. i. 1 and notes). I write to you, young men, because ye have conquered the wicked one (the proper attribute of youth is, to carry on the active parts of life: if soldiers, to be engaged in all active service: that of age, to contemplate, and arrive at sound and matured knowledge. The latter have conquered as well, but the burden and heat of their struggle is past: "vires fortibus et robustis tribuitur supra fortissimum et robustissimum victoria." Carpzov. The πονηρός is he in whom, in whose power, the whole world lieth, ch. v. 19, John xii. 31, xiv. 30, xvi. 11: the διάβολος, who deceives from the beginning, John viii. 44, ch. iii. 8, 10, 12: whose works Christ came into the world to destroy, ch. iii. 8. He is conquered once and for all, by those who have passed from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God, to communion with the Father and the Son, ch. v. 18. Whatever conflict remains for them afterwards, is with a baffled and conquered enemy: is a τηρεῖν αὐτοὺς (ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ), ch. v. 18, which τηρεῖν (see note there), owing to their whole life being led in communion with the Father and Son, is a τηρεῖσθαι, John xvii. 15). He now repeats (see above) the three classes, but with some variations and additions in his reasons for writing to each, and with the aor. ἔγραψα instead of the present γράφω. In seeking a reason for this change of tense, we have a choice between several views of Commentators. These are rather complicated by the fact that many of them read γράφω in the fourth place, against almost all authority. Of those, some, as Calvin, have been fairly baffled by the two aorists following the four presents, and have imagined ver. 14 to be interpolated: "Quamquam fieri potest ut Joannes ipse sententiam de adolescentibus augendi causa secunde inseruerit (illie enim addit fortes esse, quod non prius dixerat), librarii autem temere numerum implere voluerint." Of the rest, some (Storr, Lange, Baumg.-Crus., Schött.) think that the allusion is to St. John's Gospel: others, as Michaelis, to a former epistle; by far the greater part however agree rightly that this Epistle must be

meant by both: see Gal. vi. 11, Philem. 19, 21; our vv. 21, 26; ch. v. 13. Still, there is a wide difference in giving each tense a distinct reference. Bengel holds them to import much the same: "a scribo transit ad scripsi: non temere: sollicit verbo scribendi ex presenti in præteritum transposito immisit communionem firmissimam:" and so Sander, and in the main Neander: "as John has said 'I write to you,' so now he takes up again and sums up that which he has written, saying, 'I have written to you.' q. d., it stands fast: I have nothing more to say: this you must regard as my permanent testimony." And Paulus, comparing the formula "we decree and have decreed." But as Huther remarks, this view presupposes the false rendering of ὅτι by "that." Lücke, after Rickli, with much ingenuity tries to fix ἔγραψα on the preceding portion of the Epistle, keeping γράφω for the following. And in so doing, he fancies he sees a correspondence, in what has preceded and in what follows, with these addresses to different classes of hearers: e.g., in ch. i. 5—7, and ii. 15—17, with ἀφώνηται αἱ ἄμ.: in i. 8—ii. 2, and ii. 18—27, with ὅτι ἐγνώκατε . . . : in ii. 3—11, and ii. 28—iii. 22, with ὅτι νενικήκατε . . . But no such correspondence really subsists: and Lücke himself subsequently gave up this view:—see note in Bertheau's edn. of Lücke, p. 265. De Wette and Brückner, with whom Huther agrees, believe γράφω to refer to the immediate act of writing, going on at the moment: ἔγραψα, to what has preceded this point: so that the former refers more to the whole Epistle, the latter to the contents of what has gone before. Düsterdieck disapproves this, and, following Beza, refers both γράφω and ἔγραψα to the whole Epistle: the former to the Apostle's immediate act of writing, the latter to the readers' act of reading when complete. In deciding between these two last views, we must bear in mind the epistolary use of the aor. ἔγραψα, according to which it refers, never, that I am aware, when thus used absolutely, to a previous portion of the Epistle, but always to the whole: which circumstance would seem to rule the meaning here, and to determine for Beza and Düs-

1 ch. 1. 3 reff. d ἐγνώκατε ἰ τὸν ἰ πατέρα. 14 ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ° πατέρες, ὅτι ABCKL
 John, here and Rev. (v. 2 al) only. d ἐγνώκατε ° τὸν ° ἀπ' ἀρχῆς. ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἱ νεανίσκοι, d f g h j
 = 1 Cor. iv. ὅτι ἱ ἰσχυροὶ ἐστε καὶ ὁ κ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κ ἐν ὑμῖν k l m n o
 10. Heb. x. 34. 15 μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν
 k = John (only) κ μένει καὶ νενικήκατε τὸν ε πονηρόν. 15 μὴ ἀγαπᾶτε τὸν
 v 38. xv. 7. 11. ch. iii. 9, 17 al.

14. for 1st τὸν, το Β.

om του θεου B sah.

terdieck. And no objection lies against their view, as Huther urges, from the change of persons to be supplied (see above): the supply may just as well be thus made, understanding the reference both times to be to the Apostle himself: "I write (γράφω), now that I am writing:" "I wrote (ἔγραψα), when I wrote." I wrote to you, children (by παιδία all the readers are meant: see above), because ye know the Father (the very word παιδία reminds of πατήρ: and the relation is close, between this and that which is said before, that their sins are forgiven for Christ's name's sake. They are received thus by adoption into God's family, and He is become *their* reconciled Father, as He is the Father of Him through whom they have received their adoption: and one of the first evidences of dawning intelligence in a child is the recognition of its father. But this knowledge of the Father does not precede, nay, it presupposes, communion with the Son: for none knoweth the Father but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him, Matt. xi. 27). I wrote to you, fathers, because ye know Him that was from the beginning (verbatim as before: to shew perhaps in strong light the great truth of John xvii. 3, that the whole sum of Christian ripeness and experience is, this knowledge of σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν. Bengel gives another reason: "Hoc comma ex versu præcedente, non additis pluribus verbis, repetit propositioni tractationem æque brevem subjungens, et modestia ad patres utens, quibus non opus erat multa scribi"). I wrote to you, young men, because ye are strong (Ovid, Met. xv. 208, "Transit in ætatem post ver robustior annus, Fitque valens juvenis, neque enim robustior ætas Ulla." Wetst. ἰσχυρός, strong in fight: so in ref. Heb., Luke xi. 21 ||), and the word of God abideth in you (i. e. the whole announcement of the good news of the gospel in Christ has found entrance into your hearts and an abiding place there, and there dwells and works. The copulæ may be supplied as Grot., "Illud prius καὶ valet hic quia, alterum καὶ positum est pro ob id. . . . Fortes jam estis, non vestris viribus, verum ideo quod verbum illud Dei, profectum a Christo,

est in vobis: inde vobis robur tantum obtigit, ut et mundi hujus principem vinceretis"), and ye have conquered the wicked one (see above).

15—17.] *Dehortation from the love of the world.* The preceding designation of the different classes has been, as so frequently in St. John, their ideal designation, in the perfection of their several states of Christian life: and now, as so often, he brings that ideal state to bear on real temptations and duties. The love of the Father, the abiding in Him by His word abiding in them, the victory over him in whom ὁλος ὁ κόσμος κείται,—these particulars have been enounced: and though there may be a more apparent reason why the young should have this dehortation addressed to them, and more apparent allusion to the νενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν in the bringing out of the κόσμος, yet there can be no doubt that it is to *all* that this address is made. All are in the world, and as long as they are, are in danger of being betrayed by the senses to cleave to the things present and seen, to the forgetfulness of those which are absent and unseen. This general reference is shewn by the ἐάν τις which follows. *Love not the world* (what is ὁ κόσμος, in the diction of St. John? And what does he import by ἀγαπᾶν τὸν κόσμον? When we read John iii. 16, οὕτως ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν, κ.τ.λ., are we to understand the same thing by the words as here? and if not, are *both* κόσμος and ἀγαπᾶν taken in a different sense, or if one only, *which*? Beza replies, "Mundum considerat quatenus cum Dei voluntate non consentit, et enim amorem damnat qui nos a Deo abducit: alioquin dicitur Deus ipse suum mundum infinito quodam amore dilexisse, id est, eos quos ex mundo elegit." The palpable error of this last "id est," directs us to the right solution of both questions. The κόσμος in both cases is the same, the ἀγαπᾶν is different. In John iii. 16 it is the love of divine compassion and creative and redeeming mercy: here, it is the love of selfish desire, cherishing avarice or pride. But then recurs our question, What is ὁ κόσμος? And it is no easy one to

κόσμον, μηδὲ τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ. εἰς τὴν ἀγαπᾶ τὸν κόσμον,

answer. If we reply so as to make it *personal*, we are met at once by the difficulty of τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ: from which we cannot escape by saying that these are as below ἡ ἐπιθυμία κ.τ.λ., for none can be said ἀγαπᾶν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, but the ἐπιθυμία is the ἀγάπη. Hence some have been led to take these three, ἡ ἐπιθ. τῆς σαρκός, ἡ ἐπιθ. τῶν ὀφθ., ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου, as put for the things desired, and the material of the ἀλαζονεία. So Calvin, Episcopius, Bengel: but this manifestly will not hold, owing to the opposition in ver. 17 between ὁ κόσμος κ. ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ on the one hand, and ὁ ποιοῦν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ on the other, which evidently requires that its first member should be personal as well as its second. And this last will be a weighty reason also against 2) taking ὁ κόσμος as merely material, the present order of things, in so far as it is alien from God. We are thus brought to a point, for our understanding of ὁ κόσμος, intermediate between personal and material. But then our question is, which of the two is to take the first place? Is ὁ κόσμος the world of matter, including the men who dwell in it, or is it the world of man, including matter as subordinate to man? If the former, we seem in danger of falling into a dualism, in which God and the world of matter should be set over against one another as independent existences: for thus the evil one, the ἔρχων τοῦ κόσμου, and his agents the κοσμοκράτορες, would themselves be included in the κόσμος, and adjuncts to the world of matter: a mode of thought which nowhere appears in the apostolic writings. We are thus narrowed to our other alternative, that of understanding ὁ κόσμος as of human persons, including the inferior ranks of created being, and the mass of inanimate matter which they inhabit. Let us see whether this view will meet the necessities of our text and of similar passages. Thus understood, the κόσμος was constituted at first in Adam, well-pleasing to God and obedient to Him: it was man's world, and in man it is summed up: and in man it fell from God's light into the darkness of selfish pursuits and ἐπιθυμῖαι κοσμικαί, in and by which man, who should be rising through his cosmic corporeal nature to God, has become materialized in spirit and dragged down so as to be worldly and sensual and like him who has led him astray, and who now, having thus subjected man's nature by temptation, has become the ἔρχων τοῦ κόσμου. And thus

the κόσμος is "*man and man's world*," in his and its fall from God. It was this world which God loved, in its enmity to Him, with the holy love of Redemption: it is this world which we are not to love, in its alienation from Him, with the selfish love of participation. And this κόσμος is spoken of sometimes as personal, sometimes as material, according to the context in which it occurs. To give but a few decisive examples; of the purely personal sense, John xv. 18, εἰ ὁ κόσμος ὑμᾶς μισεῖ κ.τ.λ., followed by εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν, where the singular is broken up into the individual persons: of the purely material, John xi. 9, εἰς τὴν περιπατῆ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, οὐ προσκίπτει, ὅτι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου τούτου βλέπει. And in passages like the present, these two senses alternate with and interpenetrate one another: e.g. in τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, the κόσμος is apparently material and local: in the opposition which follows, between the love of the world and the love of the Father, the personal meaning begins to be evident: in what follows, πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, which at first sight seems material, is explained by ἡ ἐπιθυμία τῆς σαρκός, κ.τ.λ., which are the subjective desires of the τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, not the things themselves: then, finally, in ver. 17 where ὁ κόσμος καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ is opposed to ὁ ποιοῦν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, it is plain that we have passed, by the transition in the last verse, from the material to the personal sense altogether. This account may serve to explain that which has given so much trouble to Commentators here, the question whether ἐπιθυμία is not put for the thing itself which is desired: the fact being that, the κόσμος including the material world in the men, the ἐπιθυμῖαι, which are in the men, are in the κόσμος, as well as the things of which they are the desires, and which are in their turn included in them. See on the whole, the long and elaborate note in Dürstendieck, the results of which are nearly the same as those arrived at above. To detail all the shades of opinion, would be hopeless: they will mostly be found, classified and discussed, in the note referred to, **not yet** (not = μήτε, but carrying with it an exclusive and disjunctive force, implying that what follows is not identical with what went before. That was spoken of the world itself, the totality: "have no love for this present world as such." But an escape from this prohibition might be sought by men who would deny in the abstract the charge of worldly-mindedness,

1 = ver 5 reff.
m Gal v. 16
Eph ii 3.
2 Pet ii. 18.
(Rom. xiii.
14.)

οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ¹ ἀγάπη ¹ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐν αὐτῷ ¹⁶ ὅτι πᾶν τὸ
ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἡ ^{mn} ἐπιθυμία τῆς ^m σαρκὸς καὶ ἡ ⁿ ἐπιθυμία

ABCKL
PN abc
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

n John viii. 44. Jude 16, 18 Rev. xiii. 14.

15. [ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ πατρὸς bef ουκ εστιν P : η αγ. τ. π. εν αυ. bef ουκ εστιν m.]
for πατρός, θεου AC d 13 harl æth Cyr: txt BKL[P]N rel vulg syrr copt arm Orig
Thl Ec Cypg Aug.

but devoted themselves to some one object of those followed by worldly men: so that it is necessary to add, after "Love not the world,"—"no, nor any thing in it") **the things in the world** (explained above: here, the objects after which the ungodly world's ἐπιθυμία reaches out, and on which its ἀλαζονεία is founded). **If any man** (see on the same expression above, ver. 1) **love the world, the love of the Father is not in him** (ἡ ἀγ. τοῦ πατρός, love to the Father, as opposed to his love to the world: not as Luther (2), Seb.-Schmidt, and Calov., the love which the Father hath shewed to us: nor as Bengel, "amor Patris erga suos et filialis erga Patrem." As Bede, "unum cor duos sibi tam adversarios amores non capit." Philo says, fragm. ex Joh. Damasceni sacris parallelis, p. 370 B (vol. ii. p. 649), ἀμῆχανον συνπαρᾶρχειν τὴν πρὸς κόσμον ἀγάπην τῇ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀγάπῃ, ὡς ἀμῆχανον συνπαρᾶρχειν ἀλλήλοις φῶς καὶ σκότος). 16.] Gives a reason for the assertion in ver. 15: viz. the entire separation from one another of the world and God. In order to understand clearly the following, it is necessary to define strictly the things mentioned, and to lay down explicitly the apposition between πᾶν τὸ ἐν τῷ κ., and the three particulars which follow as included in that category. By some Commentators this has been altogether passed over: by others very variously done. I apprehend it can only be rightly done by bearing in mind what was said before,—that, as the world is summed up in man, both those objective material things which are properly τὰ ἐν τῷ κ., and those inward subjectivities which are in man and grounded on his cosmic state, are regarded as being ἐν τῷ κ., and these pass into, and are almost interchanged with, one another. Now here, the three things spoken of as examples of τὰ ἐν τῷ κ., are all purely subjective,—ἐπιθυμία, ἐπιθυμία, ἀλαζονεία. But they are subjectivities having their ground in the objectivities of the ungodly world: the first ἐπιθυμία springs out of (see below) the σὰρξ, the human nature unrenewed by God: the second resides in that sense which takes note of outward things and so is inflamed by them; and the ἀλαζονεία is that belonging to ὁ βίος, the manner of life of worldly men among one another,

whereby pride as to display and pomp is cherished. Now each one of these three is included in, and includes in itself, love to the world: and he that loves the world falls into, walks after, becomes part of, these lusts, and this ἀλαζονεία, which is not of the Father but of the world. Loving the things of the world, he becomes conformed to the world, and following the lusts and pride which are in the world, he himself becomes one of the things in the world. Because every thing that is in the world, (namely, or for instance) the lust of the flesh (τῆς σαρκὸς) is not, as made by so many Commentators, an objective gen., so that the words should mean, "lust after the flesh," i.e. impure desire: this they include, but far more. The gen. is subjective, the flesh being that wherein the lust dwells, as in reff.: and in ἐπιθ. τῶν καρδιῶν, Rom. i. 24: cf. Prov. xxi. 26, Sir. v. 2, xviii. 30,—τοῦ σώματος, Rom. vi. 12,—τῶν ἀνθρώπων, 1 Pet. iv. 2: cf. 2 Pet. iii. 3, Jude 16, 18,—and cf. also such expressions as ἐπιθυμία κοσμικαί, Tit. ii. 12, and σαρκικαί, 1 Pet. ii. 11. The gen. after ἐπιθυμία is never, either in LXX or N. T., objective. Cf. some passages in which it occurs in other than the subjective sense, but never of the object desired: Eph. iv. 22, 2 Pet. ii. 10. In Phil. i. 23, only Origen reads after ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων, τοῦ ἀναλῶσαι instead of εἰς τὸ ἀν.), and the lust of the eyes (subjective gen. as before: the lust which the eye begets by seeing. In the apocryphal Testament of the twelve patriarchs (Fabricius, cod. Pseudepigr. Vet. Test. i. p. 522), among the seven πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης is enumerated the πνεῦμα δρόσεως, μεθ' ἧς γίνεται ἐπιθυμία. Sander, whose commentary, otherwise useful, is disfigured throughout by an ill-natured spirit of carping at Lücke and De Wette, denies the applicability of this passage, understanding ἐπιθυμ. τῶν ὀφθ. as (if I rightly take his meaning, which is not very clear) the desire of seeing, as of the man who would not come to the supper because he must go and see his five yoke of oxen. But his whole view of this difficult passage is very superficial), and the vain-glory of life (the ἀλάζων is one who lays claim to credit or glory which is not his own: see notes on Rom. i. 30 and

τῶν ὁφθαλμῶν καὶ ἡ ἡ ἀλαζονεία τοῦ βίου, οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ see Ezek.
 ἔκ τοῦ πατρός, ἀλλ' ἔκ τοῦ κόσμου ἐστίν. 17 καὶ ὁ Gen. ii. 6.
 κόσμος παράγεται, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία αὐτοῦ δὲ ποιῶν p James iv. 16
 τὸ ἑθελῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. 18 Παιδιά, only. WJsl.
 q = Luke viii. 14. r = 2 Tim. ii. 4. John iii. 31. vii. 23, 44 ch. iii. 10. iv. 1, &c. xvii. 7. Hos.
 i. 3 reff. t ver. 8 reff. v. 5 Aq. The
 vi. 6. Heb. x. 7, 9 (from Ps. xxxix. 8), 36. v John viii. 35. xii. 34. 2 Cor. ix. 9. Heb. vii.
 24. 1 Pet. i. 25 only. Ps. lxxxviii. 36. w = ver. 13. (ζῶν, 2 Tim.
 iii. 2.) s = ch.

16. (αλλα BC Thl.)

17. om αυτου A[P] 5. 13. 27-9 (86) arm-zoh Orig.

James iv. 16. βίος here as in ref. is men's way or course of life. So in Polyb. vi. 57. 6, ἡ περὶ τοὺς βίους ἀλαζονεία κ. πολυτέλεια: he having before observed, τοὺς βίους γενέσθαι πολυτελεστέους. This βίος comprehends in it the means of living and fashion of living,—table, furniture, equipage, income, rank; and the ἀλαζονεία arising out of these is that vainglorious pride, which is so common in the rich and fashionable), is not of (springs not from, has not as its source: see below) the Father (this name is again used for God, in reference to τέκνία and παῖδια above), but is of the world (has its origin from the world. It is necessary, in opposition to all such interpretations as that of Socinus, "valde dissident ab eis quæ Deus per Christum nos sectari jussit," and Rosenmüller, "non est in his perfectio moralis," to lay down very distinctly St. John's limits of thought and speech in this matter. "Through our whole Epistle," says Düsterdieck (cf. especially ver. 29, ch. iii. 7 ff., iv. 2 ff., 7 ff., v. 1 ff.), "runs the view, which also is manifest in the Gospel of St. John, that only the mind which springs from God is directed to God. He who is born of God, loves God, knows God (vv. 3 ff.), does God's will. God Himself, who first loved us, viz. in Christ His incarnate Son, begot in us that love which of moral necessity returns again to the Father, and of like necessity embraces our brethren also. This love is hated by the world, because it springs not from the world. It depends not on the world, any more than that perverted love which springs from the world and is directed towards the world, the lust of the flesh, &c., can be directed to the Father, or to God's children. So that John grasps in reality down to the very foundations of the moral life, when he reminds his readers of the essentially distinct origin of the love of the world, and the love of God. The inmost kernel of the matter is hereby laid bare, and with it a glimpse is given of the whole process of the love of the world, and the love of God, even to the end; and this end is now set forth expressly with extraor-

dinary power:" viz., in the next verse).

17.] And the world is passing away, and the lust of it (αὐτοῦ) is subjective again: not as Lücke, Neander, Sander, objective, "the lust after it," but as in ver. 16, which see on the construction: ἡ ἐπιθ. αὐτοῦ summing up in one the three which are there mentioned. παράγεται as in ver. 8: not declaring merely an attribute, that it is the quality of the world and its lust to pass away,—but a matter of fact, that it is even now in act so to pass. See Meyer on 1 Cor. vii. 31. It is no objection to this, that the μένει, which is opposed to παράγεται, contains, not a matter of fact, but a qualitative predication. This is made necessary by the words εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα which that clause contains: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever (in this latter member of the contrast, we have a clearly personal agent introduced: and therefore, as above remarked, we may expect that the former member also will have a like personal reference. But this expectation must not be pushed too far: seeing that in the κόσμος, the ungodly men, who are in all their desires and thoughts ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, are included. They and their lusts belong to, are part of, depend on, a world which is passing away. On the other hand, eternal fixity and duration belongs only to that order of things, and to those men, who are in entire accordance with the will of God. And among these is he that doeth that will, which is (see vv. 3—6) the true proof and following out of love towards Him. As God Himself is eternal, so is all that is in communion with Him: and this are they who believe in Him and love Him, and do His will).

18—28.] WARNING AGAINST ANTICHRISTS AND FALSE TEACHERS (vv. 18—23): AND EXHORTATION TO ABIDE IN CHRIST (vv. 24—28). The place which this portion holds will be best seen by strictly recapitulating. "God is light, and in Him is no darkness:" that (ch. i. 5) is the ground-tone of this whole division of the Epistle. In ch. i. 5—ii. 11, the Apostle shews, wherein the believer's

x Acts ii 17. x ἐσχάτη y ὥρα ἐστίν, καὶ καθὼς ἡκούσατε ὅτι z ἀντί-
 2 Tim. iii. 1. James v. 3. P N A B C L
 1 Pet. i. 5. Isa. ii. 2. y = John iv. 21, 23. Rev. iii. 10. xv. 7, 15. z here bis. ver. 22. ch. iv. d f g h j
 3. 2 John 7 only +. k l m n o
 13

18. om 1st και K.

om 1st οτι AL æth. rom. [P def.]

rec ins o bef αντι-

walking in light consists. At ver. 12, his style takes at once a hortatory turn. In his addresses to the various classes of his readers, the tone of warning is slightly struck by *γενικήκατε τὸν πονηρόν*: if indeed the whole form of assertion of an ideal state in each case do not of itself carry a delicate shade of warning. Hence the transition is easy to actual warning. And this in vv. 15—17 begins by general debortation from the love of the world as excluding the love of God, and now proceeds by caution against those in the world who would rob them of Him by whom alone walking in the light of God is made both possible and actual to us. The note of transition from the last verses is the *παράγεται*, here taken up by *ἐσχάτη ὥρα ἐστίν*. The world is passing away: and those temptations and conflicts of which ye have heard as belonging to its last period, are now upon you: those adversaries who would endanger your abiding in Him and being found in Him at His coming.

18.] Children (*παιδιά*, as before, is addressed not to any one class, but to all the readers), it is the last time (what is exactly the Apostle's meaning by these words? Clearly, *in some sense or other*, that it is the last period of the world. For we must at once repudiate such views as that of Bengel, who, strange to say, seems to understand it as "*extrema Johannis ætas*," and that of Steinhof, who explains it to be John's own time as the *close of the Apostolic age*: and even more decidedly that of Ec. (*ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἐσχάτον καὶ κατὰ τὸ χεῖριστον ἐκλαθεῖν, ὡς ὕταν φαμέν, εἰς ἐσχάτον ἀφίγμαι κακοῦ*), Schöttgen, Carpzov., Rosenm., for all other reasons, and on account of the saying 2 Tim. iii. 1, *ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐσπύσσονται καιροὶ χελεποί*. These then being cleared away, we come to the view of Grot.: "*ultimum tempus, ubi ad Judæos sermo est, significat tempus proximum excidio urbis ac templi et reipublicæ Judæorum*," proceeding to interpret the *ἀντίχριστοι* to be the many false Christs who arose in that period, and *ἀντίχριστος* to be the chief of them, Barchochabas. So Hammond, Mede, Lightfoot, Socinus: and similarly, but not so decidedly, Episcopius. But two sufficient replies may be given to this view. First, that thus these false Messiahs of the Jews must have gone forth *ἐξ ἡμῶν*, i. e. from the Chris-

tian Church, which they did not. Secondly, what would the approximation of the destruction of Jerusalem, viewed merely as a Jewish event (which it must be, on the hypothesis here, as *ἐσχάτη* would only be true as addressed to Jews), have to do with the subject of our Epistle?

And thus we have arrived at the views of those who recognize here the last age of the world, but are anxious to get rid of the idea that the Apostle, in thus speaking, regarded the coming of the Lord as near at hand, and endeavour to give some meaning to the expression which shall preclude this (to them) objectionable notion. Among these may be mentioned Calvin, and many of the elder Commentators (e.g. Aug., Bede, Schol. I., Ec., Thl.), who understand the *latter dispensation*: the time from Christ's advent in the flesh to His coming to judgment. This is (Calv.) "*ultimum tempus, in quo sic complentur omnia, ut nihil supersit præter ultimam Christi revelationem*." With this in the main, Beza, Wolf, Lucke, De Wette, Neander, Sander, also agree. But, apart from considerations of the unfitness of such an idea in the context, in which *παράγεται*, vv. 8, 17,—and our ver. 28, shew that it is the coming of the Lord which is before the mind of the Apostle,—this objection is fatal to it: that manifestly not this whole period itself, but some time within its limits is meant, from the nature of the sign given below, *ὅθεν γινώσκομεν κ.τ.λ.* If the whole Christian dispensation were intended by *ἐσχάτη ὥρα*, it would not be stated as a sign of its presence, that already there were many antichrists, but rather that already He was come who is to be the final revelation of the Father. The circumstance of there being already many antichrists, corresponds with a prophecy delivered by our Lord, not of the general character of the whole of the last dispensation, but of the particular character of the time preceding τὸ τέλος, to which prophecy and to which time the Apostle here beyond question alludes.

Düsterdieck's interpretation is founded in some respects on those of Socinus and Grotius, impugned above,—but with this difference, that he believes the expression to refer to the destruction of Jerusalem considered not as a Jewish, but as a Christian event: as opening that period of judgment, which shall precede the end, and the

χριστος ^a ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ^z ἀντίχριστοι πολλοὶ γεγό- ^a πtes, Matt.
^{xi. 3 xvi.}
^{11. John}
^{iv. 25. vii. 41, 42 al. Isa. v. 26.}

χριστος, with AKLN³ rel Thl Œc: om BCN¹ arm Orig₂ Epiph₂. [P def.]

length of which was no where laid down in our Lord's prophecies, nor revealed to the Apostles. But thus, with all his anxiety to escape the ascribing to the Apostles a mistaken view as to the nearness of the Lord's second coming, he does in fact fall unavoidably into that class of interpreters, by regarding that as left uncertain, of which the apostolic prophecies seem to speak with some certainty. And I believe that if we are to deal ingenuously both with words and with facts, we must recognize this difficulty here, as well as in such passages as 1 Cor. xv. 52; 2 Cor. v. 1 ff.; 1 Thess. iv. 15 ff.; and understand the Apostle to be speaking, as any one in any subsequent age of the Church might have spoken, and as we may speak now, of his time as being the last time, seeing that the signs of the last time were rife in it. How long it may please God to prolong this *ἐσχάτη ἔρα*, how long to permit the signs to continue which demonstrate each age of the church to have this character, is a question to which it was not given to him, and is not given to us, to reply. To him indeed many prophetic visions were given, and have been recorded for us; but what is their plain and unmistakable import, will only then be known, when it becomes necessary for the churches to see clearly the signs of His coming): and even as ye heard (in our preaching, when ye received the Gospel) that antichrist cometh (ἔρχεται, the present of ordained fixity: "*is to come*." But who, and what, is ἀντίχριστος? As far as the meaning of the word is concerned, it may mean, either 1) one who stands *against* Christ, or 2) one who stands *instead of* Christ. The latter meaning is strenuously maintained here by Grotius, who holds that our ἀντίχριστος here has nothing to do with the ἀντικείμενος of St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3: that being "qui Deo summo se hostem profectur," whereas this is "qui se Christum facit:" understanding this and what follows (see above) of the ψευδόχριστοι prophesied of by our Lord, Matt. xxiv. 5, 24. This he defends by ἀντιβασιλεύς, meaning a *viceroy*, not an adversary of the king. And as Düsterd. suggests, he might have cited more instances on his side: ἀντίψυχος, in Ignat. Smyrn. 10, p. 716; Eph. 21, p. 661; Polyc. 2, 6, pp. 721, 725, in the sense of ἀντιλυτρον: the Homeric ἀντίθεος, "equal to the gods:" ἀνθύπατος, a proconsul, &c. But seeing that the

other meaning, "adversarius Christi," is also upheld by precedent,—e.g. τύπος—ἀντίτυπος, ἀντιφιλόσοφος, ἀντιφάρμακον, ἀντίθεος in Homer also = enemy to the gods (so Chrys. on 2 Thess. ii. 4, ἀντίθεός τις ἔσται, κ. πάντας καταλύσει τοὺς θεούς, κ. κελεύσει προσκυνεῖν αὐτὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ θεοῦ), ἀντιφύλαξ, ἀντιμαχητής, ἀντικάτων (the book written by Cæsar against Cato), &c.,—it is clear that we cannot solve the doubt by philology alone, but must take into account other considerations. And first among these comes the fact, that St. John, who was acquainted with the form ψευδόχριστος, using as he does ψευδοπροφήτης, ch. iv. 1, never uses it, but always (see reff.) this word ἀντίχριστος. Is it not hence probable that he intended to signify, not a false Christ, but an antichrist? Next, we may fairly allege the ancient interpretations, as shewing how Greeks themselves understood the word. In these we do not find a vestige of the meaning ψευδόχριστος being attached to the term ἀντίχριστος (Hippolyt. de Antichristo, § 6, p. 734, Migne, κατὰ πάντα ἐξομοιοῦσθαι βούλεται ὁ πλάνος τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, is not really to the point; it does not give a meaning to ἀντίχριστος, but only alleges an undeniable feature in his character. The same may be said of Iren. Hær. v. 28. 2, p. 326, "ut sicut Christum adorient illum qui seducentur ab illo:" and of that of Hippolytus, de Christo et Antichristo, c. 49, p. 768, ἐξομοιοῦσθαι μέλλει τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ θεοῦ, and indeed of all the passages where the Greek Fathers, as Cyril, Theodoret, &c., speak of the likeness of antichrist to Christ), but every where (see e.g. the quotations in Suicer) they interpret ἀντίχριστος by ἐναντίος τῷ χριστῷ. The most decided is Thl., πάντας ὁ ψεύστης ἐναντίος ὢν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἦτο τῷ χριστῷ ἀντίχριστός ἐστι. So also the Latins: Tert. de præscr. hæc. 4, vol. ii. p. 16,—"qui antichristi, interim et semper, nisi Christi rebelles?"—Aug. in loc.,—"Latine Antichristus est, contrarius Christo:" and so Bede. And lastly our ver. 22 is quite against Grot.'s view, where ἀντίχριστος is interpreted, not ὁ προσποιούμενος χριστὸν εἶναι, but ὁ ἀρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα κ. τὸν υἱόν, which is explained, ver. 23, to be involved in ἀρνεῖσθαι τὸν υἱόν. Taking then (ὁ) ἀντίχριστος for Christ's adversary, I would refer to the disquisition and summary of opinions in the Prolegomena to Vol. III. on

b = Heb ii. 17. νασιν, ^b ὅθεν γινώσκομεν ὅτι ^x ἐσχάτη ^y ὥρα ἐστίν. ¹⁹ ^c ἐξ ABCKL
 viii 3 al. ^c ἐξήλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ^d ἐξ ἡμῶν, εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν P a b c
^c Matt. ii. 6. ^d ἐξήλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ^d ἐξ ἡμῶν, εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν d f g h j
^c Acts xv. 24. ^d ἐξήλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ^d ἐξ ἡμῶν, εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν k l m n
^c Deut. xiii. 13. ^d ἐξήλθαν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦσαν ^d ἐξ ἡμῶν, εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν 13
^d = Mark xiv. 20. see ver. 16.

γινώσκωμεν Α.

19. (ἐξήλθαν, so ABC.)

ἐξ ἡμῶν bef ἦσαν (2nd time) BC a (Syr) syr coptt

2 Thess. ii. 1 ff., where the reasons which have induced me to expect a personal Antichrist are given in full: as are also the indications furnished by prophecy, and by the history of the church and the world, as to his probable character and work), even now there have arisen many antichrists (not, "even now many have become antichrists:" this would rather be ἀντίχριστοι γεγόνασιν πολλοί, or πολλοί ἀντίχ. γεγ. By the πολλοί being thrown between the subst. and the verb, it is shewn to be only an epithet, not the subject of the proposition. But what are we to understand the Apostle as saying? Is this fact alleged as a presumption that δ ἀντίχριστος is near, these πολλοί ἀντίχριστοι prefiguring and heralding him,—or as a proof that he is come, being in fact the aggregate of these? The question is an important one, as affecting that of a personal or collective antichrist. And the first thing to be noticed in answering it is, that these ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί are explained by the Apostle himself, ver. 22 f., to be deniers of the Father and the Son: i. e. of the Son: and even more explicitly, ch. iv. 3, deniers that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. Here, however, this latter point is not yet brought out: here it is as ψεύσται that we hear of them: as *deniers* of the truth, which Truth is Jesus Christ, the Son of God: as not having the Spirit, which is truth and no lie, ver. 27. They are said to have gone forth from the Christian church, but not to have been ἐξ ἡμῶν, as their spirit ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστίν, ch. iv. 3. They are ἀντίχριστοι; their spirit is τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, ibid., of which the readers had heard that it should come, and it was in the world already. From much of this it might at first sight appear as if these ἀντίχριστοι in their aggregate formed δ ἀντίχριστος. But a nearer inspection will convince us that this cannot be so. (δ) χριστός and (δ) ἀντίχριστος stand over against one another, and analogy requires that if the one be personal, the other should be also. And in ch. iv. 3 we are not told that merely the spirit is ἀντιχρίστου, but that it is τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, the personal reference being still kept. Again, we have ἔρχεται, the present future of prophetic fixity, in both places, here and in ch. iv. 3, set against γεγόνασιν and ἐστίν: and the verb itself, in its prophetic sense, one regu-

larly used of Christ, as here of antichrist. So that our only refuge in order to consistent interpretation here, is to regard these ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί clothed with the attributes and having the spirit of δ ἀντίχριστος, as being his forerunners, in the sense of 2 Thess. ii. 7, τὸ γὰρ μυστήριον ἥδη ἐνεργεῖται τῆς ἀνομίας: meaning, as I have explained at length in the summary referred to above, that the antichristian principle was then, as it is now, and will be in every age, working, realizing, and concentrating itself from time to time, in evil men and evil books and evil days, but awaiting its final development and consummation in (δ) ἀντίχριστος, who shall personally appear before the coming of the Lord. In St. John's time these ἀντίχριστοι πολλοί were to be seen in the early heretical teachers whose false and corrupting doctrine and practice was beginning to trouble the church. See again, Dusterdieck's long and elaborate note, in which he has discussed all the difficulties of the subject. He in the main agrees with the conclusion given above; as do also De Wette, Lücke, Erdmann): from whence we know that it is the last time (these words are a formal statement of the connexion between the first and second members of the foregoing sentence, which without them it would be left for the reader to supply in his mind). 19.] These antichrists are designated as having been formerly attached to the Christian church, but never really members of it. They had not that communion with the Father and the Son in which the communion of Christians with one another really consists, inasmuch as they deny the Father and the Son. They went out from among us, but they were not of us (it is plain that the prep. ἐξ must in this sentence be taken in two different meanings: first, with ἐξήλθον, in the mere local reference, and even so our Lord Himself uses the expression, John viii. 42, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξήλθον καὶ ἤκα, words which are varied, John xiii. 3, by ἀπό, and xvi. 27 "by παρά. And in xiii. 3, the local meaning is stamped as the true one by the addition of καὶ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ὑπάγει. On the other hand, ἐκ with εἶναι is very frequently used by our Apostle to denote that inner and vital dependence which betokens origin: cf. John iii. 81, vii. 17, viii. 23,

^a ἐξ ἡμῶν, μεμενῆκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν ἄλλ' ἵνα ^e φανερω- ^e John iii. 21. ² Cor. iii. 3.

Tert Opt Ambr.; txt AKL[P]N rel vulg arm Clem Orig Cyr-jer Epiph Thl Æc Iren-int Orig-int Cyprr Lucif.

44, &c. It is clear then from this double meaning of ἐξ, that ἐξῆλθαν ἐξ ἡμῶν should be rendered with Aug. and Bede, "ex nobis exierunt," and not "ex nobis prodierunt," as vulg. The idea of origin should be kept out of view, as necessarily not contained in the words, which are to be understood as Æc. and Thl., γεγονότες μαθηταὶ ἀπέστρεψαν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ ἰδίας βλασφημίας ἐξεύρον. Aug. and Bede illustrate their relation to the body of Christ by a homely but instructive comparison: "quandoquidem adhuc curatur corpus ipsius (Domini nostri Jesu Christi), et sanitas perfecta non erit nisi in resurrectione mortuorum; sic sunt in corpore Christi, quomodo humores mali. Quando evomuntur, tunc relevatur corpus: sic et mali quando exeunt, tunc ecclesia relevatur. Et dicit quando eos evomit atque projicit corpus, ex me exierunt humores isti, sed non erant ex me. Quid est, non erant ex me? Non de carne mea præcisi sunt, sed pectus mihi premebant dum inessent." Aug. in Ep. Joh. Tract. iii. 4, vol. iii. p. 1999. On this, see more below): for if they had been of us (ἐξ ἡμῶν is emphatically repeated), they would have remained with us (the E. V. inserts "no doubt," as representing the "utique" of the vulgate, which was the result of the futile endeavour to render the Greek verbatim, and was intended to give the ἔν. In some places this endeavour has produced results more serious than here. In John iv. 10, σὺ ἂν ᾔτησας is rendered "tu forsitan petiisses," and by the Rheims version, "Thou perhaps wouldest have asked of Him;" in John v. 46, "si enim crederetis Mosi, crederetis forsitan et mihi:" see also Vulgate, and Rheims, and Bishops' Bible, in John viii. 42, Matt. xi. 23. I am indebted for this useful remark to the Rev. Henry Craik of Bristol. The sense is, if they had really belonged to our number, had been true servants of Christ, they would have endured, and would not have become ἀντίχριστοι: their very becoming so, proves the unreality of their Christian profession. This point is now brought out in what follows): but (the ellipsis is variously supplied: by ἐξῆλθαν from above; so the Syr., Bengel, Lücke, al.: by τοῦτο πεποιήκασιν, πεπόνθησαν, as Æc., Thl.: "hoc factum est," as Socinus: "hæc facit Deus," as Calvin. All these in fact come to the same, provided that we keep ἵνα to its true telic meaning,

which must imply a *doer*; and that doer, God. So that it will be better, as the divine purpose must be understood in the depth of the meaning, whatever be supplied, to take the simplest supplement, viz. the ἐξῆλθαν, which is already the expressed verb of the sentence) in order that they may be made manifest, that all are not of us (the construction is a mixed one, compounded of two, 1) ἵνα φανερωθῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἦσαν ἐξ ἡμῶν, and 2) ἵνα φανερωθῇ ὅτι οὐκ εἰσιν πάντες ἐξ ἡμῶν: and the meaning is, that by their example it may be made manifest that all (who are among us) are not of us. This is shewn by the change of tense from ἦσαν to εἰσιν: and by the impossibility of giving any adequate grammatical sense to the words on the other hypothesis, viz. that πάντες means "they all" viz. the ἀντίχριστοι. For, of the two ways in which the words have been taken, we have 1) that of the E. V. "that they were not all of us," which leaves open the inevitable conclusion that *some of them are of us*. Æcumenius indeed tries to make the distinction in another way,—τούτῃστι κατὰδὲλοι γένονται ὅτι πάντα ἀπηλοτριώνται ἡμῶν καὶ μετὰ τῶν οὐχ ἡμετέρων προσεκολλήθησαν. εἰσι γὰρ τινες ἐν τοῦτοις καὶ οὐχ ἐξ ἡμῶν ὄντες, οἳ δηλαδὴ συνῆψαν ἑαυτοὺς οἱ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξελθόντες. . . . ἡμῶν γὰρ ἀπορβάντες τὸν οἶκόν, ἄλλοις ἐκολλήθησαν τοῖς ἀλλοτρίοις ἡμῶν. But this is manifestly a mistake, and is in fact a confounding of ἐξ ἡμῶν εἰσιν with ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθαν, which the Apostle expressly distinguishes. Then 2) we have the way proposed by Socinus, to take οὐ πάντες for "nulli;" not "non omnes" but "omnes non:" in fact making οὐκ belong to the predicate, εἰσιν ἐξ ἡμῶν, not to the subject, πάντες; which is the case in Rom. iii. 20, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ. But it may fairly be replied here, that whereas in that passage there is no ambiguity whatever, the words πᾶσα σὰρξ falling emphatically at the end, here there would be every chance of the reader mistaking the meaning, no such stress lying on the πάντες as would lie if the arrangement were οὐκ εἰσιν ἐξ ἡμῶν πάντες, or πάντες οὐκ εἰσιν ἐξ ἡμῶν. So that our only refuge seems to be, to believe that the Apostle makes their φανέρωσις the proof not that they were not of us, but that *all* are not of us, scil. who are commonly found among us. This is the rendering of the principal

θῶσιν ὅτι οὐκ εἰσὶν πάντες ^d ἐξ ἡμῶν. ²⁰ καὶ ὑμεῖς

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m n a
13

modern Commentators: cf. Lücke, De Wette, Dusterdieck, Huther. See on the sense, 1 Cor. xi. 19, *δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἰρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἵνα (καὶ) οἱ δοκίμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν*. It is not my intention to go at length into the question as to the dogmatic consequences which have been deduced from this verse. It may be sufficient to refer my readers to the principal sources of the two antagonistic opinions as to the final perseverance (not of the elect, which is a truism, but) of those who have been once truly children of God. They will find the most complete statement of the predestinarian view as founded on our passage, in Augustine, *De dono perseverantiæ*, 8, 9 (19, 21), vol. x. p. 1003 f. and *De correptione et gratia*, 9 (20), p. 928. In the former passage he says, "Hominibus videtur omnes qui boni apparent fideles perseverantiam usque in finem accipere debuiss. Deus autem melius esse iudicavit, miscere quosdam non perseveraturos certo numero sanctorum, ut quibus non expedit in hujus vitæ tentatione securitas, non possint esse securi, 1 Cor. x. 12. Ex duobus autem piis cur huic donetur perseverantia usque in finem, illi autem non detur, inscrutabiliora sunt judicia Dei. Illud tamen fidelibus debet esse certissimum, hunc esse ex prædestinatiis, illum non esse. Nam si fuissent ex nobis, ait unus prædestinatorum, qui de pectore Domini bibebat hoc secretum, mansissent utique nobiscum." See also Calvin h. l., who sums up all thus, "Quare non immerito dicit, ubi efficac est Dei vocatio, illic certain perseverantiam fore." The other side is ably stated by Didymus (cited in Dusterd.), whose conclusion is, "Igitur, licet figurate dicta sint hæc, attamen voluntariam necessitatem ostendunt, a quorum et cohabitatione quæ potest esse malis viris cum bonis abscesserint, dum vitio suo tales sint facti. Non igitur oportet intelligi contrarietatem hoc verbo significari naturarum." The various opponents of the predestinarian view as such, have had recourse, as so often, to various unworthy artifices and untenable explainings away of words, to escape from the inference pressed on them. Thus Socinus and Episcopus lay stress on the fact that ἦσαν is imperfect, not perfect: "non enim Apostolus dicit antichristos illos nunquam antea vere Christianos fuisse, sed tantum quod tum, vel jam antequam antichristus se esse profiterentur, non erant ii, qui esse debebant," &c. And so even Grot. ("qui ista crepabant, jam deseruerant Christianam professionem . . . Si illi tunc ex animo fuissent

Christiani cum ista inciperent, non deseruissent cœtus nostros"). Calov. again tries to escape from the inference, by making ἐξ ἡμῶν apply not to Christians in general, but to the Apostles only.

The best account of the whole matter is found in Dusterdieck's long note, in which he has thoroughly gone over all the opinions and given his own conclusion. It is, in the main, as follows. The Apostle is speaking here not dogmatically but ethically. As Didymus above, if there is a necessity in the *μεμενῆκεσαν*, it is a "necessitas voluntaria." As Aug. in his comm. here (written sixteen years before the treatise *De dono perseverantiæ*), "de voluntate sua quisque aut Antichristus, aut in Christo est. Aut in membris sumus, aut in humoribus malis. Qui se in melius commutat, in corpore membrum est: qui autem in malitia permanet, humor malus est: et quando exierit, relevabuntur qui premebantur." We must take these words, ver. 19, in intimate connexion with the enunciation of this whole portion of the Epistle, ch. i. 5—7. The object of this portion is, ch. i. 3, that ye may have fellowship with us, in that we have fellowship with the Father and the Son. This aim penetrates all the warning and exhortation vv. 18—28. This fellowship depends on the walking in light, i. e. on knowledge of the truth as regards ourselves and God, and love to God and the brethren. He who departs from the truth, he who loves not God and the brethren, belongs not to this fellowship, and shews that he belongs not to it. If he had belonged to it, he would have held fast his walk in the light, as shewn by these indications. This is the human side, on which our passage regards the act and fact. There is also a divine side. They who attain eternal life are given by the Father to the Son, and no man can come to the Son except the Father draw him (John vi. 37, 44, 65, xvii. 6), and such are kept by God (ib. xvii. 11); but also we read that they believe on the Son, receive the word of the Son, and keep themselves (John vi. 40, xvii. 6 f., i. 12, James i. 27). And so again on the other side, they who remain at last excluded from eternal life, are thus excluded not only by God's decree, but by their own evil choice and will. The words cited above, John vi. 65, were spoken by our Lord with direct reference to the traitor Judas: but on the other hand St. John gives notices of the ethical development of Judas which leave no doubt that his depravity went hand in hand with God's judgment on him. Judas

^f χρίσμα ἔχετε ἀπὸ ^g τοῦ ἁγίου, καὶ ^h οἴδατε * ^h πάντα. f ver. 27 bis
only. Exod.
xxix. 7 al.
h Jude 5.

g = John vi 69. Acts iii 14.

20. om και B sah.

* πάντες B[P]N sah : πάντα ACKL rel vss.

was covetous: his heart was inclined to mammon; hence he understood not the love of Mary when she anointed Jesus with her precious ointment: he grudged his Lord this token of love: he could not abide with Christ, because he shut his heart through greed, through love of the world, against the love of Christ; for the knowledge of the Lord, faith in Him, fellowship with Him, are all summed up in Love. Thus we see that in the rejection, as in the acceptance of eternal life, the two factors, God's will and man's will, are to be regarded in their ethical connexion only. In order to that knowledge of God, which is eternal life, man must be *taught* of God (John vi. 45): but man must also *learn* of God. And the more St. John sets forth the essential nature of this knowledge of God and Jesus Christ as *ethical*, the more does he recognize, in putting forward God's will in the matter, man's will also. Christ is the Saviour of the whole world, ch. ii. 2, iv. 14. But in the personal appropriation of this universal salvation, not all really take it to themselves,—and many, who have taken it, fall away again, because they do not keep the grace given, do not abide in Christ, do not walk in the light. This last is by no means denied by St. John when he says "if they had been of us they would have remained with us." The words set forth an ideal (ὅν, not γὰρ or a similar particle) similar to that in ch. ii. 5, iii. 9, v. 18. As in no one of those places can the Apostle possibly mean, that a true believer, one really born of God, has perfect love to God and cannot sin (for what then would ch. ii. 1 mean?),—so neither here can he mean that whoever once inwardly and truly belongs to the communion of believers cannot by any possibility fall from it. I have abridged Dusterd.'s remarks, and thereby, I fear, not increased their perspicuity. Those who are able (and I would hope, for the sake of English theology, that this number is daily increasing) should by all means give some days to the thorough study of them).

20, 21.] The Apostle puts them in mind, in an apologetic form, of the truth which they as Christians possessed, and the very possession of which, not the contrary, was his reason for thus writing to them. This reminiscence carries at the same time with it the force of an exhortation, as so many of the ideal statements on Christian per-

fection in our Epistle. What they *have* in the ideal depth of their Christian life, that they ought to have in living and working reality. And (hardly as Lücke, logically adversative to what preceded: so De Wette (ἀβέρ), and many others. Huther ascribes this interpretation virtually to Dusterdieck, but wrongly: for the latter keeps καὶ in its simple copulative meaning, and only asserts that what adversative meaning there is consists in the *sense*, not in the outward expression. "John," he says, "denotes only the passage to a new particular, without distinctly marking its adversative relation to the last") ye (expressed, as emphatic: see above) **have an anointing** (χρίσμα) is properly the oil or ointment with which the anointing takes place, not the act itself of anointing. For this we have in English no word adequate to the necessity of the passage: "unguent" is the nearest approach, but is still inadequate. It is certain that in later Greek there arose a considerable confusion between verbal nouns in -μα and their cognates in -σις. Thus in Exod. xxix., the ἔλαιον τοῦ χρίσματος, ver. 7, becomes the ἔλαιον τῆς χρίσεως, in ver. 21. On the meaning, see below) from the Holy One (viz. from Christ, the δίκαιος of our ver. 1, the ἄγνός of ch. iii. 3, the ἅγιος of Acts iii. 14, and ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ of John vi. 69: cf. also Rev. iii. 18, where the Laodicean church is counselled to buy of Christ κολλήριον ἐγγρῆσαι τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, ἵνα βλέπῃς. This is agreed to by almost all Commentators: even Socinus says that the Apostle "de Deo simul et Christo loqui, non secus ac si ambo una tantum persona essent:" and Schlichting concedes that the words *may* be understood of Christ), **and know all things** (the full and perfect knowledge of Christian truth is the ideal completion of those who have this anointing. This of course must not be understood as actually predicated of these readers: but the expression explains itself as referring to all things needful for right action in the matter under consideration: q. d. πάντα ταῦτα. So most Commentators. "Quod autem omnia dicit novisse, non universaliter capi, sed ad præsentis loci circumstantiam restringi debet," Calv. See note on John xvi. 13: cf. also 1 Cor. i. 5, viii. 1; Eph. i. 18; Col. ii. 2. Some understand, all things necessary to Christian life and godliness: so Ec., Wolf, Bengel, Neander: "quæ ut

1 ch. iii. 15.
Rev. xviii.
22, xxii. 3.
κ = Rom. i. 25.
2 Thess ii. 11.
1 = ver. 16
m ch. i. 10 reff.
n constr. ch.
v. 8.

21 οὐκ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἀλλ' ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν, καὶ ὅτι ¹πᾶν ^kψεύδος ¹ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας ⁱοὐκ ἔστιν. 22 τίς ἐστὶν ὁ ^mψεύστης, ⁿεἰ μὴ ὁ ^oἀρ-

ABCKL
P n a b c
d f g h j
k i m n o
13

o w. ὅτι, here only.—folded by neg., see Luke xx. 27. Soph. Antig. 438, 439.

21. om παν C.

homines a Spiritu Sancto uncti doctique tum ad salutem, tum ad cavendos illos seductorum et antichristorum errores scire debetis," Wolf. The alternative reading πάντες would mean "ye all know it;" a sense which hardly seems to be applicable.

But now the question recurs, What is this *χρῖσμα*, and what leads the Apostle to use this peculiar expression here? The reply to the latter question is probably, as Bengel, "Alludit appellatio *chrismatis* ad antichristi nomen, ex opposito." The Apostle sets his readers, as *χριστούς*, anointed of God, over against the *ἀντίχριστοι*. Then as to the nature of the *χρῖσμα*, we can hardly fail to be right in interpreting it of the *Holy Ghost*. For "Christ received the *Holy Ghost* without measure (John iii. 34): on Him the *Holy Ghost* abode (ib. i. 33): God *ἐχρίσεν αὐτὸν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (Acts x. 38). Christ baptizeth with the *Holy Ghost* (John i. 33): He sends the *Holy Ghost*, who takes of His and shews it to believers (John xv. 26, xvi. 14, Acts ii. 33). And seeing that the Son hath all which the Father hath, the Father is said to send forth the Spirit of His Son into the hearts of His children (Gal. iv. 6: cf. Eph. iii. 16, Phil. i. 19, 2 Cor. iii. 17 ff.), and this, at the prayer, in the name, through the mediation, of the Son (John xiv. 16, xvi. 7 f.): the Father anoints believers by giving them His Spirit (2 Cor. i. 21 f.), as He has anointed the Son with the *Holy Ghost*. And hence the Spirit, which we have received, is the token that we are in the Father (ch. iii. 24), and in the Son (ii. 27), that we are children of God (Rom. viii. 14 ff., Gal. iv. 6). The *Holy Ghost* teaches the faithful the truth and keeps them in it: that truth, in the knowledge of which they have eternal life, having thereby the Father and the Son." Düsterdieck, p. 354 f. This anointing, by virtue of which they are Christ's and the Father's, and without which a man is none of Christ's (Rom. viii. 14, 9), in respect of which they are *χριστοί*, the *ἀντίχριστοι* attack in its very root, and would rob them of, thereby severing them from the Son and from the Father: from light and truth and life. And this very *χρῖσμα* is the means and weapon whereby *they* must be detected and resisted). 21.] I did not write to you

(see on ἔγραψα above, vv. 13, 14. It may refer either to what has immediately preceded, or to the whole Epistle: here probably to the immediately preceding) because ye know not the truth, but because ye know it, and because no lie is of the truth (i. e. coupling the fact of your knowledge of the truth with the fact that no lie is of the truth, I wrote to supply the link between these two, to point out to you the lie and the liar, that you might at once act on that your knowledge of the truth, and not listen to them that deceive you. Thus we keep ὅτι and καὶ ὅτι correlative. So Justiniani, Schlichting, and Neander: but almost all the expositors take the second ὅτι as dependent on οἴδατε, "because ye know the truth, and (also know) that no lie, &c." So Aug., Bede, Erasmus, Grot., Calvin, Luther, Estius, Corn.-a-lap., Socinus, Episcopius, Wolf, Whitby, Hammond, Lücke, Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Sander, Düsterd., Ruther, and many others. But this surely does violence to the construction: ὅτι οἴδατε αὐτήν, καὶ ὅτι . . . οὐκ ἔστιν. ὅτι twice repeated, and each time with an indicative verb, surely must be kept to one and the same meaning in both clauses. Nor does the sense gain anything, as Düsterd. maintains. For their knowing the truth and their knowing that no lie is of the truth, the one a cognition of God and His Son, the other a mere apprehension of a truism, are no logical correlatives, nor can be concurrent reasons for the Apostle's writing: whereas the two facts, the one, their knowing the truth, the other, that no lie belongs to that truth, are concurrent reasons for the Apostle's writing: viz. that he may set plainly before them what the lie is, that they may at once discern their entire alienation from it. And this accordingly he proceeds to do in the next verse. As regards the construction of πᾶν ψεύδος . . . οὐκ ἔστιν, it is not, as so many of the Commentators, a Hebraism, but merely that common one of attaching the negative to the predicate, instead of to the subject. πᾶν ψεύδος (every lie) ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἔστιν (is excluded from being of the truth)). 22.] Who is the liar (the question passes from the abstract τὸ ψεύδος to the concrete ὁ ψεύστης. "Quis est illius mendacii reus?" as Ben-

νούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ χριστός; οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἁντίχριστος, ὁ ἄρνούμενος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱόν.
 23 πᾶς ὁ ἄρνούμενος τὸν υἱὸν οὐδὲ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει.
 ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει. 24 ὑμεῖς δ

p ver. 18 reff
 q = Matt. x. 33
 bis. Luke
 xii 9. Acts
 iiii. 13. 14. vii
 35. 1 Tim.
 v. 8. 2 Tim.
 ii. 12. 2 Pet.
 ii. 1. 2 John
 9. Jude
 r = ch. v. 12

4. Rev. ii. 13. iii. 8.

22. aft αρνουμενος ins και (but marked and erased) Ν¹.

23. rec om 2nd clause, with KL rel harl(Tischd) sah(prob) Ec: ins ABC[P]N a b²
 j 13. 36 vss Clem Orig₃ Ath Cyr-jer Cyr Thl Vig Pel. (*The omission arose from the*
τον πατερα χει occurring twice.)

24. rec aft υμεις ins ουν, with KL rel Thl Ec Aug: om ABC[P]N a 13 vulg syr

gel. The Apostle proceeds to identify the utterer of the *ψεύδος* of which he has just spoken. We have a similar question in ch. v. 4, 5: where after describing the victory that overcometh the world, he rejoins *τίς ἐστιν ὁ νικῶν κ.τ.λ. εἰ μὴ ὁ*, as here. Some have neglected the article altogether; so Luther, and the E. V.; others have given it merely the force of pointing out as “insigne:” so Calv. (“nisi hoc censeatur mendacium, aliud nullum haberi posse”), Seb.-Schmidt; Socin. (“mendacium, quo nihil possit esse majus”). De Wette (‘diese Irrthüm gilt dem Ἰηρ. statt aller, scheint ihm alle andern einzu[schließen]’). So also Lücke, and Huther. But there can be little doubt that the *ὁ* refers as above to the preceding *ψεύδος*, but (“if not:” so *εἰ μὴ* in ref. and Luke xvii. 18, Rom. xi. 15, 1 Cor. ii. 11, 2 Cor. ii. 2) **he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ** (lit. “denieth (to the effect) *that Jesus is not the Christ.*” “This *excepting εἰ μὴ*,” says Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 561, “is frequently found after *τί* (= *τί ἄλλο*), and also after *οὐδέ* *ἄλλος*. Hom. hymn. Cer. 78, *οὐδέ τις ἄλλος αἴτιος ἀθανάτοισιν, εἰ μὴ νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς*: Aristoph. Eq. 1106, *μηδὲν ἄλλ’ εἰ μὴ ἔσθιαι*: Xen. Ec. ix. 1, *τί δέ, εἰ μὴ ὑπισχνεῖτό γε ἐπιμελήσεσθαι*; Cf. Cyr. i. 4. 13.” So the Greeks often, bringing out more distinctly the negative proposition involved in the verb of negation,—so Demosth. p. 871: *ὥς δ’ οὐκ ἐκείνος ἐγέωργει τὴν γῆν, οὐκ ἡδύνατ’ ἀρνηθῆναι*,—or prohibition,—so Herod. iii. 128, *Δαρείος ἀπαγορεύει ὑμῖν ἡ δорυφορέειν Ὀροίτεια*. See Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 410. On the meaning, see below)? **This** (the *ψεύστης* just described; ὁ ἄρνούμενος, &c. below being appositional, and an additional consequence from his former denial) is the **antichrist** (on the personal interpretation, see above, ver. 18. *ὁ ἁντίχρ.* is obviously here used not as predicating the one person in whom the character shall be finally and centrally realized, but as setting forth identity of character with him, and participation in the same development of the antichristian principle. Nor is this, as Huther charac-

terizes it, a “willkürliche Umbeutung und Ergänzung,” but something of the kind must be understood, whichever way antichrist be taken, collective or personal), **who denieth the Father and the Son** (it is implied then, that the denying Jesus to be the Christ, is equivalent to denying the Father and the Son. And this the Apostle carefully asserts in the next verse). 23.] **Every one that denieth the Son, neither hath he the Father** (the *οὐδέ* is exclusive and climacteric; not only hath he denied the Son, but he cannot hold, possess the Father): **he that confesseth the Son hath also the Father**. As nearly the whole of this Epistle, so especially such an assertion as this, formed a battle-field for the old rationalists. Some of the early Commentators and Fathers imagining that *Jewish* error was indicated by the denying that Jesus is the Christ, the idea has been again taken up by Semler, al., and pressed in the anti-trinitarian interest. Grot., Socinus, Episcopus, all evade the Apostle’s words by inadequate or far-fetched interpretations, understanding the expressions in this verse, of not obeying the teaching, not following the example, &c. of the Son, and by consequence of the Father. But the deeper and truer meaning of the Apostle’s words has been recognized by all the better Commentators, with some variations from one another. While some, as Beza, Calov., Seb.-Schmidt, mark perhaps too precisely the doctrinal character of the words, others, as Lücke and De Wette, make their force consist too much in an ideal and economical relation between the divine Persons. Still all are agreed, that that which is spoken of is the revelation of the Father by the Son only, and that he who rejects this in its fulness rejects all that can be known of the real essence and nature of the Father Himself; “nempe quia Deus se totum nobis in Christo fruendum dedit,” as Calvin. “The antichrists denied that Jesus, the definite Person whom the Apostles had seen, heard, and handled, is the Christ. In whatever sense this denial is to be taken,—the Apostle speaks merely of the fact, as known to the readers;—at all

s = ver 7 reff
 t see John xv.
 7
 u John, here
 only. Luke
 xxiv. 49
 Acts, Paul,
 Heb., passim. 2 Pet. iii. 4, 9. Esth. iv. 7.

ἡκούσατε ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἐν υἱῶν ἐμὲν τω. ἐὰν ἐν υἱῶν
 ἐμὲν δ' ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἡκούσατε, καὶ υμεῖς ἐν τῷ υἱῷ καὶ
 ἐν τῷ πατρὶ ἐμενεῖτε. 25 καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία

ABCKL
 FN a b c
 d f g h j
 k l m n o
 13

arm Cyr Bede. ακηκοατε (twice) N. om 2nd εν N1. ακηκοατε bef 2nd
 ap αρχης N vulg Syr coptt. om last εν B vulg Melet-ap-Epiph lat-f: ins ACKL
 [P]N rel demid syr sah Cyr Thl Œc. transp uio and πατρι N c h 5.38.80. 96 Syr.

events there is involved in it a denial of the Son of God; because it is only as the incarnate Son of God (ch. iv. 2), that Jesus is the Christ. And in the denial of the Son is involved necessarily the denial of the Father, since the Father cannot be known without the Son, and the Father cannot be perceived, believed on, loved, by any man, without the Son, or otherwise than through the Son, i. e. the Son manifested in the flesh, the Christ, which is, Jesus. So that in St. John's development of the argument there are three essentially connected points: denial of the Christ, of the Son, of the Father. The middle link of the chain, the denial of the Son of God, shews how the denial of the Father is of necessity involved in the denial of Christ. And the cogency of this proof is made yet more stringent by another equally unavoidable process of argument. The antichristian false doctrine consists mainly in a negation, in the denying of the fundamental Christian truth, that Jesus is the Christ. But in this is involved the denial of the essence of the Son as well as of the Father, and again in this denial is involved the losing, the virtual *not having* of the Son and of the Father. In the sense of St. John, we may say, taking the first and last steps of his argument and leaving out the intervening ones: *He who denieth that Jesus is the Christ, hath not the Father*. And this necessary connexion between denying and not having, is perfectly clear, the moment we understand the ethical character, the living realism, of St. John's way of regarding the subject. As (ver. 23) we cannot separate the knowledge and confession of the Christ, the Son, the Father, from the *having*, the real possession of, the practical fellowship with, the actual remaining in the Son and the Father, so conversely, together with the denial is necessarily given the *not-having*; together with the loss of the truth of the knowledge, the loss of the life which consists in that knowledge (John xvii. 3). In such a connexion, the *confession* of the truth is as essential on the one side, as the *denial* on the other. Each is the necessary manifestation of the belief or unbelief hidden in the heart. And this *ὁμολογεῖν* is not to be understood of the 'confessio cordis,

vocis, et operis' (Bede), but only as ch. i. 9, of the confession of the mouth (*στομάτι* *ὁμολογεῖται*, Rom. x. 10, see John xii. 42). It is parallel with *φέρειν διδασχὴν*, 2 John 7, 10; and indicates the definite utterance of the doctrine which was made known by the apostolic preaching, ver. 24.' Düsterdieck.

24, 25.] *Exhortation to perseverance in the truth delivered to them, and statement of the promise connected with it*: connected with the foregoing by the *ὁμολογεῖν*, as involving an *ἀκούσαι*: see the concluding sentence of Düsterdieck above. *Ye* (the *υμεῖς* stands alone, serving to mark more distinctly the change of person. We have a similar anacoluthon in ver. 27. Kühner, Gram. ii. p. 156, says: "The word which exceeds in significance the other members of the sentence, is sometimes with rhetorical emphasis not only put at the beginning of the sentence, but also expressed in a form calculated to shew that it is the subject underlying the whole sentence, although the grammatical structure would require another and dependent case. So Plato, Cratyl. p. 403, A, δ δὲ Ἀιδης, οἱ πολλοὶ μὲν μοι δοκοῦσιν ἀπολαμβάνειν τὸ ἀειδὲς προσεῖρησθαι τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ: and ib. p. 404, Περίεργατα δέ, πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ τοῦτο φοβοῦνται τὸ ὄνομα." Some however explain the position of *υμεῖς* here by a trajection: so Bengel, "antitheton est in pronomine, ideo adhibetur trajectio;" and so Beza, Socinus, and even De Wette. But the other is more probable),—let that which ye heard from the beginning, abide in you (i. e. not merely as Thl., φυλάττετε παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, but as in ch. iii. 9, σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει, the truth respecting the Father and the Son once heard is regarded as a seed, dropt in and abiding in the man. ὅτι ἀρχῆς, necessarily bound here to the subjects of ἡκούσατε, just as it is necessarily bound in ch. i. 1, to the subject of ἦν,—as Beza, "Ex quo institui cœpistis in primis christianæ religionis rudimentis"). If that which ye heard from the beginning abide (aor. in the sense of the futurus exactus, "shall have abode." The result in the apodosis will be brought about by the accumulative accomplishment of the supposition) in you, ye also (on your part;

ν ἦν αὐτὸς ὡς ἐπηγγείλατο ἡμῖν, ὃ τὴν ἡ ζωὴν τὴν αἰώνιον. ν attr. 2 Cor x 13.
 26 ταῦτα ἔγραψα ὑμῖν περὶ τῶν ὧν πλανώντων ὑμᾶς. 27 καὶ ὡς James i.
 2 ὑμεῖς τὸ α χρίσμα ὃ ἔλάβετε ὅ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μένει ἐν ὑμῖν, x Matt. xix.
 καὶ οὐ ὅ χρειαν ἔχετε ὅ ἵνα τις διδάσκει ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὡς 16 ii, 29 i.
 and passim. Acts xiii. 46, 48. Paul. Rom. ii. 7 al⁸ Dan xi 2. xxii 40.
 z anacol. Luke xxi. 6. Rom. vii. 3 al. Winer, edn. 6, § 63 i. 2. d. Luke x. 25.
 22 reff. c John ii 25. xi 30. only note. a ver. 20. y ch. i 8 reff.
 b ch. iii.

25. υμιν B m¹ am: txt ACKL[P]N rel vss Thl Ec Aug Bede.

αιωνιαν B.

26. aft ταυτα ins δε N Syr æth(et hoc).

27. for 1st χρισμα, χαρισμα B 10².

with KL rel syr Ec: txt (A)BC[P]N d¹ m 13 vulg (Syr) coptt æth arm Ath Cyr Did
 Thl Aug.—μενετω [P] a d m 13. 27-9. 66². 68-9. 81. 137 vulg syr Thl Aug: ημιν Α¹?
 διδασκει (for -κη) CKL c d f m¹ n 13. ελαβατε B¹. rec εν υμιν bef μενει,
 for αλλ' ως, αλλα B 25 sah æth Aug Jer.

vicissim, as Bengel. If it abide in you, ye too shall abide . . .) shall abide in the Son and in the Father (here again the rationalizing Commentators, Socinus, Grotius, Hammond, Semler, have endeavoured to explain away the close personal relation and immanence in God expressed by the Apostle's words: "ita cum Patre et Filio conjunctum esse, ut bonorum ab utroque proficiscentium quis sit particeps," Socinus, —and similarly Semler: "summo eorum favore et amicitia fruemini," Grot., Hamm. But here as every where else, they entirely miss the sense. He in whom abides the message of life in Christ which he has heard, not only has received the tidings of that life, but is transformed into the likeness of Him whose seed he has taken into him: is become a new creation: and the element in which and by which he lives and acts is even He in whom and by whom this new life comes, even Christ the Son of God. And thus living in the Son, he lives in the Father also: for Christ the Son of God is the manifestation and effulgence of the Father, himself abiding ever in the Father, as His people abide in Him. See the same truth declared John vi. 56; xv. 1 ff.; xvii. 23 (Eph. iii. 17; 1 Cor. iii. 16; vi. 17)). And (καί is the simple copula: not put αιτιολογικῶς, as Ec., Thl.) the promise (the preceding μενεῖτε naturally carried the mind onwards into the future. The result of that abiding will be the fulfilment, not only in partial present possession but in complete future accomplishment, of Christ's promise to us. This taking up again and explaining of something expressed (see ch. iii. 23, v. 11) or implied (see ch. i. 5, iv. 21, v. 14) before, is often found in our Apostle's style) which He Himself (Christ; cf. ὁ ἀκηκόαμεν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τῆς ζωῆς, ch. i. 1: cf. αὐτῷ, ver. 8; αὐτοῦ, ver. 27; αὐτῷ, ver. 28) promised to us (in many passages of the Gospel: e.g., John iii. 15; iv. 14; vi. 40, 47, 57; xi. 25, 26; xvii. 2, 3) is this, (even) eternal life (accus. instead of nom., by a common attraction of the subject of

the sentence into the case of the relative clause: "urbem quam statuo vestra est." The fact of ζωὴν αἰώνιον being put in logical apposition with ἐπαγγελία must not make us suppose, that ἐπαγγελία means the thing promised. The aor. ἐπηγγείλατο plainly enough shews that ἐπαγγ. is to be taken in its usual sense of a spoken promise. Then, when the purport of this promise comes to be explained, it is not "that we should inherit eternal life," but, instead, the *subject* of the spoken promise is expressed, as very commonly in ordinary discourse. "He promised me such or such a price" is a case in point). 26, 27.] Conclusion of the section concerning antichrist. These things I wrote to you concerning them that deceive you (ταῦτα, the whole since ver. 18. The pres. part. πλανώντων describes the occupation, the endeavour of the antichrists: what result it had had, is not expressed: some result seems implied by ver. 19). And you (the same anacoluthon rhetoricum as in ver. 24: again setting his believing readers in marked contrast to the deceivers just mentioned),—the anointing which ye received from Him (Christ, ver. 25: see above, ver. 20: as also on χρίσμα) abideth in you ("habet hic indicativus perquam subtilem exhortationem, conferendam ad 2 Tim. iii. 14," Bengel), and ("et ideo," Beng.) ye have no need that any one teach you (the construction = χρειαν ἔχετε τοῦ διδάσκειν ὑμᾶς, Heb. v. 12, or that with the simple infin., Matt. iii 14, xiv. 16, al. See reff. The ἵνα in such cases cannot be pressed to its telic meaning; rather we should say that the clause beginning with ἵνα is expegetical of the verb preceding. Some Commentators have understood the διδάσκειν of the teaching of the antichrists: so Corn.-alap., "non est necesse ut pseudo-apostoli et heretici vos doceant veram fidem et doctrinam:" so Semler, Sander, al.: but manifestly from want of apprehension of the Apostle's meaning. His assertions here are so many delicate exhortations,

d so (art. bef. αὐτοῦ) Heb
u. 4. James
i. 18. 2 Pet.
iii. 7.
e ver. 21.

ἃ τὸ ἃ αὐτοῦ ἃ χρίσμα διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων, καὶ ἀλη-
θές ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ ψεύδος, καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς

ABCKL
PN a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

rec (for αὐτου) αυτο, with AKL rel copt Ec Thl Jer: txt B (see table at end of prolegg) C[P] N k 36 vulg syr sah æth arm Ath Cyr Did Aug Fulg Bede. for 2nd χρίσμα, χαρίσμα 10². 13: πνευμα N' 25. 81 copt æth Cyr. [ψευδες C(appy) P.]
om last καὶ A sah Aug.

veiled under the declaration of their true ideal state of unction with the Holy Spirit who guides into all truth. If that unction were abiding in them in all its fulness, they would have no need for his or any other teaching. And in what is said, he does not indeed say that it is not abiding in them; but the contrary, thus reminding them what their real state is: but (contrast to the οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε) as his anointing teacheth you concerning all things (if we read τὸ αὐτό, it is not, as Bengel, "semper idem, sibi constans:" but marks merely the identity of the anointing which they once received with that which was now abiding in them. On the reading, see the digest. Our διδάσκει ὑμᾶς περὶ πάντων is parallel to δηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάσαν, John xvi. 13.

Two ways are open to us of taking what follows. Either 1) καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ψ., καὶ καθὼς ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς is all part of the protasis, which begins with ὥς above, and the apodosis begins with μένετε,—or 2) the apodosis to ὥς κ.τ.λ. is καὶ ἀληθές ἐστιν κ. οὐκ ἔ. ψ., and then comes a new protasis, κ. καθὼς ἐδ. ὑμ., with its apodosis μένετε κ.τ.λ. The former view is taken by Ec. and Thl., by Lücke, De Wette, Neander, Düsterdieck, al.: the latter by Luther, Calv., Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Brückner, Huther, and indeed most Commentators. If we take the former, we must regard καὶ ἄλ. κ. οὐκ ἔ. ψ. as a parenthetical insertion, stamping the character of the διδασχὴ περὶ πάντων just mentioned, and then καὶ καθὼς ἐδ. ὑμ. as a resumption, slightly varied, of ὥς . . . διδάσκει ὑμ. before. To this it is objected, that it is harsh, and not so like St. John's style as the other: that καθὼς does not naturally resume ὥς, nor καί, ἀλλά,—nor the aor. ἐδίδαξεν the pres. διδάσκει: that περὶ πάντων in the former clause has no correspondent in μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ in the latter. But it is answered on the other side, that these divergences from the former expression are entirely in accordance with the vivid and rapid movement of the thought in the Apostle's style, and cannot in any way tend to obscure the connexion. The ἀλλά above was occasioned by the preceding οὐ χρείαν ἔχετε ἵνα, whereas the καί before καθὼς seems to take up again

the construction broken by the parenthesis κ. ἄλ. . . ψ. Again καθὼς, the fuller and more precise conjunction, not only repeats but enforces the ὥς above. And the change of the pres. διδάσκει into the aor. ἐδίδαξεν is no objection, but a recommendation, to this view. For by it we have, as so often in St. John's repetitions, a new side of the subject brought out: viz. the absolute historical fact, that at a certain time this teaching came to them from Christ, viz. when they heard the apostolic preaching: so that the ὥς διδάσκει, its enduring teaching, is not only taken up again but placed in a new light, by its commencement being referred to. And as to the last objection, which is Huther's, of there being in the resumption no member corresponding to περὶ πάντων, it seems to me to amount to nothing. The correspondent member would be found not in the apodosis, μενείτε or μένετε,—but in the resumption of the protasis: and there it may be well understood to be implied in ἐδίδαξεν, there being no reason why it should be again expressed. But against the second view there are weightier objections. First, the καί before ἀληθές is in this case no natural introduction to an apodosis. Huther compares it with the καί before ὑμεῖς in ver. 24: but that, giving (see there) the sense of "ye too," is quite another thing. Here, there is no mutual correspondence, and the καί merely drags on the ear. Then, the apodosis thus introduced is no logical apodosis: "as it teaches you concerning all things, (so) it is true and is not a lie," is not a connected judgment: its being true and not a lie may be an authoritative assertion inserted by way of reminding, but cannot be a logical inference from its teaching being universal; for universal teaching may be false, as well as true. For these reasons I prefer, and adopt the former rendering), —and is true, and is not a lie (what is true, and not a lie? the anointing itself, or that which it teaches about all things? Ec. and Thl. understand the latter: ἀληθές γὰρ ἐστὶ κ. οὐκ ἔστι ψεύδος ὃ δηλονότι ἐδίδαξεν ὑμᾶς. But the construction seems to require the other view: ἀληθές is in strict concord with τὸ χρίσμα, and to supply τὸ διδασκόμενον would be very harsh. And this is quite correspondent to the fact

μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ. ²⁸ ^f Καὶ ^f νῦν, ^g τέκνία, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ, ^f = John xvi. 5. Acts iii. 17. vii. 34. ^h ἵνα ἐὰν ^h φανερωθῇ, ⁱ σχῶμεν ⁱ παρῥησίαν καὶ μὴ ^{jk} αἰσχυ-
θῶμεν ^l ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ^m ἐν τῇ ^m παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

g ver. 1 reff. h = Col. iii. 4. 1 Pet. v. 4. ch. iii. 5. i = Eph. iii. 12. 1 Tim. iii. 13. Heb. iii. 6. iv. 16. x. 19. 35. ch. iii. 21. iv. 17. v. 14. Job xxvii. 10. j Phil. i. 20. Prov. xiii. 6. k as above (j). Luke xvi. 3. 2 Cor. x. 8. 1 Pet. iv. 16 only. Ps. xxxiv. 4. l Sir xli. 17. xxi. 22. see ch. iii. 17. 2 Thess. i. 9. m = 1 Cor. xv. 23. 1 Thess. ii. 19. iii. 13. v. 23.

rec μενετε, with KL rel Thl Ec: txt ABC[P]N vss a d 40 Cyr Phot.

28. om kai to autw (homæotel) N a m. [for τεκνία, τέκνα P.] add μου K b 1 40 coptt æth. rec (for εαν) οταν, with KL rel vulg syrr copt Thl Ec: txt ABC[P]N d 13 sah æth arm. rec (for σχωμεν) εχωμεν, with KLN¹ rel Ec: txt εν τη παρουσια αυτου bef απ' αυτου N.

that the Spirit who is this anointing, is the Spirit of Truth (John xiv. 17) and therefore leads into all truth (ib. xvi. 13). As Düsterd. remarks, "the chrisma which abides in and teaches believers, is essentially true, is not a lie, and hence nothing can come from it which is a lie"—and even as He (or, *it*? so Erasmus, paraphrasing *χρίσμα* by 'Spiritus' and adding "perseveretis in eo quod Ille vos semel docuit;" and so Düsterd.: but the change to the aor. seems necessarily to refer to Christ as the subject,—the *ἅγιος* from whom the *χρίσμα* came, and who is ever in the Writer's mind, a subject ever ready to be supplied) taught you, abide in Him (or, "in *it*," as Erasmus? or, in that which it teaches, as Baumg.-Crus.? Neither of these: for the μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ is immediately after repeated, and the reference of αὐτῷ fixed, by what follows, to be to Christ. (But I see that Estius, holding it improbable that this αὐτῷ refers to Christ, makes that also to mean "in eo quod doctum fuerat:" supplying "Christ" as a subject before φανερωθῇ.)

As regards μένετε, Huther, who upholds this reading, takes it as indicative here, and imperative in the next verse. But, apart from the arbitrariness of such a distinction, would it be quite true or according to the Apostle's way of asserting as existent the ideal Christian state of his readers? True, he does assert that the chrisma μένει in them, and from that abiding, important consequences are hortatively deduced: one of the most important of which is, the enduring and ultimate abiding in Christ. Therefore I much prefer taking μένετε imperative. The reading μενετε is variously understood: by Socinus, Corn.-a-lap., Estius, Lorinus, Semler, al., as an imperative: by others as a pure future: so Beza, "mihi videtur omnino servanda futuri propria significatio ut est optime sperantis:" and Bengel, "vim consolandi et hortandi habet hoc futurum." But see Digest).

28.] Conclusion of this part of the Epistle: forming also a transition to the next part: see below. And now

(by καὶ νῦν, the preceding considerations are linked on to the exhortation regarding present practice which follows: see reff. On ἀλλὰ νῦν, νῦν δέ, νῦν οὖν see Düsterdieck's note), little children (the affectionate repetition of τέκνία binds this on to ver. 18, and to the δ δὲ ποίων τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ver. 17), abide in Him ("repetitio est præcepti cum blanda appellatione, qua paternum erga eos amorem declarat," Estius. αὐτῷ, Christ: as before, ver. 27: but here even more decidedly,—pace Estii, see above: and against the Socinian interpreters): in order that if He should be manifested (in case of His second coming taking place. The ἐὰν differs from ὅταν, in marking, not time but reality only. We may supply, "in our time:" but it is better to leave it unsupplied), we (observe that he changes to the communicative way of speaking. This was not a matter in which Apostle and converts, teacher and hearer, were separate: but one in which all had a share: viz. the Christian hope of standing before the Lord with joy at His coming. This is far the most likely reason, and not as Seb.-Schmidt, mere modesty, still less, as Sander, because the failure of any of his τέκνία at that day would be a detracton from his full apostolic reward: for the relation between shepherd and flock, minister and people, is not in question here) may have confidence (παρῥησία, subjective: not freedom of speech, but confidence,—see note on Heb. iii. 6; and the reff. Cf. also Suicer, sub voce), and may not shrink with shame from Him (the ἀπ' in ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, expresses the flying from His presence, which the shame in αἰσχυνθῶμεν would suggest: see reff. (Hammond renders, "turn with shame from Him.") It is not equivalent to coram, as Socinus: nor to both of these together, as Sander, who however quotes πορεύεσθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, Matt. xxv. 41: nor can the words mean, as Erasmus thought, "ut illum non pudeat nostri." "He who has not abode in the Lord (ἐν αὐτῷ), will flee

n see John xv.
18
o ch. iii. 7, 10.
Matt. vi. 1
only. Ezek.
xviii. 17.

29 εὖν εἰδήτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστιν, ἡ γινώσχετε ὅτι καὶ παῖς
ὁ ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ὁ δικαιοσύνην ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἡ γεγέννηται.

ABCKL
P^a b c e
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

p ch. iv. 7 reff.

29. ἰδητε AKL[P] b¹ f g m n o copt æth Thl: ἡδητε j: οἰδατε c. rec om και,
with BKL rel am (and harl tol) syr copt æth arm Thl (Ec Ambr Aug Vig: ins AC[P]) N
a d 13 demid fuld Syr sah.

from Him (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ) with shame and confusion when He appears." Dusterd.) at His coming (Bengel remarks, "Epistolam igitur hanc prius scripsisse videtur quam apocalypsin, in qua demum adventus magis est dilatus." On this, see Prolegomena).

II. 29—V. 5.] THE SECOND GREAT DIVISION OF THE EPISTLE: *the doing of righteousness, the sign of new birth from God: the opposite, the sign of not being of God.* This main subject, enunciated in verse 29, is carried onward throughout, and more especially with reference to brotherly love, which is the great and obvious example of likeness to God, and its absence the most decisive proof of alienation from Him. The various subdivisions see, as the exegesis proceeds.

II. 29—III. 3.] Connected with the principle enounced ii. 29, is its obvious *application to ourselves, as children of God.* Hoping as we do to be entirely like Christ at His appearing, each one of us, in pursuance of this hope, is even now approximating to this perfect likeness by purifying himself even as He is pure.

29.] If ye know (appeal to their recognition of the divine character as that which he describes it) that He is righteous (of whom is this said? If of Christ, as seems most natural after αὐτοῦ . . . αὐτοῦ preceding, we find a difficulty in ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται below, seeing that we are never said to be born anew of Christ, but always of God (through Christ), ch. iii. 1, 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18 &c. If on the other hand they are said of God, it seems strange that after a change of reference from the preceding αὐτοῦ, another subject should be expressed in ch. iii. 1 by the words ὁ πατήρ. In consequence of these difficulties, some, as Storr, Lücke, al., have referred δίκαιός ἐστιν to Christ, and ἐξ αὐτοῦ to God; which cannot well be. It would be possible, doubtless, to understand the whole of Christ, without change of subject from ver. 28; and to leave the γεγέννηται ἐξ αὐτοῦ as we find it. If it occurs no where else in reference to Christ, there is in it nothing abhorrent from our Christian ideas. And in St. John's sense of the intimate union between the Father and Son, he who is born of the Father might be said to be born of the Son al. o. Another reason

for this might be the easily occurring reference, in δίκαιός ἐστιν, to Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν δίκαιον, ver. 1. This view is taken by Bengel, Corn.-a-lap., Lorinus, al. But after all, the other, which is that of most ancient expositors, of Baumg.-Crus., De Wette, Neander, Dusterdieck, al., must, I apprehend, be adopted. The analogy of the passage, as shewn in ch. iii. 1, 2, 9, 10, fixes the ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται to birth from God: and the absence of a new expressed subject in δίκαιός ἐστιν must be accounted for by remembering that this verse, as ch. i. 5, is the opening, and general statement, of a new section of the Epistle. And the essential unity of the Father and the Son comes in on this side also: so that the judgment alluded to ver. 28, which shall be executed by the Son, being judgment committed to Him by the Father, brings to mind the justice and righteousness in which that judgment is founded.

The whole subject of the righteousness of God is fully treated by Dusterd. in his note here. The definition which seems to him to express it most fully, is that of Hollaz, one of the best of the old Lutheran dogmatists (died 1713),—in his Examen theologicum,—"Justitia Dei est attributum divinum ἐνεργητικόν, vi cuius Deus omnia quæ æternæ suæ legi sunt conformia, vult et agit; creaturis convenientes leges præscribit, promissa facta hominibus implet, bonos remuneratur et impios punit": ye know (many, as vulg., which Aug., Bede, and the R. C. expositors follow, also Luth., Calv., Socin., Episcop., Grot., Carpov., Lücke, Sander, al., take γινώσχετε as imperative. But the whole tone of the Epistle is against this: which is one not of authoritative revelation of truth, but of inferring ethical truth from previously known theosophic facts. And with such a tone it is much more consonant to say, "If ye know the one, ye know—that knowledge sets forth and assumes—the other:" than to say, "If ye know the one, know the other." Not to insist, that γινώσκειν is more the apprehension, εἰδητε the possession, of knowledge; if ye are already aware, . . . ye thereby know . . .) that also every one who doeth righteousness (τὴν δικαιοσύνην, the righteousness which is implied in δίκαιος above: if it were not too strong, we might almost say,

III. 1 Ἴδετε ^q ποταπὴν ἀγάπην ^r δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ^s ὁ ^s πα- ^{q 2 Pet. iii. 11}
r so James iv. 6 ^{reff.} s ch. i 2, 3 reff.

CHAP. III. 1. for δεδ., εδωκεν AL c d 13: txt BCK[P]N rel Thl ŒC.

υμιν

"that righteousness," the art. shewing that there is no other. *πᾶς*, "omnis, et solus," says Bengel: every one, and no one else. The proposition will bear converting: not logically, but theologically. *ποιῶν*, for (see Hollaz's definition above) all righteousness is energetic: it springs out of holiness, truth, love: *πρακτικὰ γὰρ αἱ ἀρεταί, καὶ ἐν τῇ γίνεσθαι ἔχουσι τὸ εἶναι παυσάμεναι γὰρ ἢ μέλλουσαι οὐδὲ τὸ εἶναι ἔχουσι*. (ŒC. on ch. iii. 3), is born (= hath been begotten) of Him (God: see above: *ὁ δίκαιος γὰρ δίκαιους γεινᾷ*). The inference here must be carefully kept to the Apostle's words and obvious sense. And those require that we should understand it thus: God is *righteous*. This is our axiom, from which we set out. And if so, then the *source* of righteousness. When therefore a man doeth righteousness, *γινώσκουμεν*, we apprehend, we collect, from our previous knowledge of these truths, that the source of his righteousness is God: that in consequence he has acquired by new birth from God, that righteousness which he had not by nature. We argue from his *ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην* to his *γεννηθῆσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ*. And the right apprehension of this is the more important, because the whole mass of Socinian and Pelagian Commentators have reversed the members of the argument, and made it conclude that *ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην* is the condition, on our part, of *becoming* a child of God. So Socinus, Episcopius, Grot., Hammond, Semler, Rosenmüller, al. And the R.-C. expositors, while they avoid this error, making the good works spoken of to be, as Lyra, "opera justitiæ infusæ, quæ datur cum gratia, per quam homo constituitur in quadam participatione supernaturali esse divini," yet go equally wrong, in understanding *γενένηται* not as the statement of a past and abiding fact, but as the ground of a confidence as to the future: "habebit omnimodam fiduciam, quia iudicii suo justo similis, imo ex ipso natus est, hoc est, ipsius filius et hæres est." Corn.-a-lap.). III. 1—10.] *The true and distinguishing signs of the children of God and the children of the devil.* 1—3.] The foundation and source of all righteousness in us is, the essential righteousness of God. All our doing of righteousness is a mere sign that He has begotten us anew—that we are *His children*. And what great things are contained in this name—how precious treasures of faith, of hope, of love!

On this thought the Apostle now enters. He places the whole glory of the children of God before his readers. The being righteous as He is righteous, is the token of that new birth, and the measure of the life which began with it: the striving to perfect and mature this token, to fill up this measure, is an additional proof that a man is of God. 1.] Behold (as in John i. 29; xix. 5, does not express the Writer's own astonishment, but directs the attention of those who are addressed: "commendat Apostolus his verbis magnum Dei beneficium," Estius. But there immediately follows ἡμῖν, the communicative address, so that in fact the Apostle does in a manner include himself among those addressed in ἴδετε), *what manner of* (thus the E. V., literally and rightly. *ποταπός*, properly *ποδαπός*, originally meant, "of what country;" and occurs in this sense continually in the classics: e. g. Herod. vii. 218, *εἶπετο . . . ποδαπὸς* (or *δοπὸς*) *εἴη ὁ στρατός*, al. Its derivation is matter of dispute: whether from *δάπος*, *τάπος*, which forms enter into *δάπεδον*, *ἔδαφος*, *τόπος*; so Valcknaer: or from *ἀπό*, as Buttm. Lexil. comparing *ἀλλοδαπός*, *παντοδαπός* &c., δ being inserted as in *prodiere*, *prodesse*. Then in later writers it came to signify "of what kind," as e. g. in Demosth. p. 782, 8, *τίς ὁ κίων καὶ ποδαπός*; *οἷος μὴ δάκνει*, al. The signification *quantus* seems never to have belonged properly to the word. It may of course be often included in *qualis*, as it undoubtedly is here: "what manner of" including "how great," "how free," "how precious"—in fact all the particulars which are afterwards brought out respecting this love: see ver. 16, ch. iv. 9, 16) *love* (is *ἀγάπην* here, joined as it is with the verb *δέδωκεν*, literally *love itself*, or does it import some gift, bestowal, or fruit of love? The latter (*caritatis munus*) is taken by Beza: and similarly, *beneficium*, or the like, by Socinus, Episcopius, Seb.-Schmidt, Grot., Est., Rosenm., Neander, al. But there seems no necessity for diverting the word from its proper meaning. As in ch. iv. 9, the proof of the love is that which is imported, not by the love itself, but by the verb joined with it; as by *ἐφανερώθη* there, so by *δέδωκεν* here. So that in fact *δέδωκεν*, which has been the motive for these renderings, speaks, as Düsterd. observes, most decidedly against them. He quotes from Luther's scholia, "Usus autem est Joannes singulari verborum pondere:

there his. ver. 10. ch. v. 2. *τῆρ ἴνα ἰ τέκνα ἰ θεοῦ ἰ κληθῶμεν, καὶ ἔσμεν.* ὦ διὰ τοῦτο ABCKL
P^a a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13
John i. 12. *ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς, ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνω αὐτόν.*
xi. 52. Rom. viii. 16 (17).
21. ix. 8. Phil. ii. 15 only. u Matt. v. 9. Hos. i. 10. v Matt xxiv. 44. John v. 16. xii. 39.
w ch. iv. 6 reff.

BK¹ m¹(Scriv): txt ACL[P] rel vss. rec om και εσμεν, with KL rel arm-zoh
Ec: ins ABC[P]N a 13. 36 (vss) Thl Aug Bede. υμας KL[P]N¹ b¹ f g k l m n o
arm-ms Thl Ec. [εγνωκατε P 192(Sz): εγνωτε b (?) o.]

non dicit dedisse nobis Deum donum aliquod, sed ipsam caritatem et fontem omnium bonorum, cor ipsum, idque non pro operibus aut studiis nostris, sed gratuito." Cf. *χάριν διδόναι*, ref. James) the Father (ὁ πατήρ, spoken here not, as some, of God in general, the whole three Persons in the blessed Trinity, but personally, of the Father, as distinguished from the Son, in whom we have received our adoption. Even the Socinian Schlichting has recognized this: "Nempe Pater ille Jesu Christi et consequenter omnium in Jesum Christum credentium, unus ille Deus, qui si Pater Jesu Christi non esset, nec Jesus Christus ejus Filius ille singularissimus, neque nobis tanta ejus ac vere paterna gratia unquam obtigisset") **hath given** (see above) **unto us, that** (how is *ἴνα* here to be taken? is it to be kept to its strong telic sense, indicating that our being called the children of God is the purpose of that gift of love just spoken of, or does it, as so often in St. John, introduce the purport of that love, stated in the form of an end to be gained by its manifestation? Lange, Lücke, De Wette, and Brückner keep the strong telic sense. "What great love," says Lücke, "hath the Father shewn us (viz. in sending His Son, ch. iv. 10), in order to make us children of God!" But the objection to this is, that thus a proof of the divine Love is hinted at in our verse which is not expanded, but is left to be gathered from elsewhere: and the purpose introduced by *ἴνα* becomes the secondary and remote subject of the sentence, whereas, from *τέκνα θεοῦ* taking up the preceding *γεννῆται*, and being again taken up in verse 2, it is evidently the primary subject. The other meaning of *ἴνα* is taken by the ancient Greek expositors, so Ec., Thl., *εἰδετε γὰρ ὅτι ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι τε καὶ κληθῆναι* (λογισθῆναι Thl.). And this is not to confound *ἴνα* with *ὅτι*. Of the latter construction we have a plain example with *ποταπός*, in Matt. viii. 27: *ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι . . . ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ*. There, the *matter of fact* is the ground of the wonderment expressed in the *ποταπός*—"What a man must this be, seeing that . . ." whereas here the ground of the wonderment is in the *re-*

sult: "what manner of love . . . resulting in, proved by, our being, &c." The effect of the love, that at which it is aimed in its immediate bestowal (its *ἶδι*), is, that we should be called children of God: its ultimate purpose (its *ἵνα*) is another thing. Cf. vv. 11, 23, where we have the same construction) **we should be called children of God** (why has the Apostle rather used *κληθῶμεν* than *ᾤμεν*? Probably to bring forward the title, the reality of which, notwithstanding its non-recognition by the world, he is about to assert immediately. It is not that *καλεῖσθαι*, as Baumg.-Crusius, = *ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν γενέσθαι*, John i. 12, so that the sense should be, "that we have a right to presume to call ourselves children of God," Neander: against this the aor. *κληθῶμεν* is decisive, signifying our reception of the title once for all, and identifying this reception with the gift of love spoken of above. In this definite reference to an actual bestower of the name, probably an allusion is made to such prophecies as that cited 2 Cor. vi. 18); **and we ARE (so): for this cause the world doth not know** (apprehend, recognize) **us; because it did not know Him** (viz. God: the Father. The insertion of *καὶ ἔσμεν* appears to serve the purpose of bringing out the reality of the state conferred upon us with this title, in spite of any non-recognition of it by the unbelieving world. To those, as Lücke and De Wette, who regard the preceding *ἴνα* as telic, the clause has no meaning, and they at once reject it as a gloss. Had it been, it would surely have been *καὶ ᾤμεν*, as the vulg. et *simus*. But in our rendering of the passage, *καὶ ἔσμεν* is of the highest possible significance. On *ἔσμεν* depends *διὰ τοῦτο*: and we ARE God's children; for *this very reason*, because we bear not the name only but the essence, the world knows us not: and then, as a reason for this ignorance following on this reality of our derivation from Him,—because it knew Him not. The reality of a believer's sonship of God, and his non-recognition by the world, are thus necessarily connected together. But Whom did the world not know, and when? *αὐτόν* here, by the very requirements of the logic of the passage, must be the Father, who not

2 x ἀγαπητοί, νῦν ^t τέκνα ^t θεοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ οὐπω ^y ἐφανερώθη ^x ch. ii. 7 ^{reff.}
 τί ἐσόμεθα. οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν ^y φανερωθῇ, ὅμοιοι αὐτῷ ^y ch. ii. 28 ^{reff.}

2. [θεοῦ bef τέκνα P m.] rec aft οἶδαμεν ins δε, with KL rel Syr copt æth Orig₁
 Thl Ec Ambr₁ Jer₁ Quæst: om ABC[P]N 13 vulg syr sah arm Orig₂ Did Tert Aug^{sæpe}.

being recognized, neither are His children: τὸν *υιοθεήσαντα*, as Ec.; Aug., Benson, al., understand *Christ*: "ambulabat et ipse Dominus Jesus Christus, in carne erat Deus, latebat in infirmitate." But this can only be, if we understand that the world rejected that revelation of the Father which was made by Christ His Son. And if we introduce this element, we disturb the strictness of the argument. It is the world's ignorance of God, considered (and this is the force, if it is to be pressed, of the aor. *ἔγνω*) as one great act of non-recognition, disobedience, rebellion, hate (for all these are involved in St. John's οὐ γινῶναι, as their opposites in his γινώσκειν), which makes them incapable of recognizing, loving, sympathizing with, those who are veritably children of God: cf. ch. v. 1).

2.] Beloved, now are we children of God (the world recognizes us not: but our sonship is real: none the less real, that we ourselves know not our future condition in all its manifestation. So that the next member of the sentence is introduced not with an ἀλλά, but with a καί: the two are not contrasted, but simply put in juxtaposition as components of our present state. We are really sons of God, even now: and we look (this very word νῦν suggesting a future) for an inheritance in virtue of that sonship: it has not been yet manifested of what sort that inheritance shall be: thus much we know &c. Such seems to be the simple connexion, without any adversative particles expressed or understood), and it was never yet manifested (on any occasion: such is the force of the aor. And ἐφανερώθη, as so often in St. John, and as in the next sentence, does not mean, made manifest to knowledge or anticipation,—for that it is, as asserted below: but, shewn forth in actuality, come to its manifestation) what we shall be (understand, in virtue of this our state of sons of God: to what new development or condition this already existing fact will lead. But we must take care not to fall into Grot.'s error, "quo modo futuri simus filii Dei": for as Calov. rightly remarks, "non dantur gradus υιοτήτος:" we are as truly, and in the same sense, children of God now, as we shall be then: but now (cf. Gal. iv. 1) we are children waiting for an unknown inheritance—then we shall be children in full possession of that inheritance. And

hence, from the reality and identity of that sonship, comes what follows,—our certain knowledge, even in this absence of manifestation in detail, that our future condition will consist in likeness to Him. As Ec., τὸ γὰρ νῦν ἔδηλον φανερὸν γενήσεται, ἐκείνου ἀποκαλυπτομένου. ὅμοιοι γὰρ αὐτῷ ἀναφανέντες τὸ τῆς υιοθεσίας λαμπρὸν παραστήσομεν. οἱ γὰρ υἱοὶ πάντες ὅμοιοι τῷ πατρὶ). We know (no contrast—see above: what we know of this τί ἐσόμεθα is this. There is not even a correction of the preceding as Düsterd.: the connexion is simply, "This future condition of ours hath never yet appeared: thus much we know of it.") οἶδαμεν, as always, of certain, well-assured cognition) that if it were manifested (viz. the τί ἐσόμεθα; this φανερωθῇ takes up again the former one. So Didymus (Aug. is quoted on both sides by the Commentators, but he does not really commit himself on the point), Ec. (τὸ γὰρ νῦν ἔδηλον φανερὸν γενήσεται), Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Socinus, Episcopius, Schlichting, Grotius, Spener, Bengel, Benson, Rosenm., Lücke, Sander, De Wette, Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Düsterd., Huther, and others: on the other hand, Bede, Calvin, Beza (and the E. V.: Tyndale and Cranmer had "it"), Arétius, Whitby, Calov., Estius, al., supply "*He*," understanding *Christ*: appealing to St. John's well-known usage which we have in ch. ii. 28, and below in our ver. 5. But it may be replied, that in the former case the subject was plainly suggested by ἐν αὐτῷ in the latter actually expressed in ἐκείνος: whereas here the reference of the verb is no less plainly given by the preceding ἐφανερώθη. Besides which, ἐκείνος in verse 5 clearly shews that the divine subject of these verses is not Christ but the Father. Estius and Lyra indeed seem to hold it possible to supply ὁ θεός as a subject to φανερωθῇ here, but not even themselves have propounded this for their own interpretation: indeed the former sets it aside, and the latter seems to be only paraphrasing when he says, "cum nobis se patrem ostenderit in possessione cœlestis hereditatis." On the εἰν, hypothetical, see above, ch. ii. 28. As there, the φανερωθῇ is the futurus exactus: "on its manifestation:" and here the hypothesis, from the repetition of the verb, necessarily gains emphasis, almost = that, even if it were manifested,

z Matt. v. 8.
 Heb. xii. 14.
 Rev. xxii. 4.

ἐσόμεθα, ὅτι ^z ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστίν. ³ καὶ πᾶς

. . . This consideration has an important bearing on what follows), **we shall be (ἐσόμεθα** taken up again from above, and the emphatic *ἡμοῖσι αὐτῷ* corresponding exactly to *τί* above) **like Him** (*God*; as Ec. above, and most Commentators. See below), **because** (*ὅτι* must be kept firm to its causal meaning, and all the difficulties of the sentence met thus, not by explaining it away, as even Ec. (*ἀλλὰ καί*), Schol. ii. (*ὅτε καί*), Luther (*et*). Nor does it express merely the *mode* of the transformation, as Lyra. Still less must we, with Calvin ("neque enim docet similes ideo nos fore, quia fruemur adspectu, sed inde probat nos divinæ gloriæ fore participes, quia nisi spiritualis et celestis beataque immortalitate prædita esset natura, ad Deum nunquam tum prope accederet"), Seb.-Schmidt ("Qui visurus est Deum sicuti est, eum oportet esse perfecte similem Deo"), and Socinus ("neque enim fieri potest ut quis ipsum Deum videat, . . . nisi ei similis aliquo modo . . . fuerit"),—and so even Huther, endorsing Calvin's statement, "ratio hæc ab effectu sumta est non a causa,"—reverse the causal connexion, and make the seeing Him as He is merely a proof that we shall be like Him (*ὅτι* = *γάρ*). Whatever consequences it may entail, it is philologically certain that the proposition introduced by *ὅτι* contains the real essential cause and ground of that which it follows) **we shall see Him** (*God*: see below) **as He is** (with St. John, the recognition and knowledge of God is ever no mere cognition, but the measure of the spiritual life: he who has it, possesses God, has the Father and the Son: becomes more and more like God, having His seed in him. So that the full and perfect accomplishment of this knowledge in the actual fruition of God Himself must of necessity bring with it entire likeness to God. And this is the part of the future lot of the sons of God which is certain. Because we shall see Him as He is,—which is taken for granted as a Christian axiom,—it of necessity follows that we shall be entirely like Him: ethically like Him: we shall behold, as Ec., *δικαίον δικαιοί, ἄγρον ἄγροί*. The difficulty that no man can see God, is not in reality contained here, any more than it is in our Lord's "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The word, however understood, has for its limit, that no created eye even in the glorified body can behold the Creator: that beyond its keenest search there will be glory and perfection baffling

and dazzling it: but this incapacity does not prevent the vision, as far as it can reach, being clear and unclouded: being, to the utmost extent of which our glorified nature is capable, *ὡς ἐστίν*—a true and not a false vision of God. And if it be again objected that we seem to be thus confounding the ethical sight of God which is the measure of our likeness to God, with corporeal sight of Him in the resurrection body, I answer that in the realm where our thoughts are now employed, I cannot appreciate that distinction between ethical and corporeal. We are speaking of things which eye hath not seen, nor mind conceived: what a *σῶμα πνευματικόν* may imply, our ideas now do not enable us to conceive: but I suppose it must at all events be a body, all of whose senses are spiritually conditioned and attuned: that what *τὰ φυσικά* are to our bodies here, *τὰ πνευματικά* will be there: and feeling this, however little I may know of the details of the great fact, it removes from me all insuperable difficulty as to the *ὁψόμεθα αὐτὸν καθὼς ἐστίν*. "I know that in my flesh I shall see God," may not be the right expression in Job, but it is the expression of my hopes as a son of God: it is the one expression of a hope in which all other hopes culminate and centre. And every son of God knows, that for it ever to be fulfilled, he must be growing onward in likeness to Him, pure, even up into His purity: for in His light only shall we see light.

The literature of this verse would far surpass our limits, even in an abridged summary. It will be found in Düsterdieck's Commentary, vol. ii. pp. 56—82. One point only must be noticed before passing onward; the fact that several of the great interpreters understand *αὐτῷ* and *αὐτόν* of *Christ*. This has partly of course been occasioned by their supplying Christ as a subject to the verb *φανερῶσθαι* above. Augustine has one of his most beautiful passages, explaining how at Christ's appearing, the impious shall see only *formam servi*, but we *formam Dei*. The whole view, however, does not satisfy the requirements of the passage. It is the *τέκνα θεοῦ* who are addressed: and the topic of exhortation is that they be righteous as God their Father is righteous. Christ is expressly introduced below in ver. 5 (see on ver. 3) by *ἐκεῖνος*. Augustine concludes with a burst of eloquence which describes just as well the true view of the vision: "Ergo visuri sumus quandam visionem, fratres, quam

ὁ ἔχων τὴν ^aἐλπίδα ταύτην ^aἐπ' αὐτῷ ^bἀγνίζει ἑαυτὸν ^aPs. lxi. 7. see
καθὼς ἐκεῖνος ^cἀγνός ἐστιν. ⁴πᾶς ὁ ^dποιῶν τὴν ^dἀμαρ- ^bJames iv. 8
ref.

c 2 Cor. vii. 11. xi. 2. Phil. iv. 8. 1 Tim. v. 22. Tit. ii. 5. James iii. 17. 1 Pet. iii. 2 only. Ps. xi. 6.
d vv. 8, 9. John viii. 34. 2 Cor. xi. 7. James v. 15. 1 Pet. ii. 22 only. 3 Kings xvi. 19.

nec oculus vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit: visionem quandam, visionem præcellentem omnes pulchritudines terrenas, auri, argenti, nemorum atque camporum, pulchritudinem maris et aeris, pulchritudinem solis et lunæ, pulchritudinem angelorum, omnia superantem, quia ex ipsa pulchra sunt omnia." Tract. in Ep. Joh. iv. 5, vol. iii. p. 2008).

3.] And every one that hath this hope (viz., that of being like Him hereafter) on Him (i. e. rested and grounded on God. In God, and grounded on His promises, is all our hope), purifieth himself (these words are not to be taken in any Pelagian sense, as if a man could of himself purify himself: "apart from me," says our Lord, "ye can do nothing." John xv. 5. The man who purifies himself has this hope, resting upon God. This mere fact implies a will to purify himself, not out of, nor independent of, this hope, but ever stirred up by, and accompanying it. So that the will is not his own, sprung out of his own nature, but the result of his Christian state, in which God also ministers to him the power to carry out that will in self-purification. So that Aug. who pleads strongly for free will here, is right when he says "castificas te, non de te, sed de illo qui venit ut inhabitet te." See 2 Cor. vii. 1, which is remarkably parallel: and 1 Pet. i. 21, 22. The idea of ἀγνίζειν is much the same as that of καθαρίζειν, ch. i. 9: it is entire purification, not merely from unchastity but from all defilement of flesh and spirit. "In the LXX, the word (ἀγνός) appears to be synonymous with καθάρως, being used for ῥῆμα and like words. Levitical purity of persons and things (Num. viii. 21, xxxi. 19, 23; 1 Chron. xv. 12), the pure life of the Nazarenes (Num. vi. 2, 3), the purity of God's word (Ps. xi. 7, xviii. 10), all these are expressed by ἀγνός, ἀγνίζειν &c. And correspondent to this is N. T. usage. The purity of the wisdom that cometh from above (James iii. 17), the purity of those who had to keep a vow (Acts xxi. 24, 26, xxiv. 18), the absence of moral stain in the Christian character generally, which includes above all things purity of heart (1 Pet. i. 22; James iv. 8; 2 Cor. vi. 6; 1 Tim. v. 22: cf. Phil. iv. 8; 1 Pet. iii. 2), and the particular purity of chastity (Tit. ii. 5; 1 Tim. iv. 12, v. 2; 2 Cor. xi. 2),—all these are rightly included in the name ἀγνεία." Düsterdieck, even as He is pure (Who is intended by

ἐκεῖνος? Clearly below in ver. 5, Christ, from the facts of the case. But is it as clear here? Almost all the modern Commentators assume it. And certainly, first appearances are greatly in its favour: the usual rule requiring that ἐκεῖνος shall point to a third person as yet not spoken of in the context, and differing from αὐτός. The inference is also upheld by a first view of ch. ii. 6, where much the same expression is used, and used of Christ. But there are some weighty considerations against the view. First, it is the *Father*, of whom it is written, "Be ye holy, for (or, as) I am holy," 1 Pet. i. 15, 16; Levit. xi. 44, xix. 2: cf. also Matt. v. 48. Secondly, it would be very harsh thus to introduce a new subject, in the face of this Scripture usage. Thirdly, it would be against the whole spirit of the context: in which sonship of God and likeness to God are joined together, and the hopes belonging to the state are made motives for the duty. Fourthly, if it be asserted that Christ is our Pattern, in whom we see the Father's purity shewn forth; I answer that this would be perfectly intelligible, if allusion was made, as in ch. ii. 6, to some historical manifestation in our Lord's life (καθὼς ἐκεῖνος περιπατήσεν): but being as it is in the present tense, it refers to the essential divine attribute of purity: and if so, then to that attribute in its primary inherence in the Father. Fifthly, the usage of ἐκεῖνος with αὐτός does not at all require the change of persons, only a change of the phase of predication regarding the same person, and the throwing up into emphasis some new particular which is brought into view. See this discussed on 2 Tim. ii. 26, and consult also the note on ch. ii. 6, where it is very doubtful whether αὐτός and ἐκεῖνος do not refer to the same divine Person. For these reasons, I would interpret ἐκεῖνος here of the Father, in whom essentially abides this perfection of purity, and after continual increase of likeness to whom his sons, having the ultimate hope of being completely like Him, will be striving. In ver. 5 the case is otherwise: see there, and also on ver. 7).

4—10.] *The irreconcilability of sin with the work of redemption, with communion with Christ, and with being born of God.* So De Wette: and the passage seems thus to be well described. But the difficulty has been, to mark distinctly the connexion

e Matt. xiii. 41 ^{only.} Ps. xxxi. 1. f ch. i. 2 reff. *τίαν καὶ τὴν ἁνομίαν ἑποιεῖ, καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν ἡ ἁνομία.* ⁵ καὶ οἶδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἑφανερώθη ἵνα τὰς

ABCKL
PN a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

4. aft ἐστὶν ins καὶ (but marked for erasure) N¹.

5. οἰδομεν N 40. 98 sah arm Fulg.

with the foregoing. In order to discover this, we must go back to the theme of the whole section of the Epistle, in ch. ii. 29: "If God is righteous, then every one that doeth righteousness, is born of Him." Hitherto the positive side of this position has been illustrated: the inseparability of birth-from-God and likeness-to-God. Now, the Apostle comes to treat its negative side: the incompatibility of sin with birth-from-God. And this he deals with essentially and in the ideal, as always. The whole is in the closest connexion with the foregoing, and is developed step by step with the minutest precision, as will be seen in the exegesis.

4.] In this verse we have ver. 3 taken up (cf. πᾶς ὁ ἔχων . . . πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν) ex adverso. There, God's essential purity formed a law, according to which the child of God, having hope of ultimate complete likeness to Him, purifies himself. Here we have it declared that the sinner goes counter to (this and all other) law: indeed the two terms, sin and lawlessness, are synonymous and convertible. **Every one that committeth sin, also committeth transgression-of-law:** and sin (abstract and in general) is **transgression-of-law** (abstract and in general). The assertion amounts to the identification of the terms, and the **ἐστὶν** amounts to "is equivalent to." If either of the words were anathorous, it would become predicative of quality,—"is of the nature of"—as in θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος: *both* having the article, both are *distributed* logically, and the one is asserted to be co-extensive and convertible with the other. And from the nature of the foregoing clause, which was to declare the *ἁνομία* of sin, it would appear here also that we must take ἡ ἁμαρτία as the subject and ἡ ἁνομία as the predicate, not the converse.

This being so, *what is it exactly that our verse asserts* respecting these two things, sin, and transgression-of-law? First and obviously, no appropriation must be made, in this verse and throughout this passage, of ἁμαρτία to one kind of sin, whether it be mortal sin as distinguished from venial (so the R.-C. expositors, e. g. Estius, but hesitatingly, "loquitur præcipue de peccato mortali, quamquam et venalia sunt iniquitates quædam et legi divinæ alicui repugnant, et ab ingressu regni cælestis ac similitudine Christi participanda remorantur,

donec expurgata fuerint"), or notorious and unrepented sins, or sins against brotherly love (as Luther, and Aug. on ver. 9): "peccare contumaciter," Aret.: "peccato dare operam," Beza, Piscator: "peccare scientem et volentem," Seb.-Schmidt, Spener. The assertions are all perfectly general, and regard, in the true root and ideal, every sin whatever. Every sin whatever then is a transgression of God's law: as indeed its very name implies: ἁμαρτάνειν being to *miss a mark*, and the mark being that will of God which is the νόμος and σκοπός to him who ποιεῖ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ch. ii. 17. Ec. gives the meaning very well, except that he understands of the law of nature only, what ought to be understood of the law of God, the revelation of His will, in whatever way made: ἰστέον δὲ ὡς ἁμαρτία μὲν ἡ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἀποπτώσις ἐστίν, ἁνομία δὲ ἡ περὶ τὸν θετὸν νόμον πλημμέλεια. καὶ ταύτην ἔχουσιν ἀρχὴν ἐκάτερον τούτων, τὸ μὲν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐκπτώσιν, τὸ δὲ τὴν περὶ τὸν θετὸν νόμον πλημμέλειαν. συμφέρονται δὲ ταῦται καὶ κατὰ ταῦτόν. ὁ τε γὰρ ἁμαρτάνων τοῦ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν καὶ ἐν τῇ φύσει ἀπέντυχε σκοποῦ. σκοπὸς γὰρ τῇ ἀνθρωπείᾳ φύσει τὸ κατὰ τὸν λόγον ζῆν, τῆς ἀλογίας πόρρω ἀπφικισμένη. ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ ἁνομος πλημμελεῖ περὶ τὸν ἐν τῇ φύσει δεδομένον νόμον, διαγινόμενος ἀκρατὰς, καλῶς οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ταῦτόν ἀμφοτέρα περιέστησεν).

5.] *Additional argument* for the incompatibility of sin with the life of God's children; that He, Christ, in and by whom we have this adoption (John i. 12), and by being in whose likeness alone we can be perfectly like God, was manifested to take away all sins, being Himself sinless. **And ye know** (the Apostle assumes it as known by those who had an anointing from the Holy One and knew all things, ch. ii. 20) **that He** (now clearly Christ, from the context, which (see above on ἐκεῖνος, ver. 3) can alone decide the reference in each case) **was manifested** (viz. by His appearing in the flesh, and all that He openly and visibly did and taught in it, or may be known, by the Spirit, to have done and taught) **in order that He may** (might) **take away** (aor. "take away by one act and entirely." The meaning, "take away," and not "bear," is necessitated here by the context. Sin is altogether alien from Christ. He became in-

ἀμαρτίας ἔαρη, καὶ ἀμαρτία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν. ὁ πᾶς ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων οὐχ ἀμαρτάνει. πᾶς ὁ ἀμαρτάνων

xxviii. 34 (38). Levit. x. 17.

John i. 29.
Col. ii. 14.
1 Kings x. 25.
xxv. 28.
see Exod.
h ch. ii. 24.

rec aft ἀμαρτίας ins ἡμῶν, with CKLX rel vulg-ed Syr sah Ath Thl Ec Bede: om AB[P] 13 am(with fuld demid harl tol) syr copt æth arm Tert Aug Fulg Cassiod. ουκ εστιν bef εν αυτω X coptt æth.

carnate that He might blot it out: He has no stain of it on Himself. If we render ἔαρη "bear," this coherence is lost. Of course this fact is in the background, that He took them away by bearing them Himself: but it is not brought out, only the antagonism between Him and sin. See, on the word, the note on ref. John) sins (τὰς ἀμαρτίαι, all sins, not merely certain sins. The object of his manifestation is stated not only categorically, but definitively. Compare the striking parallel Heb. ix. 26, εἰς ἀθέτησιν ἀμαρτίας διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ πεφανέρωται; and in Him sin is not (as His work, in being manifested, was, altogether to take away sin, so likewise is He himself free from all spot of sin. The καὶ serves to co-ordinate the last clause with the first, not to subordinate it, as many Commentators have supposed, and even Aug.: "In quo non est peccatum, ipse venit auferre peccatum: nam si esset et in illo peccatum, auferendum esset illi, non ipse auferret:" and Ec., τὸ καὶ ἀντὶ τοῦ διότι: and afterwards, ἵνα ὡς μὴ ἀμαρτίαν ποιήσας τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἔαρη: so also Corn.-a-lap., Lorinus, Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Neander. This interpretation is confuted by the ἔστιν, which should have been ἦν: and by the following context, in which this fact of the sinlessness of Christ serves as the foundation for what is said, verse 6. The most palpable violations of the construction and sense are made by the rationalists, of whom Grotius may serve as an example: "præsens pro præterito: peccatum in eo non erat, nempe cum vitam mortalem viveret." Socinus, feeling that this could not be, tries to explain away *peccatum*, as meaning "non vitium aliquid in moribus," but the consequences of sin, "omnia mala, omnesque perpassiones, una cum ipsa morte," from which Christ is now (hodie) for ever free, "utpote beatissimus, et impatibilis atque immortalis." And strange to say, Calvin so far misunderstands what is here said as to write "non de Christi persona hic agit, sed de toto corpore. Quocunque vim suam diffundit Christus, negat amplius locum esse peccato." This would deprive ἐν αὐτῷ μένων, verse 6, of all its meaning as referring back to the ἐν αὐτῷ here, and make it merely tautological. It is only by holding fast here the personal reference

to Christ in himself, that we keep the logical coherence between that verse and this: the reasoning from that which He is not, and cannot be, to that which they that abide in Him are not and cannot be).

6.] The connexion see above. Every one that abideth in Him (μένει ἐν αὐτῷ) is not to be weakened down, with Semler, Episcopus, al., by any rationalistic interpretation as "credere in Christum," "Christi discipulum esse:" still less as Ec., does ἀνευδότως τὰς ἀρετὰς μετιῶν express ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ μένων. Grot. is better this time,—"qui vero amore Christo conjungitur;" but this is not enough. This a man might be to an earthly friend: but could not be said ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν. See the sense expanded in the note on ch. ii. 24. Nothing short of personal immanence in the personal Christ will satisfy the words: a living because He lives, and as receiving of His fulness) sinneth not (nor again is this to be tamed down, as has been done by far more and better interpreters than in the last case, by making it mean "does not persist in sin;" so Luther, "does not allow sin to reign over him"—so Hunnius: and similarly Socinus, Episcopus, Calvin, Beza, the Schmidts, Calov., J. Lange, Bengel ("bonum justitiæ in eo non separatur a malo peccati"), Sander, al. Against all such the plain words of the Apostle must be held fast, and explained by the analogy of his way of speaking throughout the Epistle of the ideal reality of the life of God and the life of sin as absolutely excluding one another. This all the best and deepest Commentators have felt: so Augustine and Bede, "in quantum in ipso manet, in tantum non peccat." The two are incompatible: and in so far as a man is found in the one, he is thereby separated from the other. In the child of God is the hatred of sin; in the child of the devil, the love of it; and every act done in virtue of either state or as belonging to either, is done purely on one side or purely on the other. If the child of God falls into sin, it is an act against nature, deadly to life, hardly endured, and bringing bitter repentance: it is as the taking of a poison, which if it be not corrected by its antidote, will sap the very springs of life. So that there is no real contradiction to ch. i. 8—10, ii. 2, where

ich ii. 6 reff. οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν. 7^k Τεκνία, ABCKL
 k ch ii. 1 reff. PN a b c
 l ch i. 8 reff. d f g h j
 m ch. ii. 29 reff. μηδεὶς ἴπλανάτω ὑμᾶς. ὁ^m ποιοῦν τὴν^m δικαιοσύνην δι-
 13
 13

7. for τεκνια, παδια AC[P] 13 syr-mg copt arm, filiū Lucif: txt BKLN rel sah Thl
 Ec, filioli vulg spec syrr Tert. for μηδεὶς, μη τις A. om την N¹.

this very falling into sin of the child of God's asserted and the remedy prescribed. The real difficulty of our verse is in that which follows); **every one that sinneth hath not seen Him, neither hath known Him** (here it seems to be said that the act of sinning not only "in tantum" excludes from the life in God and Christ, but proves that that life *has never existed* in the person so sinning. That this cannot be the meaning of the Apostle, is evident from such passages as ch. i. 8—10, ii. 2, and indeed from the whole tenor of the Epistle, in which the *νῦν τέκνα θεοῦ ἐσμέν* occurs in combination with *μηδεὶς πλανάτω ὑμᾶς* and the like: whereas if the above view were correct, the very fact of *πεπλανῆσθαι* not only would cause them to cease from being τέκνα θεοῦ, but would prove that they never had been such. If then this cannot be so, what meaning are we to put upon the words? First observe the tense in which the verbs stand: that they are not aorists but perfects: and that some confusion is introduced in English by our perfect not corresponding to the Greek one, but rather partaking of the aoristic sense: giving the impression "hath never seen Him nor known Him:" whereas the Greek perfect denotes an abiding present effect resting on an event in the past. So much is this so, that *ἔγνωκα*, and many other perfects, lose altogether their reference to the past event, and point simply to the abiding present effect of it: *ἔγνωκα* is the present effect of a past act of cognition, = "I know." In the Greek perfect, the *present* predominates: in the English perfect (and in the German still more), the *past*. Hence in very many cases the best version-rendering of the Greek perfect is by the English present. And so here, without for a moment letting go the true significance of the tense, I should render, if making a version, "*seeth Him not, neither knoweth Him.*" But manifestly such an interpretation would be philologically insufficient, and would only be chosen as the less of two evils, and as bringing out that side of the Greek perfect which, besides being the prevalent one, is less liable to mistake than the other. In exegesis, we must take in not merely the absence of such sight and knowledge in the present state of the sinner, but the significance of such present failure as regards the past: that his sight and know-

ledge are so far annulled as to their validity and reality. In fact, we get to much the same declaration as that in ch. ii. 19, *εἰ ἐξ ἡμῶν ἦσαν, μεμενῆκεισαν ἂν μεθ' ἡμῶν*: and their very going out shewed that they were not (all are not) of us: so here: the cutting off by an act of sin of the sight and knowledge of Christ, shews, and shews in proportion as it prevails, un-reality in that sight and knowledge.

As regards the relation of the words themselves, *ἑώρακεν* and *ἔγνωκεν*; some, with whom Dusterd. in the main agrees, hold that there is no perceptible difference: but that the latter word fixes and specifies the necessarily figurative meaning of the former: *οὐδέ* being simply copulative (= *οὔτε*). Lücke would understand *ὄραν* of knowledge obtained by historical information, which matures and completes itself into *γινώσκειν* (edn. 3); taking *οὐδέ* also merely as copulative. But this seems hardly according to St. John's practice, who uses *ὄραν* either of bodily sight (John i. 18, 1 John i. 1, &c., &c.),—or of an intuitive immediate vision of divine things, such as Christ has of the Father and heavenly things (John iii. 11, 32, vi. 46, viii. 38),—or of spiritual intuition gained by knowledge of Christ and the divine life (John xiv. 7, 9; 3 John 11). and there can be little doubt that this last is the meaning here: as Sander; and thus *οὐδέ* will retain its proper exclusive and climacteric force: *ὄραν* is a further step than *γινώσκειν*: a realization of Christ's personality and of the existence of heavenly things which is the result of spiritual knowledge: and thus the sinner "hath not seen Him, nor yet known Him"). 7, 8.] *The contrast is again stated*, and introduced by a solemn warning not to be misled respecting it: and, as usually in St. John's repetitions, a new feature is brought in, which the following verses take up and further treat: viz. *ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν*. 7.] Little children, let no one deceive you (it does not seem that any particular false teacher is here in St. John's view; but he alludes to all who would sever ethical likeness to God from the Christian life): **he that doeth righteousness** (τὴν δ., perhaps as being abstract, but more probably because the righteousness spoken of is but one, and that God's: the righteousness which is His) is righteous, even as He (here apparently, God, notwithstanding

καίος ἐστὶν καθὼς ἐκείνος δίκαιός ἐστιν.⁸ ὁⁿ ποιῶν τὴνⁿ ^{ver 4.}
^o ἁμαρτίαν^o ἐκ τοῦ^o διαβόλου ἐστίν, ὅτι ὁ^o ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ὁ^o ^o John viii. 44.

8. ins δε bef ποιων A k 25. 68 tol Syr(ε) copt æth arm Lucif.

the apparent parallel of Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν δίκαιον in ch. ii. 2: for we are by this saying, as by that in verse 3,—where see note,—referred back to the great Source of our spiritual birth, ch. ii. 29, and our likeness to Him insisted on: ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἔγνωκεν τὸν δίκαιον, καὶ δίκαιός ἐστιν ὡς καὶ ἐκείνος δίκαιός ἐστιν, *τουντέστιν ὁ θεός*) is **righteous**.

This verse has absolutely nothing to do with the sense which the R.-Cath. expositors have endeavoured to extract from it, "adversus hæreticos hodiernos, simili ratione populum seducentes, cum negant per bona opera quemquam justum esse coram Deo," Est., and so Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., and Tirinus. But this is altogether to invert the proposition of the Apostle, who is reasoning, not from the fact of doing good works to the conclusion that a man is righteous, but from the hypothesis of a man's being a child of God, born of Him and like Him, to the necessity of his purifying himself and doing righteousness. And in doing this, he ascribes the ποιεῖν τὴν δικαιοσύνην to its source, and the ποιεῖν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν to its source: the one man is of God, the other is of the devil. As Luther well says (in Düsterd. h. l.), "good works of piety do not make a good pious man, but a good pious man does good pious works. . . . Fruits grow from the tree, not the tree from fruits").

8.] *Contrast to ver. 7:* cf. ὁ ποιῶν . . . ὁ ποιῶν: but here by the necessity of the case, when a *positive* assertion comes to be made respecting the sinner, the new element ἐκ τ. διαβ. ἐστίν is introduced: see below. **He that doeth sin is of the devil** (notice first ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, as indicative not so much of individual acts as of a state, corresponding to ὁ ποιῶν τὴν δικαιοσύνην. And then ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν must not be rationalized away, as is done by those who deny the personal existence of the devil. It is the distinct opposite correlative of ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν (ver. 10 al. freq.), and implies a personal root and agency just as much as that other does. But again, it does not imply any physical dualism on the part of the Apostle. "Neminem fecit diabolus," says Aug. h. l. Tract. iv. 10, 11, vol. iii. p. 2011, "neminem genuit, neminem creavit; sed quicunque fuerit imitatus diabolus, quasi de illo natus, fit filius diaboli, imitando, non proprie nascendo . . . Omnes peccatores ex diabolo nati

sunt, in quantum peccatores. Adam a Deo factus est; sed quando consensit diabolo, ex diabolo natus est, et tales omnes genuit qualis erat. . . ." And below, § 11, "Ergo duas natiuitates attendite, Adam et Christi. Duo sunt homines, sed unus ipsorum homo homo, alter ipsorum homo Deus. Per hominem hominem peccatores sumus, per hominem Deum justificamur. Natiuitas illa deiecit ad mortem, ista natiuitas erexit ad vitam: natiuitas illa trahit secum peccatum, natiuitas ista liberat a peccato: ideo enim venit Christus homo, ut solveret peccata hominum." Origen (in Joan. tom. xx. 13, vol. iv. p. 325 D) remarks that ἐστίν is said ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου, not ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, and on the other hand γεγεννημένος is said ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, not ἐπὶ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. This must not be urged too far, seeing that St. John does speak of εἶναι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, e. g. ch. v. 19, and places over against one another the τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ and the τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου ver. 10: besides which, the devil is said to be ὁ πατήρ of the unbelieving (John viii. 44). All that we can say is, that the two are not strictly correspondent: that Origen's latter assertion is true—we have no γεγεννησθαι ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου. In the case of the children of God, there is a definite time, known to Him, when they passed from death unto life (ch. ii. 29, iii. 14, v. 11; John i. 12, iii. 3 ff., v. 24, &c.): from which their new life unto God dates: but there is no such point in the life of those who are the children of the devil: no regeneration from beneath corresponding to that from above: the natural life of men is not changed by seed of the devil as it is by seed of God. Rather may we say, that in those who are of the devil this latter change has never taken place. Since sin has come to reign in the world by man's sin, our natural birth, which is properly and essentially a birth from God, a creation by the eternal Word, has become a birth from the devil: so that it is, as Bengel expresses it, "corruptio, non generatio," and there is no trace of a physical dualism in St. John's doctrine: nay, the idea is at once precluded by the fact that according to the Apostle (John i. 12) those who are children of God have become so from having been children of the devil. See this expounded, as usual, in Düsterd.'s note, from which much of the above is gathered): **because the devil**

p John viii. 37. ¹ διάβολος ἁμαρτάνει. ² εἰς τοῦτο ³ ἐφανερώθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ⁴ θεοῦ, ἵνα ⁵ λύσῃ τὰ ⁶ ἔργα τοῦ ⁷ διαβόλου. ⁸ πᾶς ὁ ⁹ τ γε-
 Mark i. 38. ¹⁰ ¹¹ ¹² ¹³ ¹⁴ ¹⁵ ¹⁶ ¹⁷ ¹⁸ ¹⁹ ²⁰ ²¹ ²² ²³ ²⁴ ²⁵ ²⁶ ²⁷ ²⁸ ²⁹ ³⁰ ³¹ ³² ³³ ³⁴ ³⁵ ³⁶ ³⁷ ³⁸ ³⁹ ⁴⁰ ⁴¹ ⁴² ⁴³ ⁴⁴ ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ ⁴⁷ ⁴⁸ ⁴⁹ ⁵⁰ ⁵¹ ⁵² ⁵³ ⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ ⁶⁰ ⁶¹ ⁶² ⁶³ ⁶⁴ ⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ ⁶⁷ ⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ ⁷⁰ ⁷¹ ⁷² ⁷³ ⁷⁴ ⁷⁵ ⁷⁶ ⁷⁷ ⁷⁸ ⁷⁹ ⁸⁰ ⁸¹ ⁸² ⁸³ ⁸⁴ ⁸⁵ ⁸⁶ ⁸⁷ ⁸⁸ ⁸⁹ ⁹⁰ ⁹¹ ⁹² ⁹³ ⁹⁴ ⁹⁵ ⁹⁶ ⁹⁷ ⁹⁸ ⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰ ¹⁰¹ ¹⁰² ¹⁰³ ¹⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁹ ¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹ ¹¹² ¹¹³ ¹¹⁴ ¹¹⁵ ¹¹⁶ ¹¹⁷ ¹¹⁸ ¹¹⁹ ¹²⁰ ¹²¹ ¹²² ¹²³ ¹²⁴ ¹²⁵ ¹²⁶ ¹²⁷ ¹²⁸ ¹²⁹ ¹³⁰ ¹³¹ ¹³² ¹³³ ¹³⁴ ¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ ¹³⁷ ¹³⁸ ¹³⁹ ¹⁴⁰ ¹⁴¹ ¹⁴² ¹⁴³ ¹⁴⁴ ¹⁴⁵ ¹⁴⁶ ¹⁴⁷ ¹⁴⁸ ¹⁴⁹ ¹⁵⁰ ¹⁵¹ ¹⁵² ¹⁵³ ¹⁵⁴ ¹⁵⁵ ¹⁵⁶ ¹⁵⁷ ¹⁵⁸ ¹⁵⁹ ¹⁶⁰ ¹⁶¹ ¹⁶² ¹⁶³ ¹⁶⁴ ¹⁶⁵ ¹⁶⁶ ¹⁶⁷ ¹⁶⁸ ¹⁶⁹ ¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹ ¹⁷² ¹⁷³ ¹⁷⁴ ¹⁷⁵ ¹⁷⁶ ¹⁷⁷ ¹⁷⁸ ¹⁷⁹ ¹⁸⁰ ¹⁸¹ ¹⁸² ¹⁸³ ¹⁸⁴ ¹⁸⁵ ¹⁸⁶ ¹⁸⁷ ¹⁸⁸ ¹⁸⁹ ¹⁹⁰ ¹⁹¹ ¹⁹² ¹⁹³ ¹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁵ ¹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁸ ¹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰ ²⁰¹ ²⁰² ²⁰³ ²⁰⁴ ²⁰⁵ ²⁰⁶ ²⁰⁷ ²⁰⁸ ²⁰⁹ ²¹⁰ ²¹¹ ²¹² ²¹³ ²¹⁴ ²¹⁵ ²¹⁶ ²¹⁷ ²¹⁸ ²¹⁹ ²²⁰ ²²¹ ²²² ²²³ ²²⁴ ²²⁵ ²²⁶ ²²⁷ ²²⁸ ²²⁹ ²³⁰ ²³¹ ²³² ²³³ ²³⁴ ²³⁵ ²³⁶ ²³⁷ ²³⁸ ²³⁹ ²⁴⁰ ²⁴¹ ²⁴² ²⁴³ ²⁴⁴ ²⁴⁵ ²⁴⁶ ²⁴⁷ ²⁴⁸ ²⁴⁹ ²⁵⁰ ²⁵¹ ²⁵² ²⁵³ ²⁵⁴ ²⁵⁵ ²⁵⁶ ²⁵⁷ ²⁵⁸ ²⁵⁹ ²⁶⁰ ²⁶¹ ²⁶² ²⁶³ ²⁶⁴ ²⁶⁵ ²⁶⁶ ²⁶⁷ ²⁶⁸ ²⁶⁹ ²⁷⁰ ²⁷¹ ²⁷² ²⁷³ ²⁷⁴ ²⁷⁵ ²⁷⁶ ²⁷⁷ ²⁷⁸ ²⁷⁹ ²⁸⁰ ²⁸¹ ²⁸² ²⁸³ ²⁸⁴ ²⁸⁵ ²⁸⁶ ²⁸⁷ ²⁸⁸ ²⁸⁹ ²⁹⁰ ²⁹¹ ²⁹² ²⁹³ ²⁹⁴ ²⁹⁵ ²⁹⁶ ²⁹⁷ ²⁹⁸ ²⁹⁹ ³⁰⁰ ³⁰¹ ³⁰² ³⁰³ ³⁰⁴ ³⁰⁵ ³⁰⁶ ³⁰⁷ ³⁰⁸ ³⁰⁹ ³¹⁰ ³¹¹ ³¹² ³¹³ ³¹⁴ ³¹⁵ ³¹⁶ ³¹⁷ ³¹⁸ ³¹⁹ ³²⁰ ³²¹ ³²² ³²³ ³²⁴ ³²⁵ ³²⁶ ³²⁷ ³²⁸ ³²⁹ ³³⁰ ³³¹ ³³² ³³³ ³³⁴ ³³⁵ ³³⁶ ³³⁷ ³³⁸ ³³⁹ ³⁴⁰ ³⁴¹ ³⁴² ³⁴³ ³⁴⁴ ³⁴⁵ ³⁴⁶ ³⁴⁷ ³⁴⁸ ³⁴⁹ ³⁵⁰ ³⁵¹ ³⁵² ³⁵³ ³⁵⁴ ³⁵⁵ ³⁵⁶ ³⁵⁷ ³⁵⁸ ³⁵⁹ ³⁶⁰ ³⁶¹ ³⁶² ³⁶³ ³⁶⁴ ³⁶⁵ ³⁶⁶ ³⁶⁷ ³⁶⁸ ³⁶⁹ ³⁷⁰ ³⁷¹ ³⁷² ³⁷³ ³⁷⁴ ³⁷⁵ ³⁷⁶ ³⁷⁷ ³⁷⁸ ³⁷⁹ ³⁸⁰ ³⁸¹ ³⁸² ³⁸³ ³⁸⁴ ³⁸⁵ ³⁸⁶ ³⁸⁷ ³⁸⁸ ³⁸⁹ ³⁹⁰ ³⁹¹ ³⁹² ³⁹³ ³⁹⁴ ³⁹⁵ ³⁹⁶ ³⁹⁷ ³⁹⁸ ³⁹⁹ ⁴⁰⁰ ⁴⁰¹ ⁴⁰² ⁴⁰³ ⁴⁰⁴ ⁴⁰⁵ ⁴⁰⁶ ⁴⁰⁷ ⁴⁰⁸ ⁴⁰⁹ ⁴¹⁰ ⁴¹¹ ⁴¹² ⁴¹³ ⁴¹⁴ ⁴¹⁵ ⁴¹⁶ ⁴¹⁷ ⁴¹⁸ ⁴¹⁹ ⁴²⁰ ⁴²¹ ⁴²² ⁴²³ ⁴²⁴ ⁴²⁵ ⁴²⁶ ⁴²⁷ ⁴²⁸ ⁴²⁹ ⁴³⁰ ⁴³¹ ⁴³² ⁴³³ ⁴³⁴ ⁴³⁵ ⁴³⁶ ⁴³⁷ ⁴³⁸ ⁴³⁹ ⁴⁴⁰ ⁴⁴¹ ⁴⁴² ⁴⁴³ ⁴⁴⁴ ⁴⁴⁵ ⁴⁴⁶ ⁴⁴⁷ ⁴⁴⁸ ⁴⁴⁹ ⁴⁵⁰ ⁴⁵¹ ⁴⁵² ⁴⁵³ ⁴⁵⁴ ⁴⁵⁵ ⁴⁵⁶ ⁴⁵⁷ ⁴⁵⁸ ⁴⁵⁹ ⁴⁶⁰ ⁴⁶¹ ⁴⁶² ⁴⁶³ ⁴⁶⁴ ⁴⁶⁵ ⁴⁶⁶ ⁴⁶⁷ ⁴⁶⁸ ⁴⁶⁹ ⁴⁷⁰ ⁴⁷¹ ⁴⁷² ⁴⁷³ ⁴⁷⁴ ⁴⁷⁵ ⁴⁷⁶ ⁴⁷⁷ ⁴⁷⁸ ⁴⁷⁹ ⁴⁸⁰ ⁴⁸¹ ⁴⁸² ⁴⁸³ ⁴⁸⁴ ⁴⁸⁵ ⁴⁸⁶ ⁴⁸⁷ ⁴⁸⁸ ⁴⁸⁹ ⁴⁹⁰ ⁴⁹¹ ⁴⁹² ⁴⁹³ ⁴⁹⁴ ⁴⁹⁵ ⁴⁹⁶ ⁴⁹⁷ ⁴⁹⁸ ⁴⁹⁹ ⁵⁰⁰ ⁵⁰¹ ⁵⁰² ⁵⁰³ ⁵⁰⁴ ⁵⁰⁵ ⁵⁰⁶ ⁵⁰⁷ ⁵⁰⁸ ⁵⁰⁹ ⁵¹⁰ ⁵¹¹ ⁵¹² ⁵¹³ ⁵¹⁴ ⁵¹⁵ ⁵¹⁶ ⁵¹⁷ ⁵¹⁸ ⁵¹⁹ ⁵²⁰ ⁵²¹ ⁵²² ⁵²³ ⁵²⁴ ⁵²⁵ ⁵²⁶ ⁵²⁷ ⁵²⁸ ⁵²⁹ ⁵³⁰ ⁵³¹ ⁵³² ⁵³³ ⁵³⁴ ⁵³⁵ ⁵³⁶ ⁵³⁷ ⁵³⁸ ⁵³⁹ ⁵⁴⁰ ⁵⁴¹ ⁵⁴² ⁵⁴³ ⁵⁴⁴ ⁵⁴⁵ ⁵⁴⁶ ⁵⁴⁷ ⁵⁴⁸ ⁵⁴⁹ ⁵⁵⁰ ⁵⁵¹ ⁵⁵² ⁵⁵³ ⁵⁵⁴ ⁵⁵⁵ ⁵⁵⁶ ⁵⁵⁷ ⁵⁵⁸ ⁵⁵⁹ ⁵⁶⁰ ⁵⁶¹ ⁵⁶² ⁵⁶³ ⁵⁶⁴ ⁵⁶⁵ ⁵⁶⁶ ⁵⁶⁷ ⁵⁶⁸ ⁵⁶⁹ ⁵⁷⁰ ⁵⁷¹ ⁵⁷² ⁵⁷³ ⁵⁷⁴ ⁵⁷⁵ ⁵⁷⁶ ⁵⁷⁷ ⁵⁷⁸ ⁵⁷⁹ ⁵⁸⁰ ⁵⁸¹ ⁵⁸² ⁵⁸³ ⁵⁸⁴ ⁵⁸⁵ ⁵⁸⁶ ⁵⁸⁷ ⁵⁸⁸ ⁵⁸⁹ ⁵⁹⁰ ⁵⁹¹ ⁵⁹² ⁵⁹³ ⁵⁹⁴ ⁵⁹⁵ ⁵⁹⁶ ⁵⁹⁷ ⁵⁹⁸ ⁵⁹⁹ ⁶⁰⁰ ⁶⁰¹ ⁶⁰² ⁶⁰³ ⁶⁰⁴ ⁶⁰⁵ ⁶⁰⁶ ⁶⁰⁷ ⁶⁰⁸ ⁶⁰⁹ ⁶¹⁰ ⁶¹¹ ⁶¹² ⁶¹³ ⁶¹⁴ ⁶¹⁵ ⁶¹⁶ ⁶¹⁷ ⁶¹⁸ ⁶¹⁹ ⁶²⁰ ⁶²¹ ⁶²² ⁶²³ ⁶²⁴ ⁶²⁵ ⁶²⁶ ⁶²⁷ ⁶²⁸ ⁶²⁹ ⁶³⁰ ⁶³¹ ⁶³² ⁶³³ ⁶³⁴ ⁶³⁵ ⁶³⁶ ⁶³⁷ ⁶³⁸ ⁶³⁹ ⁶⁴⁰ ⁶⁴¹ ⁶⁴² ⁶⁴³ ⁶⁴⁴ ⁶⁴⁵ ⁶⁴⁶ ⁶⁴⁷ ⁶⁴⁸ ⁶⁴⁹ ⁶⁵⁰ ⁶⁵¹ ⁶⁵² ⁶⁵³ ⁶⁵⁴ ⁶⁵⁵ ⁶⁵⁶ ⁶⁵⁷ ⁶⁵⁸ ⁶⁵⁹ ⁶⁶⁰ ⁶⁶¹ ⁶⁶² ⁶⁶³ ⁶⁶⁴ ⁶⁶⁵ ⁶⁶⁶ ⁶⁶⁷ ⁶⁶⁸ ⁶⁶⁹ ⁶⁷⁰ ⁶⁷¹ ⁶⁷² ⁶⁷³ ⁶⁷⁴ ⁶⁷⁵ ⁶⁷⁶ ⁶⁷⁷ ⁶⁷⁸ ⁶⁷⁹ ⁶⁸⁰ ⁶⁸¹ ⁶⁸² ⁶⁸³ ⁶⁸⁴ ⁶⁸⁵ ⁶⁸⁶ ⁶⁸⁷ ⁶⁸⁸ ⁶⁸⁹ ⁶⁹⁰ ⁶⁹¹ ⁶⁹² ⁶⁹³ ⁶⁹⁴ ⁶⁹⁵ ⁶⁹⁶ ⁶⁹⁷ ⁶⁹⁸ ⁶⁹⁹ ⁷⁰⁰ ⁷⁰¹ ⁷⁰² ⁷⁰³ ⁷⁰⁴ ⁷⁰⁵ ⁷⁰⁶ ⁷⁰⁷ ⁷⁰⁸ ⁷⁰⁹ ⁷¹⁰ ⁷¹¹ ⁷¹² ⁷¹³ ⁷¹⁴ ⁷¹⁵ ⁷¹⁶ ⁷¹⁷ ⁷¹⁸ ⁷¹⁹ ⁷²⁰ ⁷²¹ ⁷²² ⁷²³ ⁷²⁴ ⁷²⁵ ⁷²⁶ ⁷²⁷ ⁷²⁸ ⁷²⁹ ⁷³⁰ ⁷³¹ ⁷³² ⁷³³ ⁷³⁴ ⁷³⁵ ⁷³⁶ ⁷³⁷ ⁷³⁸ ⁷³⁹ ⁷⁴⁰ ⁷⁴¹ ⁷⁴² ⁷⁴³ ⁷⁴⁴ ⁷⁴⁵ ⁷⁴⁶ ⁷⁴⁷ ⁷⁴⁸ ⁷⁴⁹ ⁷⁵⁰ ⁷⁵¹ ⁷⁵² ⁷⁵³ ⁷⁵⁴ ⁷⁵⁵ ⁷⁵⁶ ⁷⁵⁷ ⁷⁵⁸ ⁷⁵⁹ ⁷⁶⁰ ⁷⁶¹ ⁷⁶² ⁷⁶³ ⁷⁶⁴ ⁷⁶⁵ ⁷⁶⁶ ⁷⁶⁷ ⁷⁶⁸ ⁷⁶⁹ ⁷⁷⁰ ⁷⁷¹ ⁷⁷² ⁷⁷³ ⁷⁷⁴ ⁷⁷⁵ ⁷⁷⁶ ⁷⁷⁷ ⁷⁷⁸ ⁷⁷⁹ ⁷⁸⁰ ⁷⁸¹ ⁷⁸² ⁷⁸³ ⁷⁸⁴ ⁷⁸⁵ ⁷⁸⁶ ⁷⁸⁷ ⁷⁸⁸ ⁷⁸⁹ ⁷⁹⁰ ⁷⁹¹ ⁷⁹² ⁷⁹³ ⁷⁹⁴ ⁷⁹⁵ ⁷⁹⁶ ⁷⁹⁷ ⁷⁹⁸ ⁷⁹⁹ ⁸⁰⁰ ⁸⁰¹ ⁸⁰² ⁸⁰³ ⁸⁰⁴ ⁸⁰⁵ ⁸⁰⁶ ⁸⁰⁷ ⁸⁰⁸ ⁸⁰⁹ ⁸¹⁰ ⁸¹¹ ⁸¹² ⁸¹³ ⁸¹⁴ ⁸¹⁵ ⁸¹⁶ ⁸¹⁷ ⁸¹⁸ ⁸¹⁹ ⁸²⁰ ⁸²¹ ⁸²² ⁸²³ ⁸²⁴ ⁸²⁵ ⁸²⁶ ⁸²⁷ ⁸²⁸ ⁸²⁹ ⁸³⁰ ⁸³¹ ⁸³² ⁸³³ ⁸³⁴ ⁸³⁵ ⁸³⁶ ⁸³⁷ ⁸³⁸ ⁸³⁹ ⁸⁴⁰ ⁸⁴¹ ⁸⁴² ⁸⁴³ ⁸⁴⁴ ⁸⁴⁵ ⁸⁴⁶ ⁸⁴⁷ ⁸⁴⁸ ⁸⁴⁹ ⁸⁵⁰ ⁸⁵¹ ⁸⁵² ⁸⁵³ ⁸⁵⁴ ⁸⁵⁵ ⁸⁵⁶ ⁸⁵⁷ ⁸⁵⁸ ⁸⁵⁹ ⁸⁶⁰ ⁸⁶¹ ⁸⁶² ⁸⁶³ ⁸⁶⁴ ⁸⁶⁵ ⁸⁶⁶ ⁸⁶⁷ ⁸⁶⁸ ⁸⁶⁹ ⁸⁷⁰ ⁸⁷¹ ⁸⁷² ⁸⁷³ ⁸⁷⁴ ⁸⁷⁵ ⁸⁷⁶ ⁸⁷⁷ ⁸⁷⁸ ⁸⁷⁹ ⁸⁸⁰ ⁸⁸¹ ⁸⁸² ⁸⁸³ ⁸⁸⁴ ⁸⁸⁵ ⁸⁸⁶ ⁸⁸⁷ ⁸⁸⁸ ⁸⁸⁹ ⁸⁹⁰ ⁸⁹¹ ⁸⁹² ⁸⁹³ ⁸⁹⁴ ⁸⁹⁵ ⁸⁹⁶ ⁸⁹⁷ ⁸⁹⁸ ⁸⁹⁹ ⁹⁰⁰ ⁹⁰¹ ⁹⁰² ⁹⁰³ ⁹⁰⁴ ⁹⁰⁵ ⁹⁰⁶ ⁹⁰⁷ ⁹⁰⁸ ⁹⁰⁹ ⁹¹⁰ ⁹¹¹ ⁹¹² ⁹¹³ ⁹¹⁴ ⁹¹⁵ ⁹¹⁶ ⁹¹⁷ ⁹¹⁸ ⁹¹⁹ ⁹²⁰ ⁹²¹ ⁹²² ⁹²³ ⁹²⁴ ⁹²⁵ ⁹²⁶ ⁹²⁷ ⁹²⁸ ⁹²⁹ ⁹³⁰ ⁹³¹ ⁹³² ⁹³³ ⁹³⁴ ⁹³⁵ ⁹³⁶ ⁹³⁷ ⁹³⁸ ⁹³⁹ ⁹⁴⁰ ⁹⁴¹ ⁹⁴² ⁹⁴³ ⁹⁴⁴ ⁹⁴⁵ ⁹⁴⁶ ⁹⁴⁷ ⁹⁴⁸ ⁹⁴⁹ ⁹⁵⁰ ⁹⁵¹ ⁹⁵² ⁹⁵³ ⁹⁵⁴ ⁹⁵⁵ ⁹⁵⁶ ⁹⁵⁷ ⁹⁵⁸ ⁹⁵⁹ ⁹⁶⁰ ⁹⁶¹ ⁹⁶² ⁹⁶³ ⁹⁶⁴ ⁹⁶⁵ ⁹⁶⁶ ⁹⁶⁷ ⁹⁶⁸ ⁹⁶⁹ ⁹⁷⁰ ⁹⁷¹ ⁹⁷² ⁹⁷³ ⁹⁷⁴ ⁹⁷⁵ ⁹⁷⁶ ⁹⁷⁷ ⁹⁷⁸ ⁹⁷⁹ ⁹⁸⁰ ⁹⁸¹ ⁹⁸² ⁹⁸³ ⁹⁸⁴ ⁹⁸⁵ ⁹⁸⁶ ⁹⁸⁷ ⁹⁸⁸ ⁹⁸⁹ ⁹⁹⁰ ⁹⁹¹ ⁹⁹² ⁹⁹³ ⁹⁹⁴ ⁹⁹⁵ ⁹⁹⁶ ⁹⁹⁷ ⁹⁹⁸ ⁹⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰⁰ ¹⁰⁰¹ ¹⁰⁰² ¹⁰⁰³ ¹⁰⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁰⁹ ¹⁰¹⁰ ¹⁰¹¹ ¹⁰¹² ¹⁰¹³ ¹⁰¹⁴ ¹⁰¹⁵ ¹⁰¹⁶ ¹⁰¹⁷ ¹⁰¹⁸ ¹⁰¹⁹ ¹⁰²⁰ ¹⁰²¹ ¹⁰²² ¹⁰²³ ¹⁰²⁴ ¹⁰²⁵ ¹⁰²⁶ ¹⁰²⁷ ¹⁰²⁸ ¹⁰²⁹ ¹⁰³⁰ ¹⁰³¹ ¹⁰³² ¹⁰³³ ¹⁰³⁴ ¹⁰³⁵ ¹⁰³⁶ ¹⁰³⁷ ¹⁰³⁸ ¹⁰³⁹ ¹⁰⁴⁰ ¹⁰⁴¹ ¹⁰⁴² ¹⁰⁴³ ¹⁰⁴⁴ ¹⁰⁴⁵ ¹⁰⁴⁶ ¹⁰⁴⁷ ¹⁰⁴⁸ ¹⁰⁴⁹ ¹⁰⁵⁰ ¹⁰⁵¹ ¹⁰⁵² ¹⁰⁵³ ¹⁰⁵⁴ ¹⁰⁵⁵ ¹⁰⁵⁶ ¹⁰⁵⁷ ¹⁰⁵⁸ ¹⁰⁵⁹ ¹⁰⁶⁰ ¹⁰⁶¹ ¹⁰⁶² ¹⁰⁶³ ¹⁰⁶⁴ ¹⁰⁶⁵ ¹⁰⁶⁶ ¹⁰⁶⁷ ¹⁰⁶⁸ ¹⁰⁶⁹ ¹⁰⁷⁰ ¹⁰⁷¹ ¹⁰⁷² ¹⁰⁷³ ¹⁰⁷⁴ ¹⁰⁷⁵ ¹⁰⁷⁶ ¹⁰⁷⁷ ¹⁰⁷⁸ ¹⁰⁷⁹ ¹⁰⁸⁰ ¹⁰⁸¹ ¹⁰⁸² ¹⁰⁸³ ¹⁰⁸⁴ ¹⁰⁸⁵ ¹⁰⁸⁶ ¹⁰⁸⁷ ¹⁰⁸⁸ ¹⁰⁸⁹ ¹⁰⁹⁰ ¹⁰⁹¹ ¹⁰⁹² ¹⁰⁹³ ¹⁰⁹⁴ ¹⁰⁹⁵ ¹⁰⁹⁶ ¹⁰⁹⁷ ¹⁰⁹⁸ ¹⁰⁹⁹ ¹¹⁰⁰ ¹¹⁰¹ ¹¹⁰² ¹¹⁰³ ¹¹⁰⁴ ¹¹⁰⁵ ¹¹⁰⁶ ¹¹⁰⁷ ¹¹⁰⁸ ¹¹⁰⁹ ¹¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹¹ ¹¹¹² ¹¹¹³ ¹¹¹⁴ ¹¹¹⁵ ¹¹¹⁶ ¹¹¹⁷ ¹¹¹⁸ ¹¹¹⁹ ¹¹²⁰ ¹¹²¹ ¹¹²² ¹¹²³ ¹¹²⁴ ¹¹²⁵ ¹¹²⁶ ¹¹²⁷ ¹¹²⁸ ¹¹²⁹ ¹¹³⁰ ¹¹³¹ ¹¹³² ¹¹³³ ¹¹³⁴ ¹¹³⁵ ¹¹³⁶ ¹¹³⁷ ¹¹³⁸ ¹¹³⁹ ¹¹⁴⁰ ¹¹⁴¹ ¹¹⁴² ¹¹⁴³ ¹¹⁴⁴ ¹¹⁴⁵ ¹¹⁴⁶ ¹¹⁴⁷ ¹¹⁴⁸ ¹¹⁴⁹ ¹¹⁵⁰ ¹¹⁵¹ ¹¹⁵² ¹¹⁵³ ¹¹⁵⁴ ¹¹⁵⁵ ¹¹⁵⁶ ¹¹⁵⁷ ¹¹⁵⁸ ¹¹⁵⁹ ¹¹⁶⁰ ¹¹⁶¹ ¹¹⁶² ¹¹⁶³ ¹¹⁶⁴ ¹¹⁶⁵ ¹¹⁶⁶ ¹¹⁶⁷ ¹¹⁶⁸ ¹¹⁶⁹ ¹¹⁷⁰ ¹¹⁷¹ ¹¹⁷² ¹¹⁷³ ¹¹⁷⁴ ¹¹⁷⁵ ¹¹⁷⁶ ¹¹⁷⁷ ¹¹⁷⁸ ¹¹⁷⁹ ¹¹⁸⁰ ¹¹⁸¹ ¹¹⁸² ¹¹⁸³ ¹¹⁸⁴ ¹¹⁸⁵ ¹¹⁸⁶ ¹¹⁸⁷ ¹¹⁸⁸ ¹¹⁸⁹ ¹¹⁹⁰ ¹¹⁹¹ ¹¹⁹² ¹¹⁹³ ¹¹⁹⁴ ¹¹⁹⁵ ¹¹⁹⁶ ¹¹⁹⁷ ¹¹⁹⁸ ¹¹⁹⁹ ¹²⁰⁰ ¹²⁰¹ ¹²⁰² ¹²⁰³ ¹²⁰⁴ ¹²⁰⁵ ¹²⁰⁶ ¹²⁰⁷ ¹²⁰⁸ ¹²⁰⁹ ¹²¹⁰ ¹²¹¹ ¹²¹² ¹²¹³ ¹²¹⁴ ¹²¹⁵ ¹²¹⁶ ¹²¹⁷ ¹²¹⁸ ¹²¹⁹ ¹²²⁰ ¹²²¹ ¹²²² ¹²²³ ¹²²⁴ ¹²²⁵ ¹²²⁶ ¹²²⁷ ¹²²⁸ ¹²²⁹ ¹²³⁰ ¹²³¹ ¹²³² ¹²³³ ¹²³⁴ ¹²³⁵ ¹²³⁶ ¹²³⁷ ¹²³⁸ ¹²³⁹ ¹²⁴⁰ ¹²⁴¹ ¹²⁴² ¹²⁴³ ¹²⁴⁴ ¹²⁴⁵ ¹²⁴⁶ ¹²⁴⁷ ¹²⁴⁸ ¹²⁴⁹ ¹²⁵⁰ ¹²⁵¹ ¹²⁵² ¹²⁵³ ¹²⁵⁴ ¹²⁵⁵ ¹²⁵⁶ ¹²⁵⁷ ¹²⁵⁸ ¹²⁵⁹ ¹²⁶⁰ ¹²⁶¹ ¹²⁶² ¹²⁶³ ¹²⁶⁴ ¹²⁶⁵ ¹²⁶⁶ ¹²⁶⁷ ¹²⁶⁸ ¹²⁶⁹ ¹²⁷⁰ ¹²⁷¹ ¹²⁷² ¹²⁷³ ¹²⁷⁴ ¹²⁷⁵ ¹²⁷⁶ ¹²⁷⁷ ¹²⁷⁸ ¹²⁷⁹ ¹²⁸⁰ ¹²⁸¹ ¹²⁸² ¹²⁸³ ¹²⁸⁴ ¹²⁸⁵ ¹²⁸⁶ ¹²⁸⁷ ¹²⁸⁸ ¹²⁸⁹ ¹²⁹⁰ ¹²⁹¹ ¹²⁹² ¹²⁹³ ¹²⁹⁴ ¹²⁹⁵ ¹²⁹⁶ ¹²⁹⁷ ¹²⁹⁸ ¹²⁹⁹ ¹³⁰⁰ ¹³⁰¹ ¹³⁰² ¹³⁰³ ¹³⁰⁴ ¹³⁰⁵ ¹³⁰⁶ ¹³⁰⁷ ¹³⁰⁸ ¹³⁰⁹ ¹³¹⁰ ¹³¹¹ ¹³¹² ¹³¹³ ¹³¹⁴ ¹³¹⁵ ¹³¹⁶ ¹³¹⁷ ¹³¹⁸ ¹³¹⁹ ¹³²⁰ ¹³²¹ ¹³²² ¹³²³ ¹³²⁴ ¹³²⁵ ¹³²⁶

γεννημένος ^τ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ^η ἁμαρτίαν οὐ ^η ποιεῖ, ὅτι ^υ σπέρμα ^υ = here only.

—“ Spiritus sanctus et virtus ejus,” Calvin, Beza; “ gratia,” Lyra, Tirinus, Corn.-alap.; “ nativitas spiritualis,” Estius, Luther; “ vires regenerationis quæ a Spiritu sancto fit,” Seb.-Schmidt; “ the power of the divine life,” De Wette (= τὸ πν. τοῦ θ.), Baumg.-Crus., Neander, Erdmann, De W.; “ the spirit of man new begotten by the Spirit of God, in contrast to the flesh,” Sander. Some of the ancients understood it of the word of God, as in the parable of the sower, Matt. xiii. 3 ff. So Clem. Alex. (but not as exegesis on this passage: at least if the passage in Strom. i. 1. 1, p. 317 P be meant,—ὁ Σαλομῶν (Prov. ii. 1) . . . σπειρόμενον τὸν λόγον κρῦπτεσθαι μὴνύει καθάπερ ἐν γῇ τῇ τοῦ μανθάνοντος ψυχῇ, καὶ αὕτη πνευματικὴ φυτεία), Aug. (Tract. v. § 7, vol. iii. p. 2016, “ Semen Dei, id est, verbum Dei: unde dicit apostolus, Per evangelium ego vos genui, 1 Cor. iv. 15 ”), Bede (h. l.), Luther (1), Spener, Grotius, Calov., Bengel, Benson, Whitby, Socinus, Schlichting, Rosenmüller, al. This last interpretation has been impugned by all the moderns, but I cannot see that they have made good their objection: the force of which, as stated by Huther and Düsterd., amounts to this; that the word of God is not so much the *Seed*, as the *means whereby the begetting to the new life takes place* (“ das Mittel der Erzeugung des neuen Lebens,” Huth.). But whether we regard the generation of plants, or animal procreation, which latter is more in question here, what words can more accurately describe the office of the seed, than these? and what is the word of God but the continually abiding and working seed of the new life, in the child of God? Nay, it seems to be that exactly of which we are in search: not the Holy Spirit, the personal agent; not the power of the new life, the thing begotten; but just that which intervenes between the two, the word, the utterance of God—dropt into the soul of man, taking it up by divine power into itself, and developing the new life continually. This is in the most precise and satisfactory sense the σπέρμα τοῦ θεοῦ: and on this all Scripture symbolism is agreed: cf. 1 Pet. i. 23, James i. 18. In fact the very passage which is the key to this, is John v. 38, τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔχετε ἐν ὑμῖν μένοντα. Nor should any exception have been taken by Huther and Düsterd. to the comparison with the parable of the Sower (“ wie viele Ältere Ausleger mit ungeschickter Vergleichung von Matt. xiii. 3 ff.,” Düsterd.), for though the attendant circumstances of

generation are different, the analogy is the same.

There is a novel and extraordinary rendering proposed by Bengel, who, after explaining σπέρμα by “ verbum Dei cum sua virtute,” says, “ vel potius sic: Semen Dei, i. e. is qui natus est ex Deo, manet in Deo. σπέρμα, natus. Tales sunt vere ἐγγενῆς, semen Dei: Mal. ii. 15:”—and adopted by Sander,—see above. This hardly needs refutation: we can only say that any one who can persuade himself that σπέρμα αὐτοῦ, anarthrous, and loco subjecti, can mean ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννημένος, has, both philologically and exegetically, much yet to learn.

The reason of this absence of the article is plain: the seed is thought of not individually, but categorically: q. d., “ because seed of His abideth in him ”; and he cannot sin (there is no climax in καὶ οὐ: if there is any, it rests entirely with δύναται. No explaining away of this declaration must be attempted, as is done by Corn.-a-lap., who understands it of deadly sin; by Aug. and Bede, who confine the ἁμαρτάνειν to the violation of brotherly love: or as Grot. “ res de qua agitur aliena est ab ejusmodi ingenio.” The Apostle is speaking not only of the ideal, but of the real state of those born of God: drawing the strongest possible contrast between the life of God and the life of sin, as excluding one another absolutely. And there is no contradiction between what is here said and ch. i. 8, 9; nay, rather that passage shews, by the strong desire to be cleansed from all sin, which it assumes, the same incompatibility as is here insisted on), because he hath been begotten of God (almost all the expositors, from the first times until now, make this ὅτι more or less represent ἐφ’ ὅσον, in quantum, quam diu, quatenus, and the like. And where τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ μένειν was the matter to be measured, as in ver. 6, no doubt this might be: but τὸ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννησθαι is an absolute fact, to which an ἐφ’ ὅσον refuses to be applied: it either has been, or it has not been: its effect either endures, or does not endure. And in this last consideration lies the true solution of the difficulty. As before in ver. 6, so now, the Greek perfect is especially to be held firm in our exegesis. The Apostle does not say οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθη: this would testify to a past fact, once for all occurring, without any reference to its present permanence: but he has said ὅτι ἐκ τ. θ. γεγεννηται,—because he has abiding in

αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει καὶ οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, ὅτι ABCKL
PR a b c
d f g h j
kl m n o
13
 ἡ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γηγενήνεται. 10 u ἐν τούτῳ φανερά ἐστὶν τὰ

u see ch. ii. 3,
ref.

him that his birth from God. So that the ἐφ' ὅσον explanation, though falling far short of the real meaning, has at least a feeling after the truth of the Apostle's assertion in it. The abiding force of this divine generation in a man, excludes sin ("qui eam indolem retinebit, non peccabit," as Grotius, thus far right): where sin enters, that force does not abide: the γηγενῆσθαι is in danger of becoming a γεννηθῆναι, a fact in the past instead of a fact in the present: a lost life, instead of a living life. And so all such passages as this, instead of testifying, as Calvin would have this one do ("Johannes non solum docet quam efficaciter agat semel Deus in homine, sed clare affirmat, Spiritum suum gratiam in nobis ad extremum usque persequi, ut ad vitæ novitatem inflexibilis perseverantia accedat"), to the doctrine of final perseverance of the regenerate, do in fact bear witness to the very opposite: viz., that, as the Church of England teaches, we need God's special grace every day to keep us in the state of salvation, from which every act and thought of sin puts us in peril of falling away. Jerome, advers. Jovin. ii. 1, vol. ii. p. 821, quotes Jovinian as maintaining, from this verse, "eos qui fuerint baptizati a diabolo non posse tentari: quicunque autem tentati fuerint, eos aqua tantum et non spiritu baptizatos;" which view Lücke ascribes to his desire, in a spirit of ethical reform, to bring back men's minds to the fundamental and ideal contrasts of Scripture itself. But surely in such a case, "a diabolo non posse tentari" was rather beyond the mark. Before leaving this important passage, I must quote Düsterdieck's concluding remarks. "The difference between the older and more modern expositors (as Lücke, Rickli, De Wette, and Neander) lies in this, that the former are more anxious to moderate the details of the Apostle's sentiment, and to tone down his assertion to the actual life of Christians, while the moderns recognize the full precision of the text as it stands, but then remind us that the ideal truth of the principle announced by St. John continually so to speak floats above the actual life of believers as their rule and aim, and that, in so far, the Apostle's saying finds in such actual life only a relative fulfilment. None however of all the expositors, who in any way has recognized the ideal character of St. John's view, has overlooked the fact, that even in the actual life of all that are born of God there is something which

in full verity answers to the ideal words 'they cannot sin.' The children of God, in whom the divine seed of their eternal life abides, have, in reality, a holy privilege, as Steinhofer says,—they sin not, and they cannot sin, just in proportion as the new divine life, unconditionally opposed to all sin, and manifesting itself in godlike righteousness, is present and abides in them. Expositors of all theological tendencies, in all times, e. g. Didymus, Ec., Est., Schlichting, Luther, Hunnius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Bengel, Joachim Lange, Rosenm., Lucke, Neander, &c. point to this, that the new life of believers, veritably begotten by regeneration from God, is simply incompatible with sin (ἀνακόλουθον καὶ ἀνάρμοστον, Didymus);—the life which essentially alienates the spirit from all sin (ἀνεπίδεκτον ἁμαρτίας τὸν νοῦν ἡμῶν ποιεῖ, Ec.), fills it with an irreconcilable hate against every sin, and urges it to an unceasing conflict against all unrighteousness. Luther excellently says, that a child of God in this conflict receives indeed wounds daily, but never throws away his arms or makes peace with his deadly foe. Sin is ever active, but no longer dominant: the normal direction of life's energies in the believer is against sin, is an absence of sin, a no-will-to-sin and a no-power-to-sin. He that is born of God has become, from being a servant of sin, a servant of righteousness: according to the divine seed remaining in him, or, as St. Paul says, according to the inner man (Rom. vii. 15 ff.), he will, and he can work only that which is like God,—righteousness, though the flesh, not yet fully mortified, rebels and sins: so that even in and by the power of the new life sin must be ever confessed, forgiveness received (ch. i. 8 ff.), the temptation of the evil one avoided and overcome (ch. v. 18), and self-purification and sanctification carried on"). 10.] "*Epilogus superioris argumenti*," as Luther: with the insertion, in the latter half, of the new particular which is to form the argument of the next section. But this latter half belongs not only to that next section, but to this as well: its assertion πᾶς ὁ μὴ κ.τ.λ., is requisite for the carrying out fully of the ἐν τούτῳ, which at the same time looks backward and forward: backward, for the children of God have already been designated by the absence of sin, ver. 9: forward, for the children of the devil are designated below by the presence of sin in the second half of the verse. In this

ν τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου. πᾶς ὁ μὴ
 * ποιῶν * δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἕκ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ μὴ
 ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. 11 ὅτι ² αὕτη ἔστιν ἡ ἀγγε-

v vv. 1, 2 reff.
 w see Acts xiii.
 10
 x ch. ii. 29 reff.
 y ch. ii. 26 reff.
 z ver. 23 reff.
 a ch. i. 5
 only. Prov. xii. 25. xxvi. 16.

10. [See Tischdf Cod. Ephr. p. 344.]
 ACK[P] c f g k m: om BL⁸ N rel

11. ἐπαγγελία C[P]N a n 40 syr-mg-gr coptt Cyr Lucif: txt ABKL rel vulg Thl
 Gc-comm Aug Bede: *mandatum* harl Syr æth arm.

ins την bef δικαιοσύνην (from ver 7)

(fact, circumstance: *in* better than *by*, which gives the idea that this is the *only* sign) are manifest (it has been asked, *to whom?* Lücke, Sander, and Düsterd. say, to God's unerring eye alone. True, in the full and deep truth of the saying: but surely in degree and proportion to those whom the unction from the Holy One enables to know all things: in proportion as sin is manifested, or hatred and avoidance of sin is manifested, in a character. And the especial sign which follows, the sin of hate, is one which is plainly open to men's eyes, at least in its ordinary manifestations) the children of God and the children of the devil (see these expressions explained and vindicated from the charge of dualism, above, ver. 8. Cf. John viii. 44, Acts xiii. 10. Socinus remarks well, "Ex Apostoli verbis satis aperte colligi potest, quod inter filios Dei et filios diaboli nulli sint homines medi"): **every one that doeth not righteousness** (see ch. ii. 29: the difference here being that *δικαιοσ.* having no art. is more general, whereas it was *τὴν δικαιοσ.* there in reference to the *δικαίος* which was predicated of God. It is natural that, in a recapitulation, the language should be more general, though the same thing is intended) **is not of God** (= is not a child of God. It may be observed that Orig., Tert., Cypr., al. read ὁ μὴ ὄν δικαίος, which is edited by Lachmann), **and he that loveth not his brother** (see below, these words pointing on to the next section).

11—24.] Of *brotherly love*, as the sum and essence of *δικαιοσύνη*: as Christ's command (ver. 11): whereas in the world there is hate (12, 13): bound up with life, as hate with death (14, 15): finding its great pattern in Christ (16); to be testified not in word only but in deed (17, 18); as the ground of confidence toward God and the granting of our prayers to Him, being obedience to His will (19—22); which obedience consists in faith and love (23), and is testified to by the witness of His Spirit (24).

Before entering on ver. 11, the latter half of ver. 10 must be considered, as belonging properly, in its sense, to this section, though in arrangement inseparable

from the last. The *καί*, which binds on the additional particular in the last clause, serves, as in ver. 5, to co-ordinate that clause with the foregoing: not in this case as excluded from the forementioned category, but as one particular, taken out from among the general category, and put into a co-ordinate position with it. And it is thus put, as being the most eminent, and most of the nature of a summary, and criterion, of the rest, of any of those graces which are necessarily involved in *δικαιοσύνη*. Aug. beautifully says, "Dilectio sola discernit inter filios Dei et filios diaboli. Signent se omnes signo crucis Christi: respondeant omnes Amen: cantent omnes Halleluia: baptizentur omnes, intrent ecclesias, faciant parietes basilicarum: non discernuntur filii Dei a filiis diaboli nisi caritate." And this love, thus constituted into "magnum indicium, magna discretio" (Aug.), is necessarily the family love of brother for brother within the limits of those who are begotten of God. Universal love to man is a Christian grace—but it is not that here spoken of: it neither answers the description of the *ἀγγελία* given in ver. 11, nor corresponds to the context here in general, the drift of which is that a test of our belonging to God's family is our love towards His children who are our brethren in that family: cf. ch. v. 1 ff. But, while there can be no doubt that this is the right understanding of the brotherly love here insisted on, we incur at once a formal difficulty in applying this meaning to the negative or exclusive side of the test. He who does not love his brother, has in strict fact *no brother to love*, for he is not a child of God at all. Hence we must understand, strictly speaking, τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ in this case as importing his hypothetical brother: him, who would be, were he himself a true child of God, a brother, and if so, necessarily beloved. That this love does not exist in him, demonstrates him not to be of God's family.

11.] **Because** (proof that absence of love of the brethren excludes from God's family) **the message which ye heard from the beginning** (the announcement which from the beginning of the preaching of the Gos-

b ch. ii. 7 reff.
e JOHN xiii. 34.
xv. 12, 17.
ch. iv. 7, 11,
12 al. John
only, exc.
Rom. xiii. 8.
1 Thess. iv. 9.
1 Pet. i. 22.
d ch. ii. 13 reff.
e here bis.

Rev. v. 6 al.
only, J. Gen. xxii. 10.
15, 11. Jude 16 only

h here only, see Phil. iv. 8. Matt. xxiii. 35. Heb. xi. 4.

λία ἢν ἡκούσατε ^b ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ^z ἵνα ^c ἀγαπῶμεν ^c ἀλλήλους·

12 οὐ καθὼς Κάιν ^y ἐκ τοῦ ^d πονηροῦ ἦν, καὶ ^e ἐσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ. καὶ ^f χάριν τίνος ^e ἐσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι

τὰ ^{gh} ἔργα αὐτοῦ ^g πονηρὰ ἦν, τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ^h δίκαια. 13 Μὴ ⁱ θαυμάζετε, ἀδελφοί, ⁱ εἰ μισεῖ ἡμᾶς ὁ

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j
k l m n o
13

f John, here only. Luke vii. 47. Gal. vi. 19. Eph. iii. 1, 14. 1 Tim. v. 14. Tit. 15, 11. Jude 16 only. 3 Kings xiv. 16 A &c. (B def) only. Sir xxxiv (xxxii) 6. g 2 John 11 reff. i Mark xv. 44. see Sir. lxxvi. 11.

13. at beg ins και (C¹?) [P]N 29. 66². 98. 191 Syr æth arm. rec aft αδελφοι ins μου, with KL rel syrr coptt Thl Æc: om ABC[P]N d m 13. 36(sic) vulg arm Did-int Lucif Aug Ors Bede.

pel was made to you. ἀγγελία is not here = ἐντολή, though that which is cited is a commandment: but it is an ἐντολή conveyed in words and by messengers, and thus become an ἀγγελία) is this (in all such sentences as this, the demonstrative pronoun which begins them is in reality the predicate, and often might in English be transposed to the end with advantage), that we love one another (on ἵνα, see note, ver. 1. It is impossible here, as there, to press the strong telic sense. The particle carries that combination of purpose and purport which we have so many times had occasion to notice: see e. g., note on 1 Cor. xiv. 13).

12, 13.] See summary above: *example of the first instance of the world's hate*, by way of contrast.

12.] Not as Cain was of the wicked one and slew his brother (the construction is elliptic, or rather brachylogic, for nothing is to be supplied, as ἐμμέν (Sander), or ἄμην ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, as Grot., Lücke, or *diligamus*, as Corn.-a-lap.; or a relative ὅς before ἐκ τ. πον. ἦν, as Beza and Socinus. The construction is just as in John vi. 58, and in the passage of Demosth. p. 415 A, which Winer adduces, οὐ γὰρ ἐκ πολιτικῆς αἰτίας, οὐδ' ὥσπερ Ἀριστοφάν . . . ἔλυσε τὴν προβολήν. It would be simpler, οὐ καθὼς Κάιν ἐσφαξεν τὸν ἀδ. αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ὄν. The word σφάζω properly means to kill by cutting the throat. It is said to occur in LXX and N. T. in the general sense of killing (so Düsterd.); but I cannot find any instances which will not bear the precise meaning as well as a more general one. It is remarkable however, that St. John only of N. T. writers uses the verb, and that in every place there is nothing *requiring* the proper sense: so that any inference from its occurrence here as to the manner of Cain's murder of Abel would be unsafe. In ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν we have a resumption of ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστίν from above, ver. 8: to the word πονηροῦ being used probably on account of τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν following. Observe, the ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν is the inference from

that great proof which he gave of it by killing his brother: as is also the reason given in what follows: see below. So that here the assertion of his being of the wicked one is, as above, strictly ethical, and in no way physical or dualistic: "Cain erat filius non Dei sed diaboli, non generatione, sed imitatione et suggestione," Corn.-a-lap.). And for what reason (reff.) slew he him? because his (own) works were wicked, and those of his brother righteous (it has caused some difficulty, that no mention of this ethical difference is made in the narrative in Genesis. It has been supposed, e. g. by Socinus, that the Apostle gathers it from God's differing acceptance of the offerings of the two: others, as Lyra, have called the ethical characters of the two the "occasio prævia," whereas the immediately exciting cause was the "occasio propinqua," of the murder. But properly considered, the Apostle's assertion here is only a "deductio ex coucesso." Cain murdered his brother: therefore he hated him: and hate belongs to the children of the evil one,—classes him at once among those whose works are evil, and who hate those who, like Abel, are testified to (Heb. xi. 4) that they are of the children of God who work righteousness. Whatever might be the exciting occasion of the murder, this lay at the root—the hatred which the children of the devil ever bear to the children of God. The various legends, about Cain being the child of the serpent by Eve, and the characters of Cain and Abel, see in Lücke, edn. 3, pp. 317, 318, notes; and the former in Huther, p. 148).

13.] The connexion with verse 12 is close: the world (= the children of the devil) began so, and will ever go on as it began. Marvel not, brethren, if (no *doubt* is expressed by this εἰ. The hypothesis is set forth as actually fulfilled. See on this (originally Attic) use of εἰ after θαυμάζω, and like verbs, in Kühner, § 771. Among his examples are the following: οὐ δὲ θαυμαστόν ἐστιν εἰ στρατεύόμενος κ. ποῶν ἐκέλευσεν . . . ἡμῶν μελλόντων . . . περιγίγνεται,

κόσμος. ¹⁴ ἡμεῖς οἶδαμεν ὅτι ^k μεταβεβήκαμεν ἐκ τοῦ ^k JOHN v. 24.
^k θανάτου εἰς τὴν ^k ζωὴν, ὅτι ἀγαπῶμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς.
 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. ¹⁵ πᾶς ὁ μισῶν τὸν

14. μεταβεβηκεν(sic) N. aft αδελφους ins ημων N lect-58 Syr. rec aft αγα-
 πων ins τον αδελφον, with CKL[P] rel syrpt copt sah-woide æth Thl Ec Cassiod: om
 ABN 13 vulg sah-mnt arm Did-int Lucif Aug Bede.

Demosth. p. 24. 23: ἀλλ' ἐκείνο θαυμάζω, εἰ Λακεδαιμονίοις μὲν ποτε . . . ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν δικαίων ἀντήρατε νυνὶ δὲ δυνεῖτε, κ.τ.λ., ib. p. 52. 43: in both which places *matters of fact* follow the εἰ. Kuhner ascribes the idiom to the Attic urbanity, which loved to give to speech a certain tinge of doubt and uncertainty) **the world hateth you** ("magis esset mirabile si diligerent eos," says Didymus. This verse is in close sequence on the example just given: Cain being taken as the prototype and exemplar of such hate).

14, 15.] See summary above on ver. 11. The connexion with the foregoing is very close. We learnt from ver. 10, that the love of the brethren is that which makes manifest the children of God and the children of the devil. And now again, having spoken of the hate of the world as a thing to be looked for, the Apostle brings up this sign as one tending to comfort the child of God, and shew him that, notwithstanding the world's hate, he has more to rejoice at than to fear from the fact: he is in life, they in death. **We** (ἡμεῖς, emphatic: we whom the world hates: we, as set over against the world) **know** (see above, ver. 2 al.: of certain knowledge) **that we have passed over out of death into life** (notice both times the articles after the prepositions, removing the nouns in this case out of the abstract, and giving them a concrete totality—the *death*, which reigns over the unregenerate: *the life*, which is revealed in Christ), **because** (ὅτι gives the ground and cause, not of the μεταβεβήκαμεν, but of the οἶδαμεν) **we love the brethren** (here distinctly, our Christian brethren: the term οἱ ἀδελφοί being that well-known one by which the body of Christians was represented. It is curious to follow Düsterdieck in his recension of the R.-Cath. and Socinian interpretations of this verse, and to see how they both run into one in wresting it to their own doctrines. First, the former begin with οἶδαμεν. Lyra would confine it to the *Apostles*; they knew "certitudinaliter, de hoc per divinam revelationem certificati;" but "si ad alios refertur, tum hoc scire accipitur pro probabili conjectura." Similarly Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, and Estius (and I may add, Justiniani, even more strikingly; see below), denying that St.

John speaks of the certainty of assurance grounded on faith by the heretics, but "de certitudine morali et conjecturali, concepta ex testimonio bonæ conscientiæ, innocentia vitæ et consolatione Spiritus Sancti." (Justiniani's words are, "Recte ait (Didymus) nos *disciplinabiliter* id scire, ut formidinem quidem excludat, nihil tamen præter probabilitatem ex scientia offerat.") Estius predicates the knowledge indeed simply of Christians respecting all the "boni fideles," "quorum e numero nos esse singuli confidimus." On the other hand Socinus, remarking that the Scripture writers (and even our Lord Himself, for which he refers to the Beatitudes) often "hyperbolicis quibusdam amplificandæ rei causa loquutionibus utuntur," says of the test here proposed, "nam qui tali animo est præditus, vix fieri potest quin alias etiam Christianas qualitates habeat, quæ necessariæ sunt ad vitam æternam consequendam." This remark brings us on common ground with the R.-Catholics, who would do violence to the express perfect tense μεταβεβήκαμεν to suit their purpose. So even Didymus, "quoniam qui diligit fratres secundum Deum, ad vitam ex morte transit:." (so Justiniani, making brotherly love the instrument of our μετάβασις, instead of the sign of its having taken place: "amor itaque ex caritate a morte nos ad vitam traducit:." so Bede, who having explained rightly μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ below, "quod in anima mortui omnes in hanc lucem nascimur," goes on to say, "in illa utique morte, . . . si fratres perfecte amaret, *exurgere posset*:" so Lyra,—"opera ex caritate facta sunt meritoria;" so the Socinians, e. g. Schlichting ("docet quid maxime Deum impellat, ut nos ex morte transferre velit in vitam æternam"), adding, as we might expect, "dicit *transivimus*, per enallagen temporis pro *transibimus*:" so the rationalists, Grotius ("juri ad rem sæpe datur nomen rei ipsius"), and Carpov. It is very remarkable, that the fine exegetical tact of Estius causes him on the one hand to deliver a clear and decided interpretation of the verse as it really is ("non hic significatur meritum aut omnino causa dictæ translationis, quasi prius sit, diligere fratres, posterius autem, et effectus illius, transferri de morte ad vitam, id est, justificari.

¹ here bis. ^{John viii. 44} ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ¹ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἐστίν, καὶ οἶδατε ὅτι ^m πᾶς ^{ABCKL}
^{only 1.} ²¹ ἀνθρωποκτόνος ^m οὐκ ἔχει ⁿ ζῶην ⁿ αἰώνιον ἐν * αὐτῷ μένου- ^{PN a b c}
^{n ch. 11. 25 reff.} ^{d f g h j}
^{n ch. 11. 25 reff.} ^{k l m n o}

15. αὐτου B. * ἐαυτῷ AC[P]N rel 40 vulg Cyp: αὐτω BKL (c?) m 13.
 36(sic) Thl Ec.

Neque enim opera bona præcedunt justificandum, sed sequuntur justificatum, ut concinne B. Augustinus dicit, de fid. et op. c. 14 (21, vol. vi. p. 211). . . . Sed causalitas hæc referenda est ad cognitionem. Nam ex dilectione fraterna velut effectu et signo cognoscimus, nos de morte ad vitam translatos esse: et quantum de illa certi sumus, tantum et de isto¹), while his doctrinal bias leads him, a few lines after, to strike out the whole of this sound exposition by saying, "Veruntamen etsi dilectio Dei et proximi justificationem nostram totam, cujus initium est a fide, nec mereatur, nec præcedat, sed sub ea comprehendatur tanquam pars ejus, impetrat tamen remissionis gratiam, juxta verbum Domini Luc. 7, *Remittuntur ei peccata multa quoniam dilexit multum*: sed et *augenda justificationis* est causa, ut *qui justus est, opera caritatis exercendo justificetur adhuc*, Apoc. ultimo." I have not considered it beside my purpose to spend even a long note on recounting the above interpretations. It may conduce to a right estimate of the doctrines of men and churches, and put younger Scripture students on their guard, to see the concurrent abits and tendencies of interpreters apparently so opposite. When Pilate and Herod are friends, we know what work is in hand. But as a conclusion, I will quote the clear and faithful exposition of a greater and better man: "Quid nos scimus? quia transivimus de morte ad vitam. Unde scimus? quia diligimus fratres. Nemo interroget hominem: redeat unusquisque ad cor suum: si ibi invenerit caritatem fraternam, securus sit quia transit a morte ad vitam. Jam in dextera est: non attendat quia modo gloria ejus occulta est; cum venerit Dominus, tunc apparebit in gloria. Viget enim, sed adhuc in hyeme: viget radix, sed quasi aridi sunt rami: intus est medulla quæ viget, intus sunt folia arborum, intus fructus: sed æstatem expectant." Aug. in 1 Joan. Tract. v. § 10, vol. iii. p. 2017): **he that loveth not** (there is this time no qualifying object, as *τὸν ἀδελφόν*: the absence of love from the character is the sign spoken of. *τὸν ἀδελφόν* is right enough as a gloss, but the Apostle's saying is more general), **abideth in death** (*ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ*: on the art., see above: in that realm of death, in which all men are by nature: see Bede, quoted above. Here again, the absence of love is

not the reason, why he remains in death; but the sign of his so remaining. The *μετάβασις* has not passed upon him. The words have no reference to *future* death any further than as he who is and abides in death, can but end in death: "notandum quod non ait qui non diligit, venturus est in mortem, quasi de pena perpetua loqueretur, quæ restat peccatoribus in futurum: sed 'qui non diligit,' inquit, '*manet*' in morte." Bede.

15.] **Every one that hateth his brother is a manslayer** (in these words, (1) the *ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν* which preceded is taken up by *πᾶς ὁ μισῶν*: shewing, as most Commentators have remarked, that the two are identical: the living spirit of man being incapable of a state of indifference: that he who has banished brotherly love has in fact abandoned himself to the rule of the opposite state. In the ethical depth of the Apostle's view, love and hate, like light and darkness, life and death, necessarily replace, as well as necessarily exclude, one another. He who has not the one, of necessity has the other in each case. (2) He who hates his brother is stated to be an *ἀνθρωποκτόνος*. The example given, ver. 12, shewed the true and normal result of hate: and again in the Apostle's ethical depth of view, as in our Lord's own (Matt. v. 21 ff., 27 ff.), he who falls under a state, falls under the normal results of that state carried out to its issue. If a hater be not a murderer, the reason does not lie in his hate, but in his lack of hate. "Quem odimus, vellemus periisse," says Calvin. Some would make *ἀνθρωποκτόνος* mean, a destroyer of *his own* soul: so Ambrose (partly), precat. ad Missam: Lyra (not Corn.-a-lap., as Düsterd. implies), Tirinus. But this, as well as the view (Corn.-a-lap., al.) that it is the murder of his brother's *soul* which is intended, "provocando eum ad iram et discordiam,"—errs by pressing the reference to the example of Cain above. Some again, as Sander, would interpret it by a reference to John viii. 44, understood as pointing to the ruin of Adam by the Tempter. But as Düsterd. remarks (referring to a paper on John viii. 44, by Nitzsch, in the Theolog. Zeitschrift, Berlin, 1822, Heft. 3, p. 52), far rather should we say that this passage throws back a light on that passage, and makes it likely that the case of Cain, and not that of Adam, is there referred to; and **ye know that**

σαν. 16^ο ἐν τούτῳ^ο ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, ^ο ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ὑπὲρ ^ο ἡμῶν τὴν ^ο ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ^ο ἔθηκεν· καὶ ἡμεῖς ^ο ὀφείλομεν

o ch. ii. 3, 5
reff.
p ch. iv. 9, 10,
13.
q here bus. John
r = ch. ii. 6 reff.

x 11, &c. xiii. 37, 38. xv. 13 only. J.

every manslayer hath not (is without the possession of) eternal life abiding in him (οἶδατε, viz. by your own knowledge of what is patent, and axiomatic in itself. We must not fall into the error of referring the saying to the future lot of the murderer, as Bede, "Etsi hic per fidem inter sanctos vivere cernitur, non habet in se perpetuo vitam manentem; nam ubi retributionis dies advenit, cum Cain . . . damnabitur:" it regards his present state, and is another way of saying that he μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, ver. 14. Eternal life, which abides in God's children, which is the living growth of the seed of God in them, is evidenced by love: if the very crown and issue of hate, homicide, be present, it is utterly impossible that this germ of life can be coexistent with it; can be firmly implanted and abiding (cf. John v. 38) in the man.

Socinus (and Corn.-a-lap.) gives the syllogism contained in these verses thus: "nullus homicida habet vitam æternam in se manentem: verum qui fratrem suum odit est homicida: ergo qui fratrem suum odit, non habet vitam æternam in se manentem. Hoc syllogismo probat Apostolus eum qui non diligit fratrem suum manere in morte"). 16—18.] *Description and enforcement of true love.*

"Exposui hactenus et probavi, quod dilectio fratrum verissima et optima nota sit discernendi filios Dei et filios diaboli. Sed ne quis hic loci vel seipsum decipiat, vel ab aliis decipiat, . . . exponendum etiam erit, . . . quæ sit vera et christiana caritas." Seb.-Schmidt, in Düsterd.

16.] *Example of true love in Christ, and enforcement of it on us.* In this (οὐ ἐν τούτῳ, see above, ver. 10, and note, ch. ii. 3) we have the knowledge of (ἐγνώκαμεν, "we have arrived at and possess the apprehension of:" γνώσκειν, true knowledge as an act of the understanding proceeding on intellectual grounds. Here however it is used entirely within the sphere of the Christian life of union with Christ. None can understand true love as shewn in this its highest example, but he who is one with Christ, and has felt and does feel that love of His in its power on himself. See note on ch. ii. 3) love (i. e. what love is: the nature of love true and genuine: "amoris naturam," Bengel; "veram indolem amoris," Rosenmüller. And Aug., "perfectionem dilectionis dicit, perfectionem illam quam commendavimus." And so most of the Commentators. Some have

held to the insertion of τοῦ θεοῦ after ἀγάπην, which has hardly any authority (only one cursive ("52") vulg. arm.-usc.). So Beza, Socinus, Whitby, Grot., Seb.-Schmidt, Calov. And others, as Spener, Carpzov., Episcopus, though they do not read θεοῦ, yet would supply it, or χριστοῦ, in the sense of Rom. v. 8, John iii. 16. But there can be but little doubt that the other is the right view. The love of God to us is not that which would, as such, be adduced as a pattern to us of brotherly love; it is true that in the depth of the matter, all true love is love after that pattern: but in a passage so logically bound together it is much more probable that the term common to the two, Christ and ourselves, would be, not divine love, which as such is peculiar to Him, but love itself simply, that of which He has given the great example which we are to follow), that He (Christ, as the words beyond question shew) laid down His life for us (ψυχὴν τιθέναι, as "vitam ponere" in Latin, to lay aside life, to die: not as Grot., who in all the places where it occurs maintains that it is only "vitam obicere periculis," which would entirely enervate the Apostle's saying here. ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν carries in it and behind it all that we know of the nature of the death which is spoken of: but the vicariousness and atoning power of Christ's death are not here in consideration: it is looked on here as the greatest possible proof of love, as in John xv. 13. It is the very perversity of unsound reasoning to maintain, as Paulus (in Düsterd.), that because our imitation of Christ's example, insisted on below, cannot have the virtue commonly ascribed to his death, therefore his death had in reality no such virtue): and we (ἡμεῖς, emphatic: we on our part, as followers of Christ) ought on behalf of the brethren to lay down our lives (οὐ ψυχάς, Socinus says well: "Non dicit nos debere animam ponere, quasi ut unus pro multis morti sit obstrictus, sed animas, quia singuli pro singulis mori debemus." The Apostle states the duty generally: and thus stated it is clear enough. As Christ did in pursuance of His love, so ought we to do in pursuance of ours, bound as we are to Him not by the mere force of an outward example, but by the power of an inward life. But naturally and necessarily the precept finds its application only in those cases where our Heavenly Father's will sets the offer-

^s = Luke viii. 43. xv. 12, 30. xxi. 4 ||. Prov xxxi. 14 B³ F (not A³4).
^t John ii. 23 a123. Rev. xi. 11, 12 N. T. passim, but chiefly John, Paul never, exc. in Acts. Heb. vii. 4. Prov xxxi. 16. u absol., Mark ii. 25. Eph. iv. 28. v = here only. (John xx. 12, 26) w John, here only. = 2 Cor. vi. 12. Col. iii. 12. Prov. xii. 10. x see ch. ii. 26 reff. y = ch. ii. 5 reff. z ch. ii. 1 reff.

16. [for 2nd υπερ, περι P.] rec (for θειναι) τιθεναι, with KL (13 appy) rel Ec: txt ABC [P(θηναι)] N 36 Thl.

17. εχει L d f k 13. θεωρει KL a¹ c h¹ k m 36(sic). for κλειση, κλησει L 13. μενει B² KL d f j.

18. rec aft τεκνια ins μου, with KL rel vulg-ed æth Thl Ec Bede: om ABC[P]N

ing of such a sacrifice in the course and pursuance of our brotherly love, which He has ordained. Of such an occasion the aor. *θειναι* gives perhaps a hint: not *τιθέναι*, as a habit of mind ever ready: but *θειναι*, once for all, on occasion given. It is not the place here to enter on, or even to enumerate, the various cases of conscience which casuists have raised as to the question, *when* a Christian ought to lay down his life for a brother. The subject will be found discussed in such commentaries as those of Corn.-a-lap., Justiniani, Estius, Episcopus; and a summary is given by Disterdieck h. l.). 17.] But ("by the adversative connexion of ver. 17 with ver. 16 the Apostle marks the passage from the greater, which is justly demanded of us, to the lesser, the violation of which is all the more a transgression of the law just prescribed." Disterd.) *whosoever hath the world's sustenance* (βίος, as in ch. ii. 16, and in reff., for that whereon life is sustained. Grotius quotes the classical proverb, *βίος βίου δεόμενος οὐκ ἔστι βίος*. Ec. and some others have misunderstood τὸν βίον τοῦ κόσμου as if it meant excessive wealth: Ec. even making τοῦ κόσμου a gen. of apposition: οὐ τοὺς βίους σπανίζοντας λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὅλους τὸν κόσμον σχεδὸν ὑπαρξιν ἔχοντας πλούτου. And Piscator makes it mean "victus, cui acquirendo mundus est deditus." But there can be little doubt that most Commentators are right in explaining the expression to mean, with Beza, "mundanæ facultates," "les biens de ce monde;" as E. V., "this world's good"), and beholdeth (θεωρῇ gives more than the casual sight: it is the standing and looking on as a spectator: so that it ever involves not the eye only, but the mind also, in the sight: it is *contemplari*, not simply *videre*. So Chrys. in Joh. Hom. lxxv. I, vol. viii. p. 405, οἶδεν ἡ γραφή ἐπὶ ἀκριβοῦς γνώσεως θεωρίαν λέγειν· ἐπειδὴν γὰρ τῶν αἰσθήσεων τρανότερα ἡ ὕψις, διὰ ταύτης αἶν τὸν ἀκριβῆ παρίστανει γινῶσιν. St. John is very fond of the word (reff.), and wherever it occurs,

this its meaning may be more or less traced. There is then in this unmerciful man not merely the being aware of, but the deliberate contemplation of the distress of his brother) *his brother having need, and shutteth up* (by the slight addition of "*up*," we faintly represent the force of the Greek aor. *κλειση*, as implying that the shutting is then and there done, as the result of the contemplation: not a mere constitutional hardness of heart, but an act of exclusion from sympathy following deliberately on the beholding of his brother's distress) *his bowels* (= his heart, the seat of compassion: as so often in the N. T. See reff., and Luke i. 78, 2 Cor. vii. 15, Phil. i. 8, ii. 1, Philem. 7, 12) *from him* (ἀπ' αὐτοῦ is pregnant, as in ch. ii. 28, "aversandi notionem habens." There is no Hebraism: nor is any supply such as ἀποστρέφόμενος wanted. *κλείειν ἀπό* is just as good Greek as *κρύπτειν ἀπό*, John xii. 36 al. As Disterd. remarks, the fact that a man shuts up his heart against his brother, includes in it the fact that that brother is excluded *from* the heart thus shut up), *how* (can it be that; as in ch. iv. 20, πῶς δύναται ἀγαπᾶν.) *doth the love of God* (i. e. from the very express filling out of the thought in ch. iv. 20, "*love to God*;" not God's love to us. See also ch. ii. 5, where we have the same expression and reference to the love of God being in a man. The context indeed here might seem, as the mention of Christ's love to us has so immediately preceded, to require the other meaning; or at least, that of "the love whereof God hath set us a pattern;" and accordingly both these have been held: the former by Luther, in his second exposition, and Calov., the latter by Socinus and Grotius. But I see not how we can escape the force of the passages above cited) *abide in him* (Lücke and Disterd. are disposed to lay a stress on the μένει here, thereby opening a door for the view that the love of God may indeed be in him in some sense, but not as a firm abiding principle; that at all events

μὴ ἀγαπῶμεν ^a λόγῳ μὴδὲ τῇ ^b γλώσσῃ, ἀλλ' ἐν ^a ἔργῳ ^a Rom. xv. 18.
καὶ ^c ἀληθείᾳ. ¹⁹ [καὶ] ^o ἐν τούτῳ ^o γινώσκόμεθα ὅτι ^d ἐκ ^b see note.
τῆς ἀληθείας ^d ἐσμέν, καὶ ^e ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ^f πείσομεν τὰς ^c 2 John 1, 3.
^{16.} 2 Chron. xix 9 ^d John xviii. 37. ^{see} Rom. ii. 8. ^e = Matt. xxi. 32. ^{Luke}
^{xxi. 36.} 2 Cor. v. 10. ¹ Thess. ii. 19. ^f = (see note) 2 Cor. v. 11. ^{Gal. i. 10} al.

a d 36 am spec syr arm Clem Damasc Aug. (13 def.) for μὴδε, καὶ N Syr æth.
rec om τη, with [P]N d n 13. 36 arm Clem Ec: ins ABCKL rel 40 Thl.
(αλλα ΑΝ.) rec om εν, with K rel Ec: ins A B(sic: see table at end of Prolegg)
CL[P]N a b g h k l m o 40 arm Clem Thl. (40 also ins εν bef λογα.)
^{19.} rec ins 1st καὶ, with CKL[P]N rel Syr sah æth arm Thl Ec Aug: om AB d 40
vulg syr copt Clem. (αλλ' εκ τουτου α.) rec (for γινώσκόμεθα) γινώσκομεν, with KL
rel vulg syrr æth Thl Ec Aug Bede: txt ABC[P]N a j 36. 40 coptt arm Clem Damasc,
cognosceatur syr. (13 def.) εκπροσθεν(sic) N. for τας καρδιας, την καρδιαν

at the moment when he thus shuts up his bowels of compassion, it is not *aviding* in him. But this would seem to violate the ideal strictness of the Apostle's teaching, and the true sense rather to be, "How can we think of such an one as at all possessing the love of God in any proper sense?" giving thus much emphasis to *μένει*, but not putting it in opposition to *ἐστίν*, as Lücke does; for it is, in the root, equivalent to it. Here again, many questions of casuistry have been raised as to the nature and extent of the duty of almsgiving, on which it is impossible to enter here, and for which I must refer my readers as before. The safest answers to them all will be found in the Christian conscience enlightened by the Holy Spirit, guiding the Christian heart warmed by the living presence of Christ? ^{18.} *Exhortation to true brotherly love:* following naturally on the example of the want of it given in the last verse. Little children,

let us not love with word nor yet with tongue, but (let us love) in deed and truth (there is some little difficulty in assigning these words their several places in the contrast. We may notice first, that the two former, *λόγῳ* and *γλώσσῃ*, are simple datives of the instrument, whereas the two latter are introduced by the preposition *ἐν*, denoting the element in which. The true account of the arrangement seems to be, that the usual contrast of *λόγῳ* and *ἐν ἔργῳ* is more sharply defined by the epexegetic *τῇ γλώσσῃ* and *ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*: *τῇ γλώσσῃ* giving, by making the mere bodily member the instrument, more precisely the idea of absence of truth than even *λόγῳ*, and (*ἐν*) *ἀληθείᾳ* more definitely the idea of its presence than even *ἐν ἔργῳ*. Similar contrasts are adduced by the Commentators from the classics: especially from Theognis; e. g. 973 f., *μή μοι ἀνὴρ εἴη γλώσσῃ φίλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργῳ χερσὶν τε σπένδοι χρήμασί τ' ἀμφοτέρα*: 613, *ἀλλὰ δοκεῖ μέν πᾶσιν ἀπὸ γλώσσης φίλος εἶναι*: 96, *ὅς κ' εἴπῃ γλώσσῃ λήσστα*,

φρονῇ δ' ἔτερα. As connected with the exhortation in this verse, I may cite the tradition reported by Jerome in his Commentary on Gal. vi. 10, vol. vii. p. 528 f.: "Beatus Joannes Evangelista cum Ephesi moraretur usque ad extremam senectutem, et vix inter discipulorum manus ad ecclesiam deferretur, nec posset in plura vocem verba contexere, nihil aliud per singulas solebat proferre collectas, nisi hoc: 'Filii, diligite alterutrum.' Tandem discipuli et fratres qui aderant, tædio affecti, quod eadem semper audirent, dixerunt: Magister, quare semper hoc loqueris? Qui respondit dignam Joanne sententiam: Quia præceptum Domini est, et si solum fiat, sufficit"). ^{19—24.} [And] see the summary at ver. 11. *The blessed effects of true brotherly love as a test of the Christian state.* ^{19, 20.} [And] in this (on *ἐν τούτῳ*, see above, vv. 10, 16. It here refers to what had gone before: viz. to the fulfilment of the exhortation in ver. 18, as the future shews: q. d., which thing if we do, This has been very generally acknowledged: some Commentators mentioning, but only to repudiate, the connexion with what follows, *ὅτι ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.* Some, as De W., refer *ἐν τούτῳ* back to vv. 10, 16; others, as Lücke, to ver. 14. But to whichever of these it is referred, the sense is much the same. The context which follows is best satisfied by taking it as above: see on *ἐξ ἀληθείας ἐσμέν* below) *we shall know* (on the *future*, see above. It is the result consequent on the fulfilment of the condition implied in *ἐν τούτῳ*. De Wette's idea, after Bengel, that the rec. *γινώσκομεν* has been altered to the future to suit the following future *πείσομεν*, is not to be thought of, in the presence of the common formula *ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν*, ch. ii. 3, iii. 24, iv. (2, 6,) 13, v. 2. The prevalent form was adopted by the transcribers, *regardless* of the future following that *we are of the truth* (*ἐν τίνι*: *ἐν τῷ μὴ λόγῳ ἀγαπᾶν, ἀλλὰ ἔργῳ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*: . . . καὶ πῶς; ὁ γὰρ ἄλλο μὲν

g here bis.

Gal. ii. 11

only. Deut.

xxv. 1. Sir. xiv. 2.

καρδίας ἡμῶν 20 ὅτι ἐὰν ἐ καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν ἡ καρδία,

...καρ-
διας
ἡμῶν P.

A¹(originally) B Syr sah æth Aug: txt A(as anciently corrd, perhaps 1. m.) CKL[P]N
rel syr copt arm Thl Ec Bede.

λέγων, ἄλλο δὲ ποῶν, μὴ σύμφωνον ἔχων
τῷ λόγῳ τὴν πράξιν, ψεύστης ἐστὶ καὶ οὐκ
ἀληθής. Ec. But, true as this is, and
self-evident, it does not reach the depth of
the meaning: as of course do not the many
rationalistic paraphrases which have been
given: "congruere evangelio," Grot.,
Whitby, &c. To be ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, is a
different matter from to be truthful or true
men. Estius *approaches* the meaning, un-
derstanding ἀλήθεια to be the truth of God
in His promises, and so ἐκ τῆς ἀλ. ἐσμέν
to mean "are of the number of the elect."
Bede's interpretation, "ex veritate quæ
Deus est," in which Lyra, Tirinus, Calvin
agree, is nearer still: but had the Apos-
tle intended this, he surely would have
written ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ. The Lutheran Com-
mentators have come nearer still, making
ἡ ἀλήθεια to be "verbum veritatis" by
which we are begotten anew unto God:
so Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Spener,
Bengel, Lücke, De Wette. But why stop
at that which after all is itself ἐκ τῆς
ἀληθείας? Why not mount up to the
ἀλήθεια itself, that pure and objective
Truth which is the common substratum
and essential quality of the Spirit Himself,
of the Word, of those who are born of the
Word by the Spirit? and thus Düsterd.,
Huther, al.), and shall persuade our hearts
before him (i. e. and in and by this same
sign, shall still the questionings of our
hearts before God, by the assurance that
we are His true children. This meaning
has been acquiesced in by almost all Com-
mentators both ancient and modern. Fritzsche alone maintains a different one:
"Et coram Deo, i. e. Deum intuiti et
reveriti, animos nostros flectendum (viz. ad
amorem vitæ factisque ostendendum), quia,
si animus nos hujus officii præternissi
condemnet, quia major est, inquam, Deus
animo nostro et omnia scit." He denies that
πίσσωμεν is to be referred to ἐν τούτῳ,
and, as above, interprets that by the con-
sideration of God's greatness and omni-
science we are to persuade our hearts to love
in truth. This view is impugned and satis-
factorily confuted by Lücke, on the fol-
lowing grounds: 1. that after so solemn
an exhortation to brotherly love on the
deepest grounds, it is not likely that the
Apostle would subjoin another, grounded
on less deep and more general motives:
2. that every thing said by way of a
motive in ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ has been in-

cluded in what has been said before:
3. (And this is the weightiest objection of
all, enlarged on and pressed further by
Düsterdieck) in this case τὰς καρδίας here
must denote the heart as the seat of the
affections, whereas in ver. 20 ἡ καρδία
must denote the heart as the seat of the
conscience. Whereas on the common
view, καρδία is, throughout, the heart as
the seat of the conscience, giving rise
there to peace or to terror, according as it
is at rest or in disquietude: nearly as Thl.,
πίσσωμεν τὴν συνέλδησιν ἡμῶν, τοῦτο γὰρ
βούλεται σημαίνειν διὰ τὰς καρδίας:—
only that this view of the identity of the
conscience with the καρδία is not correct.
St. John uses καρδία for the innermost
seat of our feelings and passions: of alarm
(John xiv. 1, 27), of mourning (xvi. 6),
of joy (xvi. 22); it was into the καρδία of
Judas that the devil put the intent of be-
traying the Lord (xiii. 2): and the καρδία
here is the inward judge of the man,—
whose office is, so to say, promoted by
the conscience, accusing or else excusing
(Rom. ii. 15). Then, as to πίσσωμεν,
there is no need to give to the verb any
unusual meaning. It does not mean
"quiet" or "assure," except in so far as
its ordinary import, "persuade," takes
this tinge from the context. And so it is,
in every instance cited by the Commenta-
tors for this unusual meaning: e. g. in
Matt. xxviii. 14, Acts xii. 20, and reff.:
in Jos. Antt. vi. 5. 6, where Samuel ὑπ-
ισχνεῖται καὶ παρακαλεῖται τὸν θεὸν συγ-
γνώναι περὶ τούτων αὐτοῖς καὶ πείσειν:
in the passage in Plutarch, where one says
ἀπολοῖμην εἰ μὴ σε τιμωρησάμην, and
the other answers, ἀπολοῖμην εἰ μὴ σε
πείσαιμι.

It must be plain from what has been
said, that the future πείσωμεν is not, on
account of ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, to be taken
as referring to the future day of judgment,
as some (e. g. Benson, Lücke, De Wette)
have done. In ch. iv. 17, which is in
some respects parallel with this, that day
is expressly named: whereas in our pas-
sage, an equally clear indication is given,
by the parallelism of γνωσόμεθα and πεί-
σωμεν, that no such reference is intended.
ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ is not, at His appearing,
but, in His sight, as placed before His
all-seeing eye: ὡς ὑπὸ θεῷ μάτρυν, as Ec.,
though misunderstanding the whole: see
above: so Aug. ("ante Deum es: inter-

...της
καρδ. η.
ABCKL
M a b c d
f g h j k
l m o 13

h ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν καὶ γινώσκει h (see note)
ch. v. 9.

20. for εαν, αν A (34. 96 Sz).

καταγινώσκει L f k n 13.

om 2nd στ.

A d 13. 33-4. 63 vulg copt æth arm Ec Aug Bede: ins BCKLX rel syrr Thl.
for θεος, κυριος C.

roga cor tuum . . . si persuademus cordi nostro, coram ipso persuademus"), Bede, Corn.-a-lap., Luther, Calov., Bengel, Neander, Huther, Sander, Erdmann, Düsterd. It may be remarked finally, that by ἐμ-προσθεν αὐτοῦ being thus put first, it has evidently the emphasis: and this is important for that which follows. 20.]

takes up this matter of the persuading our hearts before God, and shews its true importance and rationale. This is carried on in the following verses, but is here and in ver. 21 placed as its ground. If our heart, ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, judges us unfavourably—we may be quite sure that He knowing more than our heart does, judges us more unfavourably still: if our heart condemn us not, again ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, judging and seeing in the light of His countenance, then we know that we are at one with Him, and those consequences follow, which are set forth in ver. 22.

But before arriving at this sense, there are several difficulties of no slight weight to be overcome. With these it will be best to deal, before translating the verse. Three principal questions must be answered: 1. What is the first ὅτι? 2. What is the second ὅτι? 3. What is the meaning of μείζων? 1, 2. Some monstra of exegesis must first be eliminated. It has been tried to make ὅτι ἐάν = ὅταν, "whenever?" For this is quoted Sam. Andreä, of whom I can discover nothing. This of course is impossible. Equally impracticable are the endeavours to alter the text; by striking out the 2nd ὅτι as Grot., or making this one into ἔτι (H. Stephanus, Pricæus, Piscator). Again it is quite out of the question to supply before the second ὅτι, "eheu nobis," as Episcopus,—"scimus, aut scire debemus," as Calov., al. Of other interpretations, the first requiring notice is that upheld by De Wette, and pronounced the only tenable one by Brückner, which would make the second ὅτι independent of the first, and regard it as containing the reason of the final clause, καὶ γινώσκει πάντα. The objection to this is, not the καὶ before γινώσκει, which would be natural enough,—"because God is greater than our heart, it follows that . . .;" such an apodosis being very commonly introduced by καί,—but 1) the sense thus obtained, which would be illogical, as it would not follow, because God is greater than our heart, that He knows all things: and 2) that brought by

Düsterd., the exceeding harshness and clumsiness thus introduced into the style, whereas St. John is singularly lucid, and has but very few inversions, none indeed at all approaching the harshness of this. Bengel, Hoogeven, Morus, Nosselt, Baumg.-Crus., Huther, regard the first ὅτι as the pronoun relative, ὃ τι: "coram ipso secunda reddemus corda nostra quocunque tandem crimine damnat nos cor," as Hoogeven. The objection to this is not N. T. usage, as alleged, e.g. by Düsterdieck against ὅστις ἐάν, for we read ὅστις ἐάν Gal. v. 10, and ἥτις ἐάν Acts iii. 23: but sense, context, and analogy. Sense,—for it would surely be monstrous to make the Apostle say that if we have brotherly love, we may make ourselves easy, whatever else our consciences accuse us of: context,—for in this sentence no logical reason would thus be given by the following ὅτι, which Hoog. renders quia: analogy, as shewn in the parallelism ἐάν καταγινώσκῃ and ἐάν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ, which we thus altogether destroy. Another interpretation is given, and, as usual, defended with extreme fervency and bitterness against those who differ, by Sander. He would make the whole of ver. 20 depend on ἐν τούτῳ γνωσόμεθα and on πείσμεν (some others had done the same before, e.g. Meyer. See also Erdmann below); and regard it as meant in a consolatory sense: by thus loving in deed, &c., we shall know, &c., and shall persuade our hearts that if our heart condemn us, God (he is troubled with the second ὅτι, and offers to his readers the alternative of erasing it with Lachmann or reading ἔτι with Stephens) is greater than our heart and knoweth all things: i.e. knows us to be His children and better than we seem to ourselves. With this in the main Erdmann agrees: "Hoc igitur apostolus dicit: filiis Dei, si forte in peccata inciderint, et conscientiæ accusatione perterriti fuerint, quum e conscientia veræ caritatis erga Deum et fratres pro certo sciant se ex veritate esse, vitæque novitatem in Dei patris societate accepisse, persuasum fore, τὸ καταγινώσκειν, conscientiæ magnitudine et potestate gratiæ divinæ illoque Dei γινώσκειν πάντα superari."

But how any exegete of tact and discernment can hold this, I am at a loss to imagine. Leaving for the present the question respecting the sense of μείζων ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ., can we conceive the Apostle to write so loosely as this—"we shall per-

1 ch 11. 7 reff. **πάντα.** 21 ¹ ἀγαπητοί, ἐὰν ἡ καρδιά [ἡμῶν] μὴ ² καταγι-
 21. for ἀγαπητοί, ἀδελφοί Ν. for εαν, αν Α. rec ins 1st ημων, with CKLN
 rel vulg syr coptt æth arm Thl Ec Cyp Aug, Jer, Hesyeh: om AB 13 fuld Aug, Jer, 1 m o 13
 καταγινώσκει AL c f k 13: -σκω Ν¹(sic).

suaude our hearts, that if our heart condemn us . . . ?” For, in this case, the *καρδίας* of the former clause has no connexion with the *καρδιά* of the latter, but, as Erdmann confesses, is equivalent to *ἡμᾶς αὐτούς*, whereas in the latter, *καρδιά* is the “*conscientia reatus*.” And besides, the *πέισομεν* has already had its emphatic completion in the words *ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ*, declaring its meaning to be absolute, and preventing its passing on to the *ὅτι*.

It would seem then that the first *ὅτι* cannot be “that,” but must be causal. And if the first, then the second, which, as far as I know, no one has attempted to render “*that*” after rendering the other “because.” How then is the repetition to be interpreted? The first *ὅτι* furnishes the reason for introducing the clause: what purpose is served by the second? The old scholium says, τὸ δεύτερον *ὅτι* παρέλκει. And so several of the Commentators, adducing instances of a repeated and superfluous *ὅτι* from Xenoph. Anab. v. 6. 19, λέγουσιν *ὅτι*, εἰ μὴ *ὅτι* κινδυνεύσει . . . : and so Anab. vii. 4. 5: Eph. ii. 11, 12 in N. T. But in all these places *ὅτι* is “*that*,” not “*because*,” nor can an instance be produced of the repetition of a causal *ὅτι*. This resource thus seems taken from us. The second *ὅτι* must have its distinct place and meaning assigned it. And, reserving the consideration of the meaning thus obtained, till we treat of *μείζων ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ.*,—there is one legitimate way of taking it, which does not seem to have been suggested: viz., that there is an ellipsis of the verb substantive before the 2nd *ὅτι*, and that the clause, thus introduced, forms the apodosis to the *ἐὰν κ.τ.λ.*: “because if our heart condemns us, (it is) because God, &c.” Instances of similar ellipses after *εἰ* or *ἐὰν* are of course common enough: *εἰ τις ἐν χριστῷ, καὶνὴ κτίσις*, 2 Cor. v. 17: *εἴτε ὑπὲρ τίτου, κοινωνὸς ἐμὸς κ. εἰς ἡμᾶς συνεργός. εἴτε ἀδελφοὶ ἡμῶν, ἀποστολοὶ ἐκκλησιῶν, δόξα χριστοῦ*, ib. viii. 23. Nearer to the point is 2 Cor. i. 6, *εἴτε θλιβόμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας*: 1 Cor. xiv. 27, *εἴτε γλώσση τις λαλεῖ, κατὰ δύο . . .*

But this brings us to consider (3) the meaning of the words *μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ θεὸς τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν καὶ γινώσκει πάντα*. Two ways of taking them have been prevalent: the ancients regarded them as intensifying the *ἐὰν καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν ἡ*

καρδιά: as the Schol. in Cramer’s Catena, εἰ γὰρ ἁμαρτάνοντες, τὴν καρδίαν ἑαυτῶν λαβεῖν δυνάμεθα (qu. οὐ δυνάμ.?) ἀλλὰ νυττόμεθα ὑπὸ τοῦ συνειδότος, πόσῳ μᾶλλον τὸν θεὸν πράττοντες τι τῶν φαύλων δυνήθωμεν (οὐ δυν.) λαβεῖν; and so Aug., &c., and of the moderns, Calvin, Beza, Socinus, Grot., Corn.-a-lap., Castalio, Estius, Calov., Semler, Lücke, Neander, al. On the other hand, Luther, Bengel, Morus, Spener, Nösselt, Rickli, Baumg.-Crus., Sander, Besser, Düsterd., Huther, Erdmann, regard them as consolatory in their tendency, and as softening our self-condemnation by the comforting thought of God’s greatness and infinite mercy. Erdmann remarks, “Respondet his sententia S. Pauli ad Rom. v. 20 sq.: οὐ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις. Luther ad h. l. dicit: Das Gemüßsen ist ein einziger Trostpfen, der verjöhnte Gott aber ist ein Meer vollter Trostpfen.” He compares John xxi. 17, κύριε, πάντα σὺ οἶδας, σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φίλῳ σε.

But beautiful and true as this is, and the similar considerations which have been urged by others of the above Commentators, it is to me very doubtful whether they find any place in the context here. That context appears to stand thus. The Apostle in ver. 19 has said that by the presence of genuine love we shall know that we are of the truth, and shall persuade our hearts in God’s presence. He then proceeds to enlarge on this *persuading* our hearts, *in general*. If our heart condemn us, what does it import? If our heart acquit us, what? The *ἐὰν καταγινώσκη*, and the *ἐὰν μὴ καταγινώσκη*, are plainly and necessarily *opposed*, both in hypothesis and in result. If the *consolatory* view of ver. 20 is taken, then the general result of vv. 20, 21 will be, whether our heart condemn us or not, we have comfort and assurance: and then what would be the import of *πέισομεν τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν* at all? But on the other interpretation, taken with some modifications, all will be clear. I say, taken with some modifications: because the sense has been much obscured by the introduction of the particular case treated in ver. 18 into the general statements of vv. 20, 21. It is not, if our heart condemn us *for want of brotherly love*, as Lücke for instance, calling it a statement ‘*e contrario*’ to ver. 19: but this test is dropped, and the general subject

ABCKL
 N a b c d
 f g h i j k
 l m o 13

νόσκη ἡμῶν, ^{kl} παρῤῥησίαν ^{kl} ἔχομεν ^{km} πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ²² καὶ ^{k ch. v. 14.}
^{1 ch. ii. 28. iv.} ὃ ἐὰν ⁿ αὐτῶμεν ^{op} λαμβάνομεν ^p ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι τὰς ^q ἐντολὰς ^{17. Eph. iii.}
^{12. Heb.} ^{19. Job.}

xxvii. 10 see 2 Cor. iii. 12. vii. 4. Heb. iii. 6. m = Rom. v. 1. 2 Cor. vii. 4. n ch. v.
 14, &c. reff. o = Matt. vii. 8. xxi. 22 || John xvi. 24. p Matt. xvi. 25. ch. ii.
 27. 3 John 7 only. 4 Kings v 20 Ed-vat.(παρά, AB.) q ch. ii. 3, 4 reff.

om 2nd ἡμῶν BC (Orig): ins AKLN rel vss.

for εχομεν, εχει B 29.

22. for εαν, αν B a m Orig.

αιτωμεθα N Orig.

λαμβάνομεν A k m,

accipiemus vulg syr sah Cypr Lucif.

rec (for απ') παρ', with KL rel Orig Thl

Ec: txt ABCN a 13.

of the testimony of our hearts is entered upon. Thus we get the context and rendering, as follows): because (q. d., and this *ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ πείσαι τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν* is for us a vital matter, seeing that condemnation and acquittal by our own hearts bring each such a weighty conclusion with it) if our heart condemn (notice the words *γνωσόμεθα . . . καταγνώσκῃ . . . γινώσκει*: for the meaning, see reff. It is a word especially appropriate to self-consciousness: "know (ought) against us") us, it is because (our self-condemnation is founded on the fact, that) God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things (i. e. the condemning testimony of our conscience is not alone, but is a token of One sitting above our conscience and greater than our conscience: because our conscience is but the faint echo of His voice who knoweth all things: if it condemn us, how much more He? and therefore this *πείσαι*, for which this verse renders a reason, becomes a thing of inestimable import, and one which we cannot neglect, seeing that the absence of it is an index to our standing condemned of God. And then, having given the reason why the *καταγνώσκῃ* should be set at rest by the *πείσαι*, he goes on to give the blessed results of the *πείσαι* itself in verses 21, 22). Beloved (there is no adversative particle, because *ἀγαπητοί* throws up the contrast quite strongly enough, as introducing the very matter on which the context lays the emphasis, viz., the *πείσαι τὰς κ. ἡμῶν*), if our heart (so it will stand, whether *ἡμῶν* be read or not) condemn us not, we have confidence towards God (reff.: said generally: not with direct reference to that which follows, ver. 22, which indeed is one form of this confidence: see ch. v. 14, where the connexion is similar. The confidence here spoken of is of course present, not future in the day of judgment, as Estius. *πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, with reference to God: but more than that: to God-ward, in our aspect as turned towards and looking to God.

It must be remembered that the words are said in the full light of the reality of the Christian state,—where the heart is awakened and enlightened, and the testimony of the Spirit is active: where

the heart's own deceit does not come into consideration as a disturbing element), and (such another *καί* as that in ver. 10 above, where, after *πᾶς ὁ μὴ ποιοῦν δικαιοσύνην οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, we have *καὶ ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*, i. e. after the general statement, *καί* introduced the particular instance in which the general truth was carried forward. So here: By dwelling and walking in love, we can alone gain that approval of our conscience as God's children, which brings real confidence in Him and real intercommunion in prayer, which is a result and proof of that confidence) whatsoever we ask, we receive (pres.: not for future, as Grot. The Apostle is setting forth actual matter of fact) from Him (these words must be taken in all their simplicity, without capricious and arbitrary limitations. Like all the sayings of St. John, they proceed on the ideal truth of the Christian state. "The child of God," as Huther says, "asks for nothing, which is against the will of its Father"), because (ground of the above *λαμβάνομεν*) we keep His commandments, and do the things which are pleasing in His sight (on the last expression (and parallelism) see Exod. xv. 26; also Deut. vi. 18, xii. 25, Ezra x. 11, Isa. xxxviii. 3. It is added, not as expegetical of *τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηροῦμεν*, as Sander, but as Düsterd., to connect with His granting our prayers, since our lives are in accord with His good pleasure. This however brings us to the theological difficulty of our verse, wherein it would seem at first sight as if the granting of our prayers by God depended, as its meritorious efficient, on our keeping of His commandments and doing that which pleases Him. And so some of the R.-Catholic expositors here: Corn.-a-lap., with the curious peculiarity of distinguishing *τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τηρεῖν*, the keeping of the moral law of the decalogue, from *τὰ ἀρεστὰ ἐνώπ. αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν*, the doing of "consilia evangelica, viz. continentia, obedientia et paupertas," the observance of which goes "augere gratiam Dei et merita." This is refuted by the parallelism, in which (see above) the second clause takes up the first and applies it to the matter in hand. And it is further refuted

r John viii. 29. ¹ αὐτοῦ ² τηροῦμεν καὶ τὰ ³ ἀρεστὰ ⁴ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ ποιοῦμεν. ABCKL
 Acts vi. 2. ⁵ καὶ ⁶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ αὐτοῦ, ⁷ ἵνα ⁸ πιστεύ[σ]ωμεν τῷ ⁹ N a b c d
 xii. 3 only. ¹⁰ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ καὶ ¹¹ ἀγαπῶμεν f g h j k
 see note. ¹² ἀλλήλους καθὼς ¹³ ἔδωκεν ¹⁴ ἐντολὴν ἡμῖν. ¹⁵ καὶ ¹⁶ ὁ ¹⁷ τη- l m o 13
 s = John, here only
 Luke xvi. 15. ¹⁸ v. 4.
 Acts iv. 19. ¹⁹ t ver. 11 ch. (iv. 17.) v. 3. John vi. 29, 39. (xv. 8) xvi. 3 al. John only
 1 Tim. ii. 3. ²⁰ ch. v. 13 reff.; of pers. = John viii. 31 (?), v ver 11 reff.
 v. 4. u w dat. of ὄνομ. here only. (see
v John xi. 67. xii. 49. xiii. 34. xiv.

τηρωμεν AKN 40.

23. rec πιστευσωμεν, with BKL rel Cc: πιστευωμεν ACN a f l 13 Thl; -ομεν c.
 om τῶν υἱον A 43: om ονοματι του υιου l3 æth; τῶν υιῶ, omg τῶν ονοματι, d. χριστῶ
 A d 13. om ἡμιν KL rel 40: ins ABCN a m 13. 36 vulg Syr copt Thl Cc-ms
 Lucif Bede.

by the usage of the expression τὰ ἀρεστά, by which never "consilia evangelica," but always things ethically pleasing to God, as commanded by Him, are denoted: cf. ref. John, Rom. xii. 1, xiv. 18, 2 Cor. v. 9, Eph. v. 10, Phil. iv. 18, Col. iii. 20. Estius again has pressed the words as against the heretics, who say "omnia iustorum opera esse peccata;" "nisi," he adds, "dicant, quod absque blasphemia dici non potest, peccata esse Deo placita." But both here and elsewhere the solution of the difficulty is very easy, if separated from the party words of theology, and viewed in the light of Scripture itself. Out of Christ, there are no good works at all: entrance into Christ is not won nor merited by them. In Christ, every work done of faith is good and is pleasing to God. The doing of such works is the working of the life of Christ in us: they are its sign, they its fruits: they are not of us, but of it and of Him. They are the measure of our Christian life: according to their abundance, so is our access to God, so is our reward from God: for they are the steps of our likeness to God. Whatever is attributed to them as an efficient cause, is attributed not to us, but to Him whose fruits they are. *Because* Christ is thus manifested in us, God hears our prayers, which He only hears for Christ's sake: *because* His Spirit works thus abundantly in us, He listens to our prayer, which in that measure has become the voice of His Spirit. So that no degree of efficacy attributed to the good works of the child of God need surprise us: it is God recognizing, God vindicating, God multiplying, God glorifying, His own work in us. So that when, e.g., Corn.-alap. says, "congruum est et congrua merces obedientiæ et amicitia, ut si homo faciat voluntatem Dei, Deus vicissim faciat voluntatem hominis," all we can reply is that such a duality, such a reciprocity, does not exist for Christians: we are *in God*, He in us: and this St. John continually insists on. We have no claim *ab extra*: He works in us to do of His good pleasure: and the

works which He works, which we work, manifest before Him, and before all, that we are His children. The *δὲ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν, λαμβάνομεν*, I reserve to be treated of on ch. v. 14, 15, where it is set forth more in detail. 23.] *Summing up of all these commandments in one: faith in Christ, and brotherly love according to Christ's command.* And (see *καὶ* similarly used, ch. i. 5, ii. 17, ver. 3) *His commandment* ("singulari numero mandatum præmisit, et duo subsequentia adiungit mandata, fidem scilicet et dilectionem, quia nimirum hæc ab invicem separari nequeunt. Neque enim sine fide Christi recte nos alterutrum diligere, neque vere in nomine Jesu Christi sine dilectione possumus credere," Bede: and Cc., *ἔχοντες ἐντολὴν, ἵνα τῇ πιστεὶ τῇ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησ. χρ. ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους*) is this, that (see on *ἵνα*, ver. 11) *we should believe* (the aor. imports one act of receptive faith: the present, a continuing habit) *the name* (this unusual expression, *πιστεύειν τῷ ὀνόματι* (reff.), is well explained by Calvin and Beza,—"nomen ad prædicationem respicit:" so that, as Seb.-Schmidt, it is "credere merito, satisfactioni, omnibusque promissionibus Christi et de Christo:" to believe the Gospel message concerning Him, and Him as living in it, in all His fulness. We have similar expressions, *πιστεύειν τῇ γραφῇ*, John ii. 22; *τοῖς ῥήμασι*, v. 47; *τῇ ἀκοῇ*, xii. 38) of *His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another* (pres., of a continued habit), even as *He gave us commandment* (some Commentators have referred these words to both *πιστεύσωμεν* and *ἀγαπῶμεν*, and understood *ὁ θεός* as the subject of *ἔδωκεν*. So Estius, Hunnius, Bengel, Sander. But this would seem to introduce too much of a tautology: "God's commandment is, that we should, &c. . . . as He gave us commandment." It seems more natural, with the generality of Commentators, to understand Christ as the subject to *ἔδωκεν*, and by the commandment, John xiii. 34, xv. 12, 17). 24 a.] *General return,*

ρῶν τὰς ^aἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ^xἐν αὐτῷ μένει, καὶ αὐτὸς ^xἐν ^xJohn xv 4, 7 ch. ii. 27
αὐτῷ. καὶ ^yἐν τούτῳ ^{yz}γινώσκουμεν ὅτι μένει ^xἐν ἡμῖν, ^{al. fr}ch. ii. 3, 5
^zἐκ τοῦ ^aπνεύματος ^bοὗ ἡμῖν ^aἔδωκεν. ^{reff.}

IV. 1 ^cἈγαπητοί, μὴ παντὶ ^dπνεύματι ^eπιστεύετε, ^{z Matt. xii. 33.}
^aLuke xi. 13. ^{Acts viii. 18. xv. 8.} ^battr., John vii. 39. ^{Acts i. 1.} ^{Jude 15 bis.} ^{Rev xviii. 6 al. fr.}
^cch. ii. 7 ieff. ^{d = 1 Cor. xii. 10. xiv. 32. 1 Tim. iv. 1.} ^{e = John ii. 22 iv. 21 al. fr.}

24. om last καὶ ^h c g h 80 sah. ^{Ec lat-if.}

ἔδωκεν bef ημιν ΚΝ a b d m o Ath Cyr Thl

with reference to what has been said in the last verses, to the great key-note of the Epistle, μένετε ἐν αὐτῷ, with which the former part of it concluded, ch. ii. 28. This keeping of His (God's) commandments is the abiding in God: this of which brotherly love is the first and most illustrious example and summary. So that the exhortation given at the beginning of this portion of the Epistle is still in the Apostle's mind, as again ch. iv. 15, 16, and v. 20; see also ch. ii. 6, iii. 6, 9. And he that keepeth His (God's) commandments abideth in Him (God), and He (God) in him (Sander, Neander, al., hold that αὐτός, αὐτῷ are to be referred to Christ. And no doubt they would be perfectly true, and according to our Lord's own words, when thus applied: cf. John xiv. 15, xv. 5 ff. Still, from the context (cf. on ἔδωκεν below), it is better to refer them to the chief subject, viz. to God. In the sense, the difference is not important. It is one of the most difficult questions in the exegesis of this most difficult of Epistles, to assign such expressions as the present definitely to their precise personal object).

24 b.] And of one part of this mutual indwelling there is a sign and token, given us by God Himself, viz. the Holy Spirit. By the mention of the Spirit, the Apostle makes these words the note of transition to the subject of the next section, ch. iv. 1—6, which is parenthetical, of the discerning of true and false spirits, and after which the main subject of brotherly love is resumed again. And in this we (all the children of God; not as the R.-Cath. expositors, Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., Estius, the Apostles, or the apostolic church, only) know that He abideth in us, from the Spirit (the change of construction is unusual. It arises from the Apostle having combined together two ways of speaking in this connexion,—ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκουμεν, ὅτι . . ., see vv. 16, 19, and ἐκ τούτου γινώσκουμεν, ch. iv. 6. The knowledge is ἐν τούτῳ, in this element or department of fact, and it is ἐκ τούτου, derived from, as its source, that which follows) which He gave us (ἔδωκεν, aor.; at a certain time, by a definite act, viz. on the day of Pentecost, when the Father bestowed the

Holy Spirit on the Church. And this ἔδωκεν is one sign that the whole is to be referred to the Father: seeing that our Lord says, καὶ γὰρ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν . . . τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, John xiv. 16, 17. This indwelling Spirit of God is to the child of God the spring and source of his spiritual life, the sure token of his sonship, Rom. viii. 14, 15, Gal. iv. 6, and of his union with God in Christ).

CHAP. IV. 1—6.] Warning against, and criteria whereby to distinguish, false teaching. This passage takes up again, with reference to this portion of the Epistle, the similar warning given in the former portion, ch. ii. 18 ff. It is intimately connected with what has immediately preceded. By brotherly love we are to know that we are of the truth, ch. iii. 19,—and the token that He abideth in us is to be the Spirit which He gave us. This Spirit, the Spirit of Truth, it becomes then all-important for us to be able to distinguish, and not to be led astray by any false spirits pretending to his character and office. Such false spirits there are, which are not of God, but of the world, and which make up that spirit of antichrist, of which prophecy had already spoken.

1.] Beloved (so verse 7, and ch. iii. 2, 21, marking a transition to a subject on which the Apostle affectionately bespeaks their earnest attention), believe not every spirit (the expressions πᾶν πνεῦμα, τὰ πνεύματα, indicating plurality of spirits, are to be explained by the fact that both the Spirit of Truth and the spirit of error speak by the spirits of men who are their organs. So we have, in reference to prophecy, 1 Cor. xiv. 32, πνεύματα προφητῶν προφήταις ὑποτάσσεται. By the nature of the testimony of the human spirits, we shall know whether they are of God or not; whether they are organs of the πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας or of the πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης. It will be observed that this interpretation of πᾶν πνεῦμα, and the Apostle's way of speaking, rest on the assumption of there being One Spirit of Truth, from God, and one spirit of error, from the world; as opposed to all rationalizing interpretations, such as "sensus

f = Luke xiv. 19. 1 Cor. xiii. 13. 2 Cor. viii. 8. 1 Thess. ii. 4 (2nd). v. 21 al. Prov. xvi. 3. g ch. ii. 16 reff. h Matt. vii. 15 xxi. 11, 24 y Mk. Luke vi. 26. Acts xiii. 6. 2 Pet. ii. 1. Rev. xvi. 13 a2 only. Jer. vi. 13. Zech. xii. 2. xxi. 7, so John i. 44. Matt. xi. 7. xxii. 10 al (see John vi. 14. xvi. 28, xviii. 37.) k ch. ii. 3, 5 reff. 1 2 John 7. so John ix. 22. 2 John 7. see Wsd xviii. 13. m 2 John 7. n Rom. ii. 28. 2 Cor. x. 3. 1 Tim. iii. 16. 1 Pet. iv. 1, 2. see John i. 14. o see ch. v. 6 Matt. xxi. 27, 28. xxi. 9 Mark ix. 1 al.

ἀλλὰ ἡ δοκιμάζετε τὰ πνεύματα, εἰ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, ὅτι πολλοὶ ψευδοπροφήται ἐξεληλύθασιν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκετε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ. πάντες πνεῦμα δὲ ὁμολογεῖ Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυ-

CHAP. IV. 1. ins πάντα bef τα πνεύματα K.

γευδοπροφηται(sic) N¹.

2. γινώσκεται (itacism) K rel vulg Syr Cyr Thl Did-int Aug Bede: -κομεν N¹ a 9. 14². 69 arm: txt ABCLN³ 1 13 syr coptt æth Ec Irén-int Lucif. χριστον bef ἰησουν C: om χρ. a Orig. for ἐληλυθота, ἐληλυθεναι B 99 Thdr̄t; venisse vulg Irén-int Cyrp.

hominis aliquo modo inspiratus," Socinus; "*doctrina*," Episcopius: as opposed also to all figurative understanding of the word, as Calv., "metonymice accipio pro eo qui spiritus dono se præditum esse jactat ad obeundum prophetiæ munus," Beza, Grot., Whitby, Wolf, and even Lücke, who explains it by λαλοῦντες ἐν πνεύματι. It is not the men themselves, but their spirits as the vehicles of God's Spirit or the spirit of antichrist, that are in question.

In πιστεύετε some have seen a figure drawn from the physical meaning of πνεῦμα; so Corn.-a-lap.,—"Respicit ad nautas, qui non credunt omni spiritui, id est, vento." But this is far-fetched and unlikely, in the universal acceptance of the spiritual meaning of both words), but try the spirits (this δοκιμάζειν is enjoined not on the "ecclesia in suis prælatis," as Estius and the R.-Cath. expositors, but on all believers, as even he reluctantly admits: and the test is one of plain matter of fact, of which any one can be judge. The Church by her rulers is the authoritative assessor of this δοκιμασία in the shape of official adoption or rejection, but only as moved by her component faithful members, according to whose sense those her formularies are drawn, of which her authorities are the exponents) whether they are of God (bear the character of an origin from Him): because (ground for the necessity of this trial) many false prophets (= ἀντιχριστοὶ πολλοί, ch. ii. 18: προφήται, not as foretelling future things, but as the mouth-pieces of the πνεῦμα which inspires them. Cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1, where the N. T. false teachers are called ψευδοδιδασκαλοὶ, and compared to the O. T. ψευδοπροφῆται) are gone forth (scil. from him who sent them: even as Jesus Himself is said, John viii. 42, xiii. 3, xvi. 27, 28, ἐξεληλυθέναι from God. Or we may take it as in ch. ii. 19, ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξῆλθον,—from the Church: but the other is more likely. Socinus and Grotius take it of "prodire ad munus suscipien-

dum:" but it certainly means more than this) into the world (cf. John xvi. 28, which tends to fix the ἐξεληλύθασιν above).

2, 3 a.] *Test, whereby the spirits are to be tried.* In this (see above, ch. iii. 10, &c.) ye know (apprehend, recognize. γινώσκετε is taken as imperative, on account of the preceding πιστεύετε and δοκιμάζετε, by Huther, De Wette, Lücke (most Commentators do not touch it). But on account of the very frequent ἐν τούτῳ γινώσκομεν, I should let analogy prevail, and take it as indicative) the Spirit of God (the Holy Spirit, present, inspiring, and working in men's spirits). Every spirit which confesseth ("spiritui tribuitur actio quæ hominis est per spiritum." Schlichting. The confession is necessarily, from the context here, not the genuine and ascertained agreement of lips and life, but the outward and open profession of faith: see 2 John 7.—10, where ταύτην τὴν διδασχὴν . . . φέρειν is its equivalent) Jesus Christ come in the flesh (Ἰ. χρ. primary predicate: ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα, secondary predicate: = Ἰ. χρ. ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί, 2 John 7. Cf. the same arrangement of predicates 1 Cor. i. 23, κηρύσσομεν χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον: 2 Cor. iv. 5, κηρύσσομεν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν κύριον. In all these cases it is important to observe, that the construction is not equivalent to an accusative with an infinitive, Ἰ. χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι. If it were, the confession, or the preaching, would be simply of the fact announced: whereas in each case it is the PERSON who is the object or primary predicate: the participle carrying the attributive or secondary predicate. This is abundantly shewn here, by the adversative clause, where it is simply μὴ ὁμολογοῦν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The confession required is, "Jesus Christ come in the flesh;" ἐληλυθώς here standing midway between the ἐρχόμενος of 2 John 7, which is altogether timeless, and the ἐλθὼν of ch. v. 6, which is purely historical. This perfect gives

...θεοῦ θότα, ἡ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν. ³ καὶ πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ μὴ ὁμο-

ABKLN 3. for ο μη ομολογει, ο λυει old-MSS-mentioned-by-Socr vulg Iren Orig Tert, Fulg.;
a b c d f qui negat Did-int Tert, Cyr: qui destruit Lucif: txt all-known-Greek-manuscripts vss
g h j k l Polyc Cyr Thdrt Thl Eccl Fulg. (Socr. H. E. vii. 32 states γέγραπτο ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς
m o 13 ἀντιγράφους ὅτι πᾶν πνεῦμα ὃ λυεῖ τὸν ἰησοῦν, ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστίν. That Irenæus and
Origen really had this reading before them is evident from the whole context as
given by their interpreters. Iren. (iii. 16. 8, p. 207) says, *Igitur omnes extra
dispositionem sunt, qui sub obtentu agnitionis alterum quidem Jesum intelligunt, al-
terum autem Christum, et alterum Unigenitum, et alterum Salvatorem. . . Sententia
enim eorum homicidalis, Deos quidem plures confingens et Patres multos simulans.
Comminuens autem et per multa dividens Filium Dei; quos et Dominus nobis cavere
prædicat et discipulus ejus Ioannes in prædicta epistola fugere eos præcepit dicens:*
*"Multi seductores exierunt in hunc mundum, qui non confitentur Jesum Christum in
carne venisse. Hic est seductor et Antichristus. Videte eos, ne perdatiis quod operati
estis."* Et rursus in epistola ait: *"Multi pseudoprophetae exierunt de sæculo. In
hoc cognoscite Spiritum Dei. Omnis spiritus qui confletur Jesum Christum in carne
venisse, ex Deo est. Et omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum, non est ex Deo, sed de Anti-
christo est."* Hæc autem similia sunt illi quod in evangelio dictum est, quoniam
"Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis." Orig on Matt xxv. 14 thus writes
(Com. Ser. 66, vol. iii. p. 1703 f.): *Secundum hanc divinitatis suæ naturam non
peregrinatur, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit. . . .
Hæc autem dicentes non solvimus suscepti corporis hominem, cum sit scriptum
apud Joannem "Omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum non est ex Deo;" sed unicuique*

the present endurance of a past historical fact. If we enquire what that fact is, we are met by two widely divergent interpretations. On the one side we have the Socinian view, which, while it keeps to the strict philological sense of the words, ἐν σαρκί and ἐρχεσθαι (see below), distorts the meaning to bring the Apostle into accord with the tenets of that school: e.g. Socinus: "Jesum Christum, i.e. Jesum qui dicitur Christus, non modo mortalem hominem fuisse, sed etiam innumeris malis et denique ipsi cruentæ morti obnoxium:" and Grotius,—"non cum regia pompa et exercitibus, sed in statu humili, abjecto, multisque malis ac postremum cruci obnoxio." But no such sense of ἐν σαρκί can be or has been attempted to be adduced. On the other hand we have many of the orthodox expositors, who strive to make the words not implicative only, but directly assertive of the Incarnation. So Piscator, who plainly asserts that ἐν σαρκί = εἰς σάρκα: so others who waver between ἐν and εἰς, e.g. Hunnius,—"tunc venire in carne dicitur Jesus Christus, quando λόγος ex sua velut arcana sede prodiens assumpta visibili carne se in terris manifestat:" so Bengel (apparently), al. And among this number must proximately be reckoned Augustine, who introduces in the train of the Incarnation the death and redeeming love of Christ, and makes the confession or denial depend on "caritatem habere." "Deus erat et in carne venit: Deus enim mori non poterat, caro mori poterat: ideo ergo venit in carne ut moreretur pro nobis. Quemadmodum autem mortuus est pro nobis? Majorem

hac caritatem nemo habet, quam ut animam suam ponat pro amicis suis. Caritas ergo illum adduxit ad crucem. Quisquis ergo non habet caritatem, negat Christum in carne venisse." As between these two, the recent Commentators, Lucke, De Wette, Düsterd., Huther, appear to have taken the right path, in keeping ἐν strictly to its proper meaning, 'in,' 'clothed with,' = διά, ch. v. 6: and ἐρχεσθαι also to its proper meaning, to "come forward," "appear," "prodiere:" and in interpreting the words as directed against the Docetæ, who maintained that the Son of God had only an apparent, not a real human body. I cannot however agree in Huther's view, that Ἰησοῦν is here to be taken alone as the object, and χριστὸν ἐν σαρκί ἐληλ. together as predicate: Jesus as Christ come in the flesh. For first, it would be against the usage of our Apostle, see ch. v. 1, in this case, to leave out the article before χριστὸν: secondly, Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν thus in conjunction, could hardly but express the joint Name so well known: and thirdly, the sense required, that Jesus is the Christ, is assumed, by the very juxtaposition of the names. The words imply the præ-existence and incarnation by their very terms: but they do not assert these doctrines, only the verity of our Lord's human nature, is of God (has its origin and inspiration from Him by His Spirit): 3 a.] ex adverso: and every spirit which does not confess (as Huther rightly remarks, μὴ sets forth, not only the non-confession as matter of fact, but the opposition to, the denegation of the confession:

λογεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστιν, καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ABKL^{a b c d f}
 τὸ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου, ὃ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται, καὶ νῦν ἐν g h j k l
 τῷ κόσμῳ ἐστὶν ἤδη. ⁴ ὑμεῖς ἔκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ, ⁹ τεκνία,
 καὶ νενικήκατε αὐτούς, ὅτι μείζων ἐστὶν ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν, ἢ ὁ ἐν

p ch. ii. 18
(reff.).

q ch. ii. 1 reff.

substantiæ proprietatem servamus Si enim omnis homo fidelis "qui coniungitur Domino unus spiritus est:" quanto magis homo ille quem secundum dispensationem carnis Christus suscepit non est solvendus ab eo, nec alter est dicendus ab eo? Et vide quomodo ait: "sicut homo peregre futurus" quoniam non erat homo, sed sicut homo et quasi homo peregrinabitur, qui erat ubique secundum divinitatis naturam.

On the other hand Polycarp (Ep. ad Phil. cap. 7, p. 1112) seems to quote, though loosely, the received text—Πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθέναι, ἀντίχριστός ἐστι· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ὁμολογῇ τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ σταυροῦ ἐκ τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὶ· καὶ ὃς ἂν μεθοδεύῃ τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου πρὸς τὰς ἰδίας ἐπιθυμίας καὶ λέγῃ μὴτε ἀνάστασιν μὴτε κρίσιν εἶναι, οὗτος πρωτότοκος ἐστὶ τοῦ Σατανᾶ.) om τον ΚΝ b c

d g h l 40 Polyc Thl: ins ABL rel Cyr Thdrt Socr. rec aft ιησουν ins χριστον, with KL rel am demid sah Polyc Thl Ec Aug; κυριον Ν: om AB a 13 fuld syrr copt arm Cyr Thdrt Socr Iren int Orig-int Did-int Lucif Fulg, Tich. rec further adds εν σαρκι εληλυθουσα, with KLN rel syrr arm Thl Ec Iren-int Cyr; εν σαρκι εληλυθεναι 13-(ηναι) Polyc Thdrt: om AB vulg copt æth-rom(omg τ. ιησ.) Iren Cyr Socr Orig-int Did-int Lucif Fulg, Bede. om εκ KL k 36. for δ ακηκοατε, οτι ακηκοαμεν Ν 5.

q. d. "refuseth to confess") Jesus (τὸν Ἰησοῦν, in the complex of all that He is and has become, involved as it is in His having come in the flesh), is not of God. Some notice must be taken of the remarkable reading ὃ λυεῖ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. The words of Socrates (see Digest) hardly seem to amount to an absolute assertion that the reading was found in any mss. extant in his time, and it appears to have been regarded rather as an interpretation against the Nestorians than as a part of the ancient text. Bengel says well of it, "humanam potius artem quam apostolicam redolet sapientiam." The appearance of it in the vulgate is remarkable, seeing that not one of our present mss. has it, and not one version besides. 3 b.] This has been already virtually explained on ch. ii. 18. And this is the (spirit) (so nearly all the Commentators supply the ellipsis, and rightly. Episcopius, Valla, Zeger, the R.-Cath. Mayer, and Huther, render it, this is "proprium antichristi." But this would not surely be τὸ τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου, but τοῦ ἀντιχρίστου only. None of the passages cited by Huther touch the point, Matt. xxi. 21, τὸ τῆς συκῆς, "this of the fig-tree;" 1 Cor. x. 24, τὸ τοῦ ἐτέρου, "that which belongs to his brother;" 2 Pet. ii. 22, τὸ τῆς παροιμίας, "that of the proverb;" James iv. 14, τὸ τῆς αἰῶνος, "the event of to-morrow." In every one of these the genitive belongs to the subject: but Huther would attach it to the predicate, "hoc est proprium antichristi," in which case I cannot see how the article could be there. Besides, the δ ἀκηκόατε ὅτι ἔρχεται would be awk-

wardly said as applied merely to an abstract fact, the τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν, to which it must be referred if τοῦτο is subject, and the genitive imports *proprium antichristi* (of antichrist (of) which ye have heard (the reference is not to ch. ii. 18 (ἡκούσατε), but to the course of their Christian instruction in which this had been taught them) that it cometh (the present used as so often of that which is a thing fixed and determined, without any reference to time: "that it should come" of the E. V. is in sense very good, but does not quite suit the perf. ἀκηκόατε, which seems grammatically in English to require "that it shall come;" "that it must come" would perhaps be better), and now it is (not, now is: this ἐστὶν is not dependent on the preceding ὅτι, but introduces a fresh assertion) in the world already (viz., in the person of these ψευδοπροφήται, who are its organs). 4.] Ye (so we had ὑμεῖς ch. ii. 24, 27: his readers clearly and sharply set against the antichristian teachers) are of God, little children (thus he ever speaks to his readers, as being children of God, see ch. iii. 1 ff.), and have overcome (there need not be any evading or softening of this perfect: see ch. ii. 14. It is faith outrunning sight: the victory is certain in Him who said ἐγὼ νενίκηκα τὸν κόσμον, John xvi. ult. The ground of this assurance follows) them (αὐτούς, the false prophets, thus identified with antichrist. The vulg. has the unjustified reading eum, which is naturally referred to antichrist (Aug., Bede, and the R.-C. expositors generally); to the world, "devincendo con-

τῷ κόσμῳ. ⁵ αὐτοὶ ἔκ τοῦ κόσμου εἰσὶν διὰ τοῦτο ⁶ ἡμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμέν· ὁ ἡγινώσκων τὸν θεὸν ἀκούει ἡμῶν· ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἀκούει ἡμῶν. ^α ἐκ τοῦτου ἡγινώσκομεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πλάνης.

r JOHN iii. 31.
s JOHN viii. 55.
xvii 3, 25.
Rom i. 21.
1 Cor i. 21.
Gal. iv. 9.
ch. ii. 4, 13,
14 iii. 1, 6
Jer. ix. 3
t JOHN viii. 47
u ch. iii. 24 reff.
v JOHN xiv 17.
xv. 26 xvi.
13.

w 1 Thess. ii. 3. 2 Thess. ii. 11. Prov. xiv. 8. see 1 Tim iv. 1.

6. om os ουκ το ημων (homœotet) AL. Bede.

for εκ τουτου, εν τωτα A vulg coptt

cupiscentiam," by Lyra; to "antichrist and the world," by Erasmus), because greater is He (that is) in you than he (that is) in the world.

ὁ ἐν ὑμῖν is most naturally understood of God, seeing that ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ preceded; for he who is ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ has God dwelling in him. Though, as Düsterd. remarks, it matters not much whether we take it thus, or of the indwelling of God by His Spirit, or of the life of Christ in believers. The former of these is taken by Lücke, al., the latter by Aug., Bede, Grot., Corn.-a-lap., al.

ὁ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ is the devil, the prince of this world. Having said this, he proceeds in the next verse to identify these false prophets with the κόσμος of which he has spoken.

5.] They are of the world (this description is not ethical, as Socinus and Grot.,—"affectus habent, quales habet mundus, i.e. pars longe maxima humani generis: amant splendorem hujus vitæ, opulentiam et voluptates:"—but betokens the origin and source of that which they are and teach, as ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστὶ did on the other side. That origin and source is the world, unregenerate human nature, ruled over and possessed by the devil, the prince of this world): for this cause they speak of (not concerning, but of, as out of and from; the material of what they say being cosmic: "ex mundi vita et sensu sermones suos promunt," Bengel) the world, and the world heareth them (loving as it does its own, who are of it, John xv. 19, from which our verse is mainly taken: see also John viii. 47, xviii. 37).

6.] contrast. We (emphatic, as opposed to them: but who are meant? The Apostles and their companions in the ministry, or all believers? Or again, all teachers of God's truth, the Apostles included? It is hardly likely that the wider meaning has place here, seeing that 1) he has before said ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστέ, and 2) he is here opposing one set of teachers to another. On the other hand, it is not likely that he should confine what is said to the Apostles only: such as are mentioned with praise in

3 John 5—8 would surely be included) are of God (see above): he that knoweth (pres.: apprehendeth: hath any faculty for the knowledge of. The Apostle sets ὁ ἡγινώσκων τὸν θεόν in the place of ὁ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, as belonging more immediately to the matter in hand, the hearing, and receiving more knowledge. This ἡγινώσκειν τὸν θεόν, the apprehension and recognition of God, is the peculiar property of God's children, not any natural faculty in which one unregenerate man differs from another. All rationalistic interpretations of these words, e. g., that of Socinus, Schlichting, al. "animi probitas et studium ea faciendi quæ Deo probantur," are quite beside the purpose) God heareth us: he who is not of God doth not hear us (here we must remember carefully, what the context is, and what its purpose. The Apostle is giving a test to distinguish, not the children of God from those who are not children of God, but the spirit of truth from the spirit of error, as is clear from the words following. And this he does by saying that in the case of the teachers of the truth, they are heard and received by those who apprehend God, but refused by those who are not of God. It is evident then that these two terms here, ὁ ἡγινώσκων τὸν θεόν, and ὃς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, represent two patent matters of fact,—two classes open and patent to all: one of them identical with the κόσμος above: the other consisting of those of whom it is said above, ἐγνώκατε τὸν πατέρα. . . ἐγνώκατε τὸν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ch. ii. 13, 14. How these two classes are what they are, it is not the purpose of this passage to set forth, nor need we here enquire: we have elsewhere tests to distinguish them, ch. iii. 9, 10, and have there gone into that other question. We have a striking parallel, in fact the key to these words, in the saying of our Lord to Pilate, John xviii. 37). From this (viz., not, as Düsterd., al., the whole foregoing train of circumstances; nor, those tests proposed in vv. 2, 3: but the facts set forth in vv. 5, 6: the reception of the false teachers by the world

x ch. ii. 7 reff.
 y ch. iii. 11 reff.
 z ch. u. 26 reff.
 a Matt. i. 3, 5,
 6, 16 (xix.
 12). John i.
 13 iii. 5, 6
 bis, 8. viii. 41 ch ii. 29. iii. 9 bis, v 1 bis, 4, 18, bis only. Ezra x 44.

7 x' Ἀγαπητοί, ὁ ἀγαπῶμεν ὁ ἀλλήλους, ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη ἔκ ABKLN
 τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀγαπῶν ἔκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ γεγέννη- a b c d f
 ται καὶ ὁ γινώσκει τὸν θεόν. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν οὐκ ἔγνω g h j k l
 m o 13

7. aft o αγαπων ins τον θεον A, fratrem demid tol Fulg (Did-int).

8. om 1st clause (homœotele) N¹(ins, exc τον θεον, N³) d. for ουκ εγνω, ου γινωσκει A 13: εγνωκεν N³ m.

the reception of the true teachers by those that apprehend God, and their rejection by those who are not of God: as Schlichting, who however means the words in his rationalistic sense, "ex assensu et dissensu proborum et improborum." The same point is touched by our Lord in John x. 8, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα) we know (in this unemphatic first person the Apostle includes his readers: we, all God's children. γινώσκουμεν, distinguish, recognize, as so often) the Spirit of truth (the Spirit that cometh of God and teacheth truth: see reff.) and the spirit of error (the spirit that cometh of the devil, teaching lies and seducing men into error: see ch. i. 8, ii. 26).

7—21.] The Apostle again takes up his exhortations to brotherly love, but this time in nearer and deeper connexion with our birth from God, and knowledge of Him who is Himself Love, vv. 7, 8. This last fact he proves by what God has done for us in and by His Son, vv. 9—16: and establishes the necessary connexion between love to God and love to man, vv. 17—21.

The passage is in connexion with what went before, but by links at first sight not very apparent. The great theme of the whole was enounced ch. ii. 29. The consideration of that has passed into the consideration of that δικαιοσύνη in its highest and purest form of love, which has been recommended, and grounded on His love to us, in ch. iii. 11—18, where the testimony of our hearts came in, and was explained—the greatest of His presence in us being the gift of His Spirit, ch. iii. ult. Then from the necessity of distinguishing and being sure of that His Spirit, have been inserted the foregoing tests and cautions respecting truth and error. And now he returns to the main subject. The γινώσκει τὸν θεόν, ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν and γεγέννηται, the taking up again of God's love to us in Christ at ver. 9 from ch. iii. 16, the reiteration of the testimony of the Spirit in ver. 13, all serve to shew that we are reading no collection of spiritual apophthegms, but a close and connected argument, though not in an ordinary style.

7, 8.] Beloved (as before, marks the fervency and affection of the Apostle turn-

ing to his readers with another solemn exhortation. Here the word is especially appropriate, seeing that his own heart is full of that love which he is enjoining, let us love one another: because (he at once rests the exhortation on the deepest ground) love (ἡ ἀγάπη, abstract, in the widest sense, as the following words shew) is from God (has its origin and source in God: He is the wellspring and centre of all love. No such weakening as "Deo maxime placet" (Grot.) must be thought of. It is remarkable that Didymus understood ἀγάπη here of Christ,—ἡμίνα οὐκ ἔλλην εἶναι νομιστέον ἢ τὸν μονογενῆ, ὥσπερ θεὸν ἐκ θεοῦ, οὕτω καὶ ἀγάπην ἐξ ἀγάπης ὄντα:—and Augustine, fitting together "Dilectio est ex Deo," and "Dilectio est Deus," infers that "Dilectio est Deus ex Deo," which comparing with Rom. v. 5, he infers that love is the Holy Spirit: Tract. vii. 6, vol. iii. p. 2032): and every one that loveth (there is no need to supply an object after ἀγαπῶν, as τὸν θεόν in A, "his brother" as some latt., and Lücke: indeed to do so would be to narrow the general sense of the Apostle's saying: all love is from God: every one that loveth, taking the word of course in its pure ideal sense in which the assertion follows from the former), hath been begotten of God (has truly received within him that new spiritual life which is of God: see note on ch. ii. 29), and knoweth (pres.: in his daily walk and habit, recognizes and is acquainted with God: by virtue of that his divine birth and life) God: 8.] (Contrast, but with some remarkable variations) he that loveth not (general, as before: no object: he that hath not love in him) hath never known God (aor.: hath not once known: has never had in him even the beginnings of knowledge of God: as Lücke, "noch gar nicht kennen gelernt hat." So that the aorist makes a far stronger contrast than the present οὐ γινώσκει would. That is excluded, and much more); because (reason why he who loveth not can never have known God. ὅτι cannot well be "that," dependent on ἔγνω, as e. g. Tirinus (cited by Düsterd.) seems to make it: "non novit, saltem practice non ostendit se nosse et agnoscere, Deum esse . . . caritatem:" in that case

τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ὅ ἐστιν. ὅ ἐν τούτῳ ἔφανερ-
 ρώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ
 τὸν μονογενῆ ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ἵνα
 ζήσωμεν ἡ αὐτοῦ. 10 ἐν τούτῳ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, οὐχ ὅτι
 f of Christ, John i. 14, 18. iii. 16, 18 (Luke vii. 12 al². Heb. xi. 17) only. (Ps. xxi. 20.)
 17. x. 36. h John vi. 57 (but acc.). i so ἐν, Luke i. 77. Eph. i. 17. Heb. iii. 12.

9. for ἀπεσταλκεν, ἀπεστείλεν K Ath.

10. aft αγαπη ins του θεου N coptt.

for ζησωμεν, ζωμεν N¹.

it would be either οὐκ ἔγνω, ὅτι ὁ θεός . . . or οὐκ ἔγνω τὸν θεόν, ὅτι ἀγ. ἐστίν) God is love (ἀγάπη, not ἡ ἀγάπη: love is the very essence, not merely an attribute, of God. It is co-essential with Him: He is all love, love is all of Him: he who has not love, has not God. It is not the place here to enter on the theological import of this weighty and wonderful sentence. It will be found set forth in Augustine, de Trinitate, ix. 2 ff., vol. viii. p. 961 ff.: in Sartorius, die Lehre von der heiligen Liebe, i. 1, and in the first of my Sermons on Divine Love, which are founded on Sartorius's work. Düsterd. refers also to Nitzsch, über die wesentliche Dreieinigkeit Gottes, in the Studien u. Kritiken for 1841, 2, p. 337: and Liebner, Christologie, p. 135. But it may be necessary to put in a caution against all inadequate and shallow explanations of the saying: such as that of Grotius (after Socinus), "Deus est plenus caritate,"—Benson, "God is the most benevolent of all beings: full of love to all His creatures,"—Whitby, "The Apostle intends not to express what God is in his essence . . . but what He is demonstrative, ἐνεργητικῶς, shewing great philanthropy to men :"—Hammond, "God is made up of love and kindness to mankind :"—Calvin, "hoc est quod ejus natura sit, homines diligere . . . de essentia Dei non loquitur, sed tantum docet qualis a nobis sentiatur :"—&c. &c. In all these,—in the two last by supplying an object, "homines," which is not in the sacred text,—the whole force of the axiom as it stands in the Apostle's argument is lost. Unless he is speaking of the essential being of God, quorsum pertinent, to say that he that loveth not never knew God, because "God is love?" Put for these last words, "God is loving," and we get at once a fallacy of an undistributed middle: He that loveth not never knew what love is: God is loving: but what would follow? that in as far as God is loving, he never knew Him: but he may have known Him in as far as He is just, or powerful. But take ὁ θεὸς ἀγάπη ἐστίν of God's essential being,—as a strict definition of God, and the argumentation

will be strict: He that loveth not never knew love: God is love (the terms are co-essential and co-extensive): therefore he who loveth not never knew God).

9, 10.] *Proof of this* as far as we are concerned, in God's sending His Son to save us. In this (viz. which follows: the ὅτι is the apodosis, as in ch. iii. 16) the love of God was manifested in regard to us (ἐν ἡμῖν must be taken with the verb, not with ἡ ἀγάπη, which in this case (*pace Luther*: being the case of a particular manifestation of that which has been before generally stated. The combination of anathorous predicatory clauses only takes place when the whole will bear running together into one idea, as τοῖς κυρίοις κατὰ σάρκα) would require the article ἡ ἐν ἡμῖν. Many Commentators have thus wrongly connected it, and in consequence have been compelled to distort ἐν into εἰς: so Luther, Seb.-Schmidt, Spener, Beza, Socinus, Schlichting, Episcop., Grot., Benson, Neander, al. Bengel has fallen into the former fault, though not into the latter: "amor Dei qui nunc in nobis est, per omnem experientiam spiritualem." This is upheld also by Sander, who defends it by Gal. i. 16, where a totally different matter is treated of. Connected then with the verb, it must not be taken as = εἰς, but as in refl., especially John ix. 3, where the same phrase occurs: "in," i. e. "in the matter of," in regard of: cf. ver. 16 below: the manifestation not being made to us as its spectators, but in our persons and cases, as its "materies." ἡμῖν, communicative, believers in general), that God hath sent (perf. The manifestation is regarded as one act, done implicitly when God sent His Son: but the sending is regarded in its present abiding effects, which have changed all things since it took place) His only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through Him (no words can be plainer than these and need less explanation to any one acquainted with St. John. The endeavours of the old rationalists, Socinus, Schlichting, Grotius, to escape from the assertion of Christ's præ-existence, by rendering εἰς τὸν κόσμον, "ad mundum," μονογ., "dilectissimum," &c.,

k ver. 9.
l ch. ii. 2 only.
Num v. 8 B.
(ἐξελ. Α.)
Ps. cxxix.
xiv. 27
4. Εὐελ.
m so w. ἰλάσ-

κεσθαι.
Exod xxxii. 14 A.
n ch. ii. 7 reff.
o = ch. ii. 6 reff.
p ch. iii. 11 reff.
q JOHN 1. 18.

ἡμεῖς ἡγάπησαμεν τὸν θεόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἠπέστειλεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἰλασμὸν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν. ἡμεῖς, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁ οὐφείλομεν ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. θεὸς

ABKLN
a b c d f
g h j k l
m o 13

ἡγαπηκαμεν B: ἡγαπησεν(sic) N¹.

for αὐτος, ἐκεῖνος A.

ἀπεσταλκεν N.

may be seen in Düsterd. He well remarks, "Such expositors may naturally be expected to give an answer to the question, how a Christ so understood could be our life (ver. 9), our atonement (ver. 10), or our salvation (ver. 14)." The two emphatic words in the sentence are *μονογενῆ* and *ζήσωμεν*. This was the proof, that SUCH a Son of God was sent, that we might LIVE). 10.] *The same proof particularized* in its highest and noblest point, the atonement: and at the same time this brought out, that the love manifested by it was all on God's side, none on ours: was love to us when we were enemies, Rom. v. 8, and therefore all the greater. Ch. iii. 16 is very similar: except that there it is Christ's personal love to us: here the Father's, in sending His Son. In this is love ("in this case," "in this matter," "herein," *is*, 'is found,' 'exists,' ἡ ἀγάπη, Love; in the abstract: "herein is Love," as E. V. This interpretation is necessary, on account of the disjunction which follows. If ἡ ἀγάπη meant, the love of God just spoken of, then it would be irrelevant to subjoin that this love was not our love to Him but His to us. Ec.'s comment is in the main right, though inaccurately expressed: ἐν τούτῳ δέικνυται ὅτι ἀγάπη ἐστὶν ὁ θεός, not that (the ὅτι is the usual one, introducing the apodosis for which the ἐν τούτῳ prepares us: and οὐκ denies this. "In this is love, not in the fact that . . ., but in the fact that" Thus taken, there is no difficulty whatever in the sentence: cf. John xii. 6, 2 Cor. vii. 9. Some Commentators have missed this, and thus found a difficulty. "οὐχ ὅτι (non quasi) pro ὅτι οὐκ (quasi non)," says Grotius: but does not make his meaning very plain. Rosenm., who takes the transposition, explains it, "Quod, quamvis nos non amavissimus Deum, ille tamen amaret nos." Justiniani takes ὅτι as "because" both times, and regards the apodosis as beginning at καὶ ἠπέστειλεν) we loved God (the aor., corresponding to the aor. below, marks the verb as referring to an indefinite time past—no act of love of ours to God at any time done furnishes this example of love, but an act of His towards us. It is not the nature of our love to God, as con-

trasted with His to us, of which the clause treats, but the non-existence of the one love as set against the historical manifestation of the other. Again that "He loved us, though we did not love Him," is so far in the words as it is given by the context (see above), but is not the meaning of the words themselves, but that He loved us (aor., referring again to an act of Love, which is now specified), and (proved this love in that He) sent His Son a propitiation (see on ch. ii. 2) for (see *ibid.*) our sins (His death being therein implied, by which that propitiation was wrought, Eph. i. 7: and that, God's giving His own Son to death for us, being the greatest and crowning act of divine Love). 11.] *Application to ourselves of this example*, as a motive to brotherly love. Strictly parallel with the latter part of ch. iii. 16, where the same ethical inference is drawn with regard to the example of Christ Himself. Beloved (the Apostle's usual introduction of a fervent and solemn address, vv. 1, 7, al.), if (this εἰ with an indicative is very difficult to give exactly in English. It is not on the one hand any expression of uncertainty: but neither on the other is it "since," or "seeing that." We may call it a certainty put in the shape of a doubt, that the hearer's mind may grasp the certainty for itself, not take it from the speaker. "If (it be true that) . . ." is perhaps the nearest English filling up of the sense) God so loved us (so namely as detailed in ver. 10, which and which alone, by the catch-word ἡγάπησεν in the aorist, is pointed at), we also ought to love one another (the καὶ does not belong to the οὐφείλομεν, but purely to the ἡμεῖς,— "we, on our side." But on what does the obligation, asserted in οὐφείλομεν, rest? Clearly, on that relation to God and one another implied by being children of God, ἐκ θεοῦ γεγεννησθαι, which runs through all this section of the Epistle. If we are of God, that love which is in Him, and which He is, will be in us, will make us like Him, causing us to love those who are begotten of Him, ch. v. 1, 2. And of this love, our apprehension of His Love to us will be the motive and the measure). 12.] God hath no one ever beheld (what is the connexion of these words, so sud-

οὐδεὶς ⁹ πώποτε ¹ τεθέαται· ἐὰν ² ἀγαπῶμεν ³ ἀλλήλους, ὁ ⁴ John chiefly, i. 14, 32 al^s. here bis ch. i.

1. 2 Chron. xxii. 6. 2 Macc. ii. 4. iii. 36 only.

denly and startlingly introduced? It is evident that ver. 12 is connected with ver. 11, by the words ἐὰν ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους, taking up again ὀφείλομεν ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. But it is also evident that it is connected with ver. 13 by the ἐν ἡμῖν μένει, κ.τ.λ. And it is further plain, that these words, θεὸν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται, must have some close reference to ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, seeing that they stand between those words in ver. 11, and the resumption of them in ver. 12. It would appear by this, that the idea of connecting them with ἡμεῖς τεθεάμεθα, ver. 14, in the sense, "but we have truly beheld," &c., as Carpzov., is a mistake. (Cf. and similarly Thl. and Aretius) takes it as if some objector were introduced,—ἀκούουσιν δ' ἡν εἰπεῖν τινα, καὶ πᾶθεν τοῦτο λέγεις περὶ πραγμάτων ἀθεάτων καὶ ἀνεφίκτων, καὶ διαβεβαιούς ἡμᾶς οἷς μήπω τις ἔγνωκε; and that the Apostle, συντρέχων τοῖς οὕτω λέγουσι φησὶ καὶ αὐτὸς ὅτι θεὸν μὲν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε, σύμφημι καὶ αὐτός. ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους ἀγάπης φησὶ γινώσκουμεν ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐστί. But of this *objection* there is not the slightest trace in the text: and had the Apostle intended to adduce such an one, he would, as Düsterd. well observes, have replied to it not from the effect of our love to one another, but from the facts of the mission and ministry of the Son of God. Of the remaining Commentators, there are two great divisions. The first consists of those who take the axiom as referring forward to ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν μένει: i. e. our inner communion of life with God whom we have not seen must be realized and will be realized, by love towards one another: so the Scholl., I.,—ὁ ἀόρατος θεὸς κ. ἀνεφίκτος διὰ τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλους ἀγάπης ἐν ἡμῖν μένει, and II.,—τοῦτο οὐ κατορθώσεται, φησὶν, ἡ ἀγάπη, τὸ ἐνοικον ἡμῖν γενέσθαι θεόν, ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε τεθέαται. And so Hunnius, Sel.-Schmidt, Spener, Joach. Lange, Socinus, Grot., Rosenm., Baumg.-Crus., Rickli, Neander, De Wette, Sander, Düsterd., Huther, al. Düsterd. quotes Rickli's representation of this view as the best: "To behold God,—to perceive Him immediately and according to His infinite divine essence, is given to no man here: we cannot apprehend God: but then in the highest and the best manner do we perceive Him inwardly, as His true children, if we love one another, for then God abideth in us." And all this is most true. But I would submit that although it might explain ver. 12 and what

follows, it does not explain the place of ver. 12 in the context at all. How comes the Apostle thus suddenly to introduce this axiom and what follows it? Clearly, vv. 11 and 14 are connected: the same strain of argument is going on, and it is most improbable that a thought thus foreign to that argument would be introduced into the midst of it. Obviously, this is a great defect in this interpretation. Let us turn to the other, and see whether we have it supplied. It takes the words as saying this: "We cannot *immediately* return to the invisible God the love which He has shewn to us: for no man has ever seen Him: i. e. He is not to be seen by any. But if we love our brethren, whom we do see, God abides in us, we are His children, objects of His love, and so, by love to our brethren, love to God is perfected in us." (Lücke.) And thus or nearly thus, Corn.-a-lap., Mayer, Schlichting, Episcopus, Bengel, Whitby, G. Lange, Jachmann.

Now this interpretation, as above given, has the merit of being linked to what went before, by our inability to return God's love: but I must feel that Düsterd.'s objection to it is fatal: it gives a sense wholly alien from St. John's habit of thought, in alleging that we cannot return God's love, and further alien in giving as a reason for this inability, that He is invisible. It would be a most unjustifiable use of ver. 20, to convert it thus and make it say that we *cannot* love God whom we have not seen.

Thus it appears that each view has something to recommend it, each something to discommend it. Is there no third way to be found? In examining ver. 11, we find an unexpected substitution, εἰ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὀφείλομεν (not τὸν θεόν, but) ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν. Why so? Here, ver. 20 will guide us to an answer, if rightly used. Not, because we *cannot* love God whom we have not seen: but because the exponents of God whom we have not seen are our brethren whom we do see. And the Apostle, in substituting ἀλλήλους, does not for a moment drop or set aside the higher τὸν θεόν, but in fact leads up to it by putting its lower and visible objects before us. And then ver. 12 comes in as an explanation, an apology as it were, for this substitution, in the following manner: ἀλλήλους ἀγαπᾶν, I say: for the love to God, which is our ὀφειλή, is love towards one whom we have never seen, and cannot exist in us (as ver. 20) unless by and with its lower degrees as manifested

s ch. iii. 24 reff. θεός^s ἐν^s ἡμῖν^s μένει, καὶ ἡ^t ἀγάπη^t αὐτοῦ^t τετελειωμένη ABKL
 t = ch. ii. 5 (refl) a b c d f
 u ch. ii. 3, 5 ἐν^s ἡμῖν^s ἐστίν. 13^u ἐν^u τούτῳ^u γινώσκομεν^u ὅτι^s ἐν^s αὐτῷ^s g h j k l
 v so Matt xxv. s μένομεν καὶ αὐτὸς^s ἐν^s ἡμῖν, ὅτι^v ἐκ^v τοῦ πνεύματος αὐτοῦ^s m o 13
 s ch. iii. 24 vw δέδωκεν^s ἡμῖν. 14^s καὶ ἡμεῖς^t τεθεάμεθα καὶ^x μαρτυροῦ-
 reff
 x ch. i. 2 reff.

12. rec εστιν bef 2nd εν ημιν, with KL rel syrr coptt æth arm Cc Aug: εν ημιν bef τετελειωμένη A a m vulg Thl: εν ημιν τετελειωται και τετελειωμένη εστιν 13: txt Bx.

13. for δεδ., εδωκεν A c 13 Did Ath, Chr; txt BKLX rel Thl Cc.

14. for τεθεαμεθα, εθεασαμεθα A Cyr: txt BKLX rel Thl Cc.

towards our brethren whom we have seen. By our love to them are we to know, how far we have love to Him: if that be present, He dwelleth in us, and ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ τετελειωμένη ἐστίν ἐν ἡμῖν. And thus (see below) the way is prepared for vv. 15, 16, which take up and bring to a conclusion the reasoning: if we love one another, God abideth in us (for the reason already stated in ver. 8, and restated in immediate connexion with this very matter in ver. 16, that God is Love, and every one that loveth is born of God, knows God, abides in God and God in him), and (simply the copula: not as Calvin, "copulam accipit causalis particulæ loco") the love of Him (i. e. ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ, as in ch. ii. 5, where we had the same expression, *our love to Him*, not, as Beza, Bengel, Sander, al., *His love to us*. This is evident not merely from ch. ii. 5, but from the context here: see it explained above, and remember that it is our love to God which is here the subject, as evinced by our love to our brethren. This is further shewn by the recurrence of the same expression in ver. 17, ἐν τούτῳ τετελείωται ἡ ἀγάπη μεθ' ἡμῶν, and ver. 18, ὁ φοβούμενος οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. And so the majority of Commentators. Calvin proposes as a possible alternative, "caritas, quam nobis inspirat." Socinus renders "dilectio quam ipse Deus nobis præscripsit." But both these are forced, and agree neither with usage nor with the context) is perfected (see note ch. ii. 5. Here, as there, it signifies, has reached its full maturity: the ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους being the token and measure of it. The form τετελειωμένη ἐστίν, like all resolved forms of verbal tenses, brings out more strongly the peculiar temporal force of the verb substantive united with the import of the participle as a predicate. Hence in this case, the *present* sense always contained in the perfect, predominates, and there is more reason than ever for rendering "is," not "hath been") in us (on the view above maintained of ἡ ἀγάπη αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἡμῖν keeps its primary and obvious sense, "in us," "within us," as in ch. ii. 5).

13.] In this we know that we are

abiding in Him and He in us, because He hath given us of His Spirit (nearly repeated from ch. iii. 24. But why introduced here? In the former verse, the fact of His abiding in us was assured to us, if we love one another. Of this fact, when thus loving, we need a token. Him we cannot see: has He given us any testimony of His presence in us? He has given us such a testimony, in making us partakers of His Holy Spirit. This fact it is to which the Apostile here calls our attention, as proving not the external fact of the sending of the Son (ver. 14), but one within ourselves,—the indwelling of God in us, and our abiding in Him. It is obvious that all inferences from the expression ἐκ τοῦ πν. against the personality of the Holy Ghost are quite beside the purpose: compare Acts ii. 17 with Joel ii. 28 (Heb. and E V.). We each have the indwelling of one and the same personal Spirit, but each according to our measure, 1 Cor. xii. 4, 11. One only had the Spirit without measure, in all His fulness: even Christ; John iii. 34. And the presence of the Holy Spirit is most aptly adduced here where love is in question, His first fruit being love, and His presence being tested by His fruits). 14, 15, 16.] The connexion seems to be this: the inward evidence of God's abiding in us and we in Him, is, the gift of His Spirit. But this is not the only evidence nor the only test which we have. This internal evidence is accompanied by, nay, is itself made possible (see ver. 19) by, our recognition of the Father's love in sending His Son as our Saviour: which last is a fact, testified by human evidence. This recognition of God's love is a condition of abiding in Him and He in us: in a word, is the μένειν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, which is equivalent to abiding in Him. And we (this ἡμεῖς brings up in sharp relief the apostolic body whom Christ appointed His witnesses, John xv. 27, Acts i. 8. The assertion is of the same kind as that in ch. i. 1) have beheld (τεθεάμεθα is joined closely to μαρτυροῦμεν, and in common with it belongs to the ὅτι following. No object must be supplied after it, as "Deum ejusque virtutes imprimis carita-

μεν ὅτι ^γ ὁ ^υ πατήρ ^κ ἀπέσταλκεν ^{κz} τὸν υἱὸν ^α σωτήρα τοῦ ^{γ ch 1 3 reff}
^a κόσμου. ¹⁵ ὃς ^{δς} ἂν ^β ὁμολογήσῃ ^β ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστίν ὁ ^{z absol., Matt}
υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ θεὸς ^s ἐν αὐτῷ μένει καὶ αὐτὸς ^s ἐν τῷ θεῷ. ^{xi. 27 d.}
¹⁶ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐγνώκαμεν καὶ ^c πεπιστεύκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ^{a John, passim}
ἔχει ὁ θεὸς ^d ἐν ἡμῖν. ὁ θεὸς ^e ἀγάπῃ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ ^s μένων ^{only, sec}
ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ ^s ἐν τῷ θεῷ μένει, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ^s ἐν αὐτῷ μένει. ^{Phil. v. 23}
¹⁷ ^f ἐν τούτῳ ^t τετελείωται ^{tg} ἡ ἀγάπη ^h μεθ' ἡμῶν, ^{ὡνα} ^{b constr., Matt}
^{d ver. 9} ^{h so 2 John 2.} ^{e ver. 8.} ^{f with ὡνα, John xv. 8. (ch. iii. 23 1 reff)} ^{g = (gener.) ver. 16.}

15. εαν B a k. for ὁμολογήσῃ, ὁμολογῇ A. aft ιησους ins χριστος B spec arm.
16. for πεπιστευκ., πιστευομεν A 13 an tol copt Aug: txt BKL^N rel demid harl Thl
Ec. om 4th d N. rec om 2nd μενει, with A rel vulg aeth Thl Ec Cyp^r,
Bede: ins BKL^N b¹ f g j k l m 36(sic) 40 syr coptt Cyp^r Aug. (coptt add it also at
end of ver 15.)

17. aft ημων ins εν ημιν N.

tem." Piscator. The construction of *θεᾶσθαι* with *ἔτι* is found John vi. 5) and do testify that the Father hath sent (not merely to the historical fact as a thing past, but to its abiding influence as implied by *σωτήρα τ. κόσμου* below: q. d., that the Father sent the Son, and that the Son is the Saviour of the world) the Son (better here than "His Son:" ὁ πατήρ, τὸν υἱόν, are *termini theologici*) as Saviour of the world (*σωτήρα*, anarthrous, is not appositive but predicated = in meaning "to save the world," but one degree removed back from it in telic force: *σῶζειν τὸν κόσμον* would express more strongly the ultimate view of His mission; *σωτήρα τοῦ κόσμου* gives the mediate aim, leaving it possible that another may be yet behind. τοῦ κόσμου here, as in ch. ii. 2, John iii. 16, in its widest sense: no evasion of this sense, such as the "electorum in omnibus populus" of Piscator and Aretius, is to be endured). 15.] And recognition of this fact is a condition and proof of the life of God. Whosoever confesseth (the aorist can only be given by the English present and an exegesis,—viz. that this present betokens not a repeated act and habit, but a great act once for all introducing the man into a state of *ὁμολογήσαι*. All futures, "*shall confess*," and futuri exacti, "*shall have confessed*," are objectionable; the one as losing the retrospective tinge, the other as making it unduly prominent, and indeed imparting a slight hue of transitoriness, which least of all belongs to the word.

The same remark holds good of this confessing, as before with regard to denying, ch. ii. 23: viz., that we must not bring into it more than the Apostle intends by it: it is not the "confession of the *life*" which is here spoken of, but that of the lips only. Of course it would be self-

evident that this is taken by the Apostle as ruling the life: but simply as a matter of course. He speaks of the ideal realized) that Jesus is the Son of God (i. e. receives the testimony in the last verse as true), God abideth in him, and he in God.

16.] a) And we (not now the apostolic body only, but communicative, the Apostle and his readers. This is evident and necessary (against Episcopius, Huther, al.), because on the other view the *ἐν ἡμῖν* which follows, interpreted as it must necessarily be of the same persons, would fit awkwardly on to the repeated general proposition with which the verse concludes) have known and have believed (the two roots which lie at the ground of *ὁμολογεῖν*, *ἐγνώκαμεν* and *πεπιστεύκαμεν*, are in St. John's language, most intimately connected. "True faith is, according to St. John, a faith of knowledge and experience: true knowledge is a knowledge of faith." Lücke. Cf. John vi. 69) the love, which God hath in regard to us (*ἐν ἡμῖν* as above, ver. 9: not "towards us," as Beza (and E. V.), Estius, Luther, Socinus, Grot., &c. b) God is Love, and he that abideth in love abideth in God and God (abideth) in him (this is the solemn and formal restatement of that which has been the ground-tone of the whole since ver. 7. And here, as there, *ἀγάπη* is in its widest abstract sense. Its two principal manifestations are, love to God, and love to one another: but this saying is of Love absolute). 17, 18]

These verses, which are parallel with ch. iii. 19—21, set forth the confidence with which perfect love shall endow the believer in the great day of judgment. In this is love perfected with us (for *ἐν τούτῳ*, see below. ἡ ἀγάπη, not, as Luther, Calv., Spener, Grot., Calov., Bengel, Sander, al., *God's love to us*: this is forbidden by the whole

1 ch. iii. 21 reff.
k John, here
only. 2 Pet.
i. 5 i. eff.
1sa. xxxiv. 8.
1 ch. iii. 3.

ⁱ παρρησίαν ⁱ ἔχουμεν ἐν τῇ ^k ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ^k κρίσεως, ὅτι ¹ καθ-
ὥς ¹ ἐκεῖνος ἐστὶν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐσμέν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ.

ABKLN
a b c d f
g h j k l
m o 13

for ἡμερα, αγαπη Ν.

εχομεν ΚΝ c f.

for εσμεν, εσομεθα Ν.

context: our verse is introduced by *δ μένων ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ*, and continued by *φύβος οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ*: it is love dwelling and advancing to perfection in us. And again, not love to God merely, nor love to our brethren merely; these are concrete manifestations of it: but love itself in the abstract—the principle of love, as throughout this passage. This sense of *ἀγάπη* will point out that of *μεθ' ἡμῶν*, which belongs not to *ἡ ἀγάπη* but to the verb, as in ver. 12. Love is considered as planted in us; its degrees of increase take place *μεθ' ἡμῶν*—not merely “*bei uns*,” “*chez nous*,” *πρὸς ἡμᾶς*, but as *concerned with us*; in a sense somewhat similar to that in which *ἐμεγάλυνεν κύριος τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτῆς*, Luke i. 58. See 2 John 2, where however the idea of dwelling with is more brought out than here), that we have confidence in the day of judgment (*ἵνα* gives not the purpose of the *τετελείωται*, but the apodosis to the *ἐν τούτῳ*, as in reff.: “in this love is perfected in us, viz. that we, &c.” So most, and nearly all the best Commentators. Beza (and E. V.), Socinus, Grot., Mayer, give *ἵνα* its telic force, regarding *ὅτι* as the apodosis (not so E. V.), and assuming a trajection: the objection to which is, not the transposition, but the sense so gained, as belonging to the context. On this view, the aim given by the *ἵνα* comes in altogether disjointed from the context, and the perfection of love in us is stated to be found in a fact which is objective, not subjective. It is only necessary to cite Grotius's exegesis to shew the incongruity, even in his understanding of *ἡ ἀγάπη*. “*Hic est summus gradus dilectionis Dei erga nos, si qualis in hoc mundo Christus fuit, i. e. mundi odiis et propterea plurimis malis expositus tales et nos simus* (Joh. xv. 18; 1 Pet. ii. 19, iv. 16). Ideo hoc Deus ita disponit, ut cum bonā fiduciam appareamus in die iudicii. Nam constans perspersio malorum ad exemplum Christi efficit, ut a Christo optima exspectemus, quippe ipsi similes.” Can any thing be more broken and far-fetched than such a connexion? to say nothing of its “*si simus*” for *ὅτι ἐσμέν*.

On the right interpretation, the confidence which we shall have in that day, and which we have even now by anticipation of that day, is the perfection of our love; grounded on the consideration (*ὅτι καθὼς κ.τ.λ.*) which follows: casting out fear, which cannot consist with perfect

love, ver. 18): because even as He (Christ, see below) is, we also are in this world (this is the reason or ground of our confidence: that we, as we now are in the world, are like Christ: and in the background lies the thought, He will not, in that day, condemn those who are like Himself. In these words, the sense must be gained by keeping strictly to the tenses and grammatical construction: not, as e. g. (Ec. *ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἦν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*, by changing the tenses (so also Thl., Tirin., Corn.-a-lap., Mayer, Grot., Luther, Calov., Rickli, al.), nor by referring the words *ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ* to Christ, as several of the above, and Socinus. And when we have adhered to tense and grammar, wherein is the likeness spoken of to be found? Clearly, by what has been above said, not in our trials and persecutions. Nor by our being not of the world as He is not of the world (Sander, who however adds, “clothed with His righteousness”): nor in that we, as sons of adoption through Him, are beloved of God, even as He is beloved (Tirinus, Neander); nor as Luther, in that we live in Love, as He lives in Love: but in that we are righteous as He is righteous, ch. ii. 29, iii. 3 ff., 10, 22: this being evinced by our abiding in Love. And so mainly (Ec., Thl., with the mistake pointed out above), Beza, Corn.-a-lap., Mayer, Socinus, Lücke, De Wette, Rickli, Düsterd., al. Many indeed of these approach to Luther's view impugned above, and make it to be *love* in which we are like Christ: but Düsterd. brings rightly this logical objection,—that St. John does not say that Love is perfected in confidence in us, because we resemble Christ in Love; but he refers to the fundamental truth on which our Love itself rests, and says; because we are absolutely like Christ, because we are in Christ Himself, because He lives in us, for without this there cannot be likeness to Him; in a word, because we are, in that communion with Christ which we are assured of by our likeness to Him in righteousness, children of God, therefore our love brings with it also full confidence. Essentially, the reason here rendered for our confidence in the day of judgment is the same as that given ch. iii. 21 f. for another kind of confidence, viz., that we keep His commandments. This also betokens the *δικαιοσύνη*, of which Christ is the essential exemplar and which is a necessary attribute of those who

18 φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἀλλ' ἡ ^m τελεία ἀγάπη ^{m = Rom. xii. 2, 1 Cor. xiii. 10, James i. 4.}
ⁿ ἔξω ⁿ βάλλει τὸν φόβον, ὅτι ὁ φόβος ^o κόλασιν ^p ἔχει, ὁ ⁿ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ ^q τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. ¹⁹ ἡμεῖς ⁿ
^{xv. 6.} ^o Matt. xxv. 46 only. ^{Ezek. xliii. 11.} ^p so Matt. vi. 1. ^q ch. ii. 5 reff.

18. αλλα B.

19. aft ημεῖς ins ουν A g k m 13 vulg Syr Pel Leo Bde.

through Christ are children of God).

18.] Confidence in (or as understood, as to) that terrible day presupposes the absence of fear: and this casting out of fear is the very work of love, which in its perfect state cannot coexist with fear. **Fear** (φόβος, abstract and general: anarthrous, on account of the negative predication) **existeth not in love** (τῇ ἀγάπῃ, abstract and general also, as in ver. 17: not "God's love to us," as Calv., Calov., Spener, al.: nor "brotherly love," as Lücke, al.), **may** perfect (see on τετελείωται in ver. 17) love casteth out fear, because fear hath torment (see below): but he that feareth hath not been perfected in (his) love. The points here to be noticed are, 1) the emphatic οὐκ ἔστιν, which is better rendered as above, than "There is no fear in love," in order to keep φόβος, which is the subject in the Greek, also the subject in the English: 2) ἀλλά, which

is not here the mere adversative after a negative clause, in which case it would refer to something in which fear is, e. g. φόβος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, ἀλλ' (ἔστιν) ἐν τῷ μίσει: but it is the stronger adversative, implying "nay far otherwise:" "tantum abest ut . . . ut." 3) the argument in ἀλλ' . . . ἔχει, which is doubly enthymematic, having in it two assumptions or suppressed premisses, α) that nothing having κόλασις can consist with perfect love: β) that fear is in us by nature and needs casting out in order to its absence:

4) the meaning of κόλασιν ἔχει. There are two opinions: a, that κόλασις is merely pain or torment; so Aug. ("tormentum habet"), Erasmus ("punitionem seu potius cruciatum habet"), Tirinus ("parit animi perturbationem cruciatum et tormentum, ob impendens, quod metuit, malum seu poenam"), Luther, Calvin, Schlichting, Beza (and E. V.), Piscator, Aretius, Episcopius, Rosenm., Bengel ("nam diffidit, omnia inimica et adversa sibi fingit ac proponit, fugit, odit"), Joach. Lange (who interprets it, compunction at the preaching of the law), Sander, al.:

b) that κόλασις is properly *punishment*. So Lyra (but mistaking κ. ἔχει; "debetur poena timori servili"), Corn.-a-lap., Estius (well: "poenam, quam commervit, semper animo versat"), Mayer, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Spener, Benson, Whitby, Bauung-

Crus., Neander, Lücke (includes in itself punishment, i. e. consciousness of deserving it), De Wette, Düsterd., Huther. And this last is certainly the sense, both from the usage of the word (reff.), and from the context, in which the day of judgment is before us. Fear, by anticipating punishment, has it even now; bears about a foretaste of it and so partakes of it: 5) the last clause, ὁ δὲ φοβούμενος οὐ τετελείωται ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ, is intimately connected with what follows (see on ver. 14) as well as with what went before. The δὲ is adversative to the whole preceding sentence, ἡ τελεία ἀγάπη κ.τ.λ., and mainly to the idea of τελεία ἀγάπη therein expressed.

As regards the absence of fear from the love of the Christian believer, it has been well observed by (Ecum., that there are two kinds of godly fear, φόβος προκαταρκτικός, which afflicts men with a sense of their evil deeds and dread of God's anger, and which is not abiding: and φόβος τελειωτικός, of which it is said, "The fear of the Lord is clean and endureth for ever," Ps. xix., and which δέους τοιοῦτον ἀπήλλακται. And Bengel says in his brief pointed manner, "Varius hominum status: sine timore et amore: cum timore sine amore: cum timore et amore: sine timore cum amore." The difference is finely wrought out by Augustine, in loc. Tract. ix. 5—8, vol. iii. p. 2048 ff.

19.] I am sorry to be obliged here to differ from the best modern Commentators, Lücke, De Wette, Düsterdieck, Huther, as well as from Episcop., Grot., Luther, Calov., Spener, al., and the Commentators on the vulgate, in holding firmly that ἀγαπῶμεν is indicative, not imperative (i. e. hortative). This I do not merely on account of the expressed ἡμεῖς, though that would be a strong point in the absence of stronger, but on account of the context, which appears to me to be broken by the imperative. He that feareth is not perfect in love. Our love (abstract, not specified whether to God or our brother) is brought about by, conditioned by, depends upon, His love to us first: it is only a sense of that which can bring about our love: and if so, then from the very nature of things it is void of terror, and full of confidence, as springing out of a sense of His love to us. Nor only so: our being new begot-

r absol., ver. 7. * ἀγαπῶμεν, ὅτι αὐτὸς πρῶτος ἡγάπησεν ἡμᾶς. ²⁰ ἐάν ABKLN
s ch. ii. 9. iii. 15. τις εἶπη ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν θεόν, καὶ τὸν ὁ ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ a b c d f
t ch. i. 10 reff u John i. 18. ὁ μισῇ, ὁ ψεύστης ἐστίν· ὁ γὰρ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν g h j k l
u John xiv. 21. Heb. vii 5. αὐτοῦ ὃν ἐώρακεν, τὸν ὁ θεὸν ὃν οὐχ ὁ ἐώρακεν οὐ δύναται m o 13
(so λαμβ., 2John 4 reff) ἀγαπᾶν. ²¹ καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔχομεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ,
w John xi. 57. ὅτι ὁ ἀγαπῶν τὸν θεὸν ἀγαπᾶ καὶ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ.
xv. 12 ch. iii. V. 1 Πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστός
23 al J. only, exx Acts xvii 15. x constr., John vi. 69. xx. 31. Matt ix. 24. al. Job xv 31.

rec aft ἀγαπῶμεν ins αυτον, with KL rel Thl Ec Aug₁; τον θεον N a c d 13 demid (and harl) syrr copt arm Leo₁ Bede: om AB am (with fuld) Aug₂ Pel. for αυτος, ο θεος A 13 vulg Pel: txt BKLN rel harl syrr copt æth arm Thl Ec Aug₂ Bede.

20. om ειπη N¹ (ins N-corr¹ (appy)). rec (for ου) πωσ, with AKL rel vulg Syr copt æth arm Thl Ec Cyr Ambr Aug Cæs-arel Bede: txt BN a syr sah Lucif Zeno. om οτι N. μεισει K N-corr(-σι) m 13. 36 (sic). 66.

21. for απ' αυτου, απο του θεου A am demid Bede: txt BKL rel fuld Lucif Aug. om τον θεον αγαπα και (passing from τον το τον) A¹B¹ (sic: see table at end of prolegg.): in both cases inserted by the original scribe or one of the same age, see Woide and Rulotta.

ten in love is not only the effect of a *sense* of His past love, but is the effect of that love itself: **We** (emphatic—one side of the antithesis) **love** (see above. The indic. is taken by Calvin, Beza, Aretius, Socinus, Schlichting, Seb.-Schmidt, Whitby, Bengel, Rickli, Neander, al. Most Commentators supply αὐτόν or ἀλλήλους, but unnecessarily. It is of all love that he is speaking; of love in its root and ideal), because **He** (God: see the parallel, ver. 10) **first loved us** (viz. in the sending of His Son).

20.] The connexion is most close: and the error great of those who, as e.g. Erdmann, have made a new section begin here. This *ἀγάπη* is universal, necessarily manifested in *both* of the two great departments of its exercise. Love, living and working in the heart as a principle, will fix first upon objects at hand and seen: those objects being natural objects for it to fix on. How then can a man love God, the highest object of love, who is removed from his sight, and at the same time refuse to love his brother, bearing the mark of a child of God, before his eyes from day to day? Put in a brief form, the argument, as connected with the last verse, is this: His love has begotten *us* anew in love: in this *us* are included our brethren, objects of our daily sight: if therefore we do not love them, we do not love Him. If **any** say (aor. “have said;” i.e. at any time: the saying once, rather than the habit, is the hypothesis) **I love God, and hate** (pres. of habit) **his brother, he is a liar**: for (here again the argument is enthymematic, and we must supply from our common sense ἐφελκυστικὸν γὰρ δρασις πρὸς ἀγάπην, Ec.: “oculi sunt in

amore duces,” &c.) **he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen** (perf.: and continues to feel the influence of that sight. We do not say “I have seen him” of the dead, but of the living only), **cannot love God whom he hath not seen** (St. John does not say that there is no love without sight; nor that we love all we see better than any thing we do not see: his argument rests on a deeper and truer position: viz. on that assumed in the word ἀδελφόν, which carries with it the consideration that he of whom it is said is begotten of God. Both δ ἀδελφός and δ θεός are used within the limits of the Christian life, of which that is true, which is unfolded ch. v. 1, that this ἀδελφός as begotten of God is a necessary object of love to one that loves Him that begat him. Here, a lower step of the same argument is taken; but without this great truth, lying beneath the word ἀδελφός, it would carry no conviction with it). 21.] And besides this argument from common sense, there is another most powerful one, which the Apostle here adds. “Quomodo diligis eum, cuius odisti præceptum?” as Aug. **And this commandment we have from Him** (God: not, Christ: see below), **that he who loveth God, love also his brother** (where have we this commandment? In the great summary of the law, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, . . . and thy neighbour as thyself;” so often cited by our Lord; see Matt. xxii. 37—39). CHAP. V. 1.] And who is our brother? and why does this name carry with it such an obligation to love? These questions, in closest connexion with the last verse, the Apostle answers in this.

f = here only. *ἀυτοῦ* ^e *τηρῶμεν*. *καὶ αἱ ἐντολαὶ αὐτοῦ* ¹ *βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν*, ABKLP
8 a b c d
f g a j k l
m o 13
 4 *ὅτι* ^g *πάν τὸ* ^γ *γεγεννημένον* ^γ *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ νικᾷ τὸν κόσ-*
 7. 2 Cor. x. *μον*. *καὶ* ^h *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ νίκη ἡ* ⁱ *νικήσασα τὸν κόσμον*,
 10 only. *ἡ πίστις ἡμῶν*. ⁵ *τίς ἐστὶν ὁ* ⁱ *νικῶν τὸν κόσμον*, ^k *εἰ μὴ ὁ*
 Prov. xxvii. ³ *πιστεύων* ^x *ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*; ⁶ *οὗτός*
 g neut., = John (iii 6) vi. ² *ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*; ⁶ *οὗτός*
 37, 39. xvii. ² *ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*; ⁶ *οὗτός*
 h constr., ch. ii. 25. i John (esp. Rev.) only, exc. Luke xi. 22. Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps. i. 4) xii. 21 bis past,
 ch. ii. 13, 14. iv. 4. see John xvi. 33. k constr., ch. ii. 22.

4. *αυτης*(sic) *Ν*¹.

5. aft *τις* ins δε K[P]X a c 13. 36 demid tol syr copt arm Cyr Thl Did-int; γαρ Syr: pref
 και æth Leo: aft *ἐστιν* ins δε B: txt AL vulg-ed(with am) sah. [*πιστεύσας* P.]

diate this reference, but apparently on account of the form of expression; observing that the Apostle has said not *ελαφραὶ εἰσίν*, but *βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν*; but the comment of Ec. is in confusion, and not easy to understand. The Schol. in the Oxf. Catena well remarks, *εἰ τις προσελθὼν αὐταῖς μὴ ὅν δεῖ τρόπον λέγει αὐτὰς βαρέας, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀσθένειαν ἡττίσαστο· φίλον γὰρ τοῖς ἅγαν ἀποβάλλουσιν ἰσχύον βαρέα νομίζεσθαι καὶ τὰ πάντα ελαφρὰ καὶ κοῦφα*.

This declaration, that His commandments are not grievous, has, as did ch. iii. 9, furnished some of the R.-Cath. Commentators with an opportunity of characterizing very severely the Protestant position that none can keep God's commandments. But here as there the reply is obvious and easy. The course of the Apostle's argument here, as introduced in the next verse by *δτι*, substantiates this *βαρεῖαι οὐκ εἰσίν* by shewing that all who are born of God are standing in and upon the victory which their faith has obtained over the world. In this victorious state, and in as far as they have advanced into it, in other words in proportion as the divine life is developed and dominant in them, do they find those commandments not grievous. If this state, in its ideality, were realized in them, there would be no difficulty for them in God's commandments: it is because, and in so far as sin is still reigning in their mortal bodies and their wills are unsubdued to God's will, that any *βάρος* remains in keeping those commandments), 4.] because (reason, why His commandments are not grievous: not, as Ec., *ἐπιτίθησι τοῖς ἡδὴ εἰρημένοις καὶ ἔτερον ἐπακτικὸν πρὸς τὴν μεταχείρισιν τῆς ἀγάπης*, making *καὶ αἱ ἐντ. αβ. β. οὐκ εἰσ.* merely parenthetical)

all that is born of God (the neuter is here used as gathering together in one, under the category of "born of God," the *ἡμεῖς* implied in the last verses. So St. John uses the comprehensive categorical neuter in ref. Ec. seems to deny this personal meaning of *πάν*, and to understand it

"every thing," applying it afterwards to *ἡ πίστις ἡμ.* as one such thing. Aretius and Paulus take it similarly. But besides the Apostle's usage cited above, the whole analogy here is against such an interpretation. It is *we*, not our faith, of which the term *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγεννησθαι* is used) conquereth (*νικᾷ*, of habit: simply predated of the category *πάν τὸ κ.τ.λ.*) the world (the kingdom of evil under its prince the devil, God's adversary; in the main as Calv., "quicquid adversum est Dei spiritui. Ita naturæ nostræ pravitās pars mundi est, omnes concupiscentiæ, omnes Satanæ actus, quicquid denique nos a Deo abstrahit."

The argument then is this: The commandments of God are not grievous: for, although in keeping them there is ever a conflict, yet that conflict issues in universal victory: the whole mass of the born of God conquer the world: therefore none of us need contemplate failure, or faint under his struggle as a hard one), and the victory which (hath) conquered the world is this, our faith (the identification of the victory with the faith which gained it, is a concise and emphatic way of linking the two inseparably together, so that wherever there is faith there is victory. And this is further expressed by the aorist participle, by which, as Estius (notwithstanding that the vulgate has "quæ vincit"), "significatur victoria jam parata:" cf. ch. ii. 13, iv. 4. Socinus absurdly explains the aorist as speaking of those whose Christian course is done, against the plain *ἐστίν*, not only here but in ver. 5).

5.] If it be asked, How does our faith overcome the world? this verse furnishes the answer; because it brings us into union with Jesus Christ the Son of God, making us as He is, and partakers of His victory, John xvi. 33. Through this belief we are born again as sons of God; we have Him in us, One greater than he who is in the world, ch. iv. 4. And this conclusion is put in the form of a triumphant question: What other person can do it? Who that believes this,

ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν ¹ δι' ὕδατος καὶ αἵματος, Ἰησοῦς χριστός. ¹ = Acts xiv. 22. see note.
Winer, edn. 6, § 47 1

6. δ.α. Ν. aft αιματος ins και πνευματος AN a 13. 36 tol syr coptt: bef κ. αιμ.
[P] aeth arm: om BKL rel vulg Syr Cyr₁ Thl Ec Tert Rebapt Aug₁—for αιμ., πνευμ.
103-4 Cyr₁ Ambr Aug₁ rec (aft ιησ.) ins δ, with b f 13 Thl comm₁ Ec-comm₁:
om ABLN rel 40 Cyr₂ Thl Ec: χρ. ιησ. K[P] 36 sah Ambr.

can fail to do it? Who is he that conquereth the world, except he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? By comparing ver. 1 a, we find 1) that δ χριστός there answers to δ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ here; 2) that by the combination of the two verses, we get the proposition of ver. 4 a. Episcopus gives well the meaning: "Lustrate universum mundum et ostendite mihi vel unum, de quo vere affirmari possit, quod mundum vincat, qui Christianus et fide hac praeditus non est."

6—21.] THE THIRD AND LAST DIVISION OF THE EPISTLE. This portion falls naturally into two parts: vv. 6—13, and vv. 14—21: the former of which treats of the concluding part of the argument, and the latter forms the close of the Epistle.

6—13.] As in the former portions, our communion with God who is light (ch. i. 5 ff.) was treated, and our birth in righteousness from God who is righteous (ii. 29 ff.), by faith in Jesus the Son of God,—so now we have another most important element of the Christian life set before us: the testimony to it arising from that life itself: *the witness of the spiritual life to its own reality*. This witness rests not on apostolic testimony alone, but on the Holy Spirit, which the believer has in himself (ver. 10), and which is God's testimony respecting His Son (vv. 9, 10), and our assurance that we have eternal life (ver. 13).

There is hardly a passage in the N. T. which has given rise to more variety of interpretation: certainly none which (on account of the apparent importance of the words interpolated after ver. 7) has been the field of so much critical controversy. Complete accounts of both the exegesis and the criticism will be found in the recent monographs on the Epistle: more especially in that of Düsterdieck. I shall indicate the more salient points of the divergent interpretations as I proceed.

6.] This (viz. the person spoken of in the last verse; Jesus. This, which is maintained by most Commentators, is denied by Knapp and Huther, who refer οὗτος to δ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ: "This Son of God is he &c.:" making the proposition assert the identity of the Son of God with the historical Jesus, not the converse.

This Huther supports on two grounds: 1) that the fact that Jesus came by water and blood needed no proof even to Heretics: 2) that on the ordinary interpretation the following words, Ἰησ. (δ) χριστός, become altogether superfluous. But to these it is easily replied, 1) that although the fact might be confessed, that was not confessed to which the fact bore testimony, viz. that Jesus who came in the flesh was the Son of God: 2) that the apologetical clause Ἰησ. (δ) χριστός is by no means superfluous, being only a solemn reassertion of our Lord's Person and Office as testified by these signs.

The main objection to Huther's view is, that, as well stated by Düsterd., it makes the coming by water and blood, which, by the context, is evidently in the Apostle's argument a substantiating consideration, to be merely an exceptional one: "this Son of God is Jesus (the) Christ, *though* He came by water and blood." Therefore the other interpretation must stand fast. It is well defended also by Lücke) is *he that came by water and blood* (the words δι' ὕδατος κ. αἵματος have been universally and rightly taken with ἐλθὼν. Only Hofmann, in the Schriftbeweis, ii. 1, p. 331, maintains the joining δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ. to ἐστιν, understanding ἐλθὼν, "He that has come," in the sense of δ ἐρχόμενος. But this latter idea is wholly without N. T. precedent, and condemns the whole. It indeed, without Hofmann's construction, is taken by several Commentators, Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, Calov., Bengel ("Jesus est is quem propter promissiones venire oportuit, et qui venit revera"), Knapp, &c. But if this meaning is in ἐλθὼν, then it cannot be the mere exponent of δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ., but must take an emphatic place of its own, and δι' ὕδ. κ. αἵμ. must stand awkwardly alone, "and that by water and blood," or must, as Hofmann, belong to ἐστιν.

Taking then the generally received construction, we may observe that the article before the aor. part. ἐλθὼν, makes οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν to be the identification of οὗτος with ὁ ἐλθὼν, i. e. with one who as an historical fact, ἦλθεν, precluding such renderings as "came" for ἐστιν ὁ ἐλθὼν; also forbidding the making the aor. into a present, "this is He that cometh," as Luther, Seh.-Schmidt, J. Lange, Rickli,

^{m = Heb ix. 25. (see ch. iv. 2.)} οὐκ ^m ἐν τῷ ὕδατι μόνον, ἀλλ' ^m ἐν τῷ ὕδατι καὶ ^m ἐν ABKLP
N a b c d
f g h j k l
m o 13

μῶνω B. for ἀλλ', ἀλλὰ A, ἀλλὰ καὶ b o. rec om 3rd ἐν, with K^K rel vulg
 Cyr₂ Thl Ec Aug: ins ABL[P] j k 13. 36(sic). 40 Cyr₂. [transp ὑδατι and αἵματι]

Sander, al., and perhaps Ec., as has been inferred from his understanding ὕδωρ and αἷμα of present means of grace and salvation: ὁ γὰρ ἐλθὼν Ἰησοῦς ὁ χριστὸς δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννᾷ καὶ αἵματος. But he may have been misunderstood: the ἐλθὼν in this comment, and the circumstance that he afterwards dwells on the historical facts of the Baptism and the Crucifixion, seem to shew that he understood the participle aoristically. We may clearly do so, and still regard the water and blood as present in their effects and testimony. All Commentators, except Hofmann (see above), regard ἐλθὼν as referring, not to the Lord's birth in the flesh, but to His open manifestation of himself before the world. See above on ch. iv. 2.

The prep. διὰ, which passes into ἐν in the next sentence, is thereby explained to bear its very usual sense of through or by means of, as said of that which accompanies, as the medium through which, or the element in which. We have an example of ἐν passing into διὰ, 2 Cor. vi. 6, 7: and the very same phrases, δι' αἵματος and ἐν αἵματι, are used of our Lord in Heb. ix. 12, 25, which chapter is the best of all comments on this difficult expression.

δι' ὕδατος κ. αἵματος has been very variously understood. Two canons of interpretation have been laid down by Düsterd., and may safely be adopted: 1) "Water" and "blood" must point both to some purely historical facts in the life of our Lord on earth, and to some still present witnesses for Christ: and 2) they must not be interpreted symbolically, but understood of something so real and powerful, as that by them God's testimony is given to believers, and eternal life assured to them. These canons at once exclude such interpretations as that of Wetst., al., "probavit se non phantasma sed verum hominem esse qui ex spiritu (sive aëre, ver. 8) sanguine et aqua seu humore constaret, Joh. xix. 34:"—as the purely symbolical interpretation, of which there are two kinds:—1) that of Socinus and his school, in which ὕδωρ stands for the purity and innocence of the life and doctrine of Christ, Heb. x. 22, Eph. v. 26,—and αἷμα of the death of Christ as His testimony of Himself. So Schlichting and Grotius: 2) that given by Clement of Alex., Adumbrationes ad h. l. 1011

P (not in Migne), in which ὕδωρ represents regeneration and faith, and αἷμα, knowledge (cognitionem): by Beza,—in which ὕδωρ is "ablutio a peccati labe, cuius nunc tessera est Baptismus,"—αἷμα, "expiatio et persolutio pro peccatis:" by Calvin, in which he explains both ὕδωρ and αἷμα by "summam ostendit quorsum præcipue tenderent ceremoniæ veteres: nempe ut homines ab inquinamentis purgati et soluti omnibus piaculis, Deum haberent propitium et illi consecrarentur." By the latter of our two canons is excluded also the idea of mere symbolical reference to the sacraments, as e. g. Beza (see above), Luther, Calvin, al.

Düsterdieck observes that it is remarkable that the best R.-Cath. expositor, Estius (whose commentary is unfortunately broken off at this verse), does not as some have done, interpret αἷμα of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but puts together ὕδωρ and αἷμα, as Calvin and Luther: "per sanguinem vivificat tum in baptismo aqua, tum in aliis sacramentis, tum etiam extra sacramenta." So that, as Düsterdieck proceeds, the great leaders of the three schools of theology have had the tact to see that which their less skilful followers have missed seeing,—that αἷμα cannot by any means be understood of the Lord's Supper, as has been done by Hunnius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Wolf, Bengel, Carpzov., Sander, al.

The next point which comes before us is, to enquire whether at all, or how far, our passage is connected with John xix. 34? It occurs here, because many Commentators, e. g. Bede, Hunnius, Seb.-Schmidt, Calov., Wolf, Bengel, &c., have seen in the incident there related a miraculous symbolizing of the two sacraments, and in this passage an allusion to that incident. To deny all such allusion, as is done by Düsterdieck, seems against probability. The Apostle could hardly both here and in that place lay such evident stress on the water and blood together, without having in his mind some link connecting this place and that. That in the Gospel it is αἷμα and ὕδωρ,—in this place ὕδωρ and αἷμα,—a difference of which Düsterd. makes much, is surely not worth mentioning. The idea that we have here nothing more than a reference to the fact of John xix. 34, is against our 2nd canon

τῷ αἵματι καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ μαρτυροῦν, ὅτι τὸ <sup>n John xv. 26
Heb x 15
see Acts v. 32.</sup>

P m¹ (5. 83 Sz):] for αἵματι, πνευματι: A 21. 41 Cyr: al vary.

above: but that John xix. 34 and this refer to the same fundamental truth, is I conceive hardly to be doubted.

It rests now then that we enquire into the meaning of each expression. On αἷμα, there cannot surely be much uncertainty. The blood of His Cross must, by all Scripture analogy, be that intended. The pouring out of this blood was the completion of the baptism which He had to be baptized with, Mark x. 38, 39, Luke xii. 50. And if this is so, to what can ὕδωρ be referred so simply, as to that baptism with water, which inaugurated the Lord's ministry? It might indeed be said that the baptism which He instituted for His followers, better satisfies the test of our 2nd canon, that viz. of being an abiding testimony in the Christian Church. But to this there lies the objection, that as αἷμα signifies something which happened to Christ Himself, so must ὕδωρ likewise, at least primarily, whatever permanent testimony such event may have left in the Christian Church. And thus some modern Commentators have taken it: as uniting the historical fact of the Lord's baptism with the ordinance of baptism, grounded on it, and abiding in the Christian Church. So Semler, Rosenm., Baumg.-Crus., Brückner, Neander, Huther. Düsterd. refuses to accept this view, denying that our Lord's Baptism was any proof or testimony of His Messiahship, and understanding ὕδωρ of the ordinance of baptism only. But surely we are not right in interpreting δ' ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδατος, *He that ordained baptism*: nor, whatever Düsterd. may say, in giving the two, αἷμα and ὕδωρ, an entirely different reference. For his endeavour to escape from this by making αἷμα not Christ's death but His blood, applied to us, cannot be accepted, as giving a "non-natural" sense to ἐλθὼν δι' αἵματος likewise.

All this being considered, it seems impossible to avoid giving both to αἷμα and ὕδωρ the combined senses above indicated, and believing that such were before the Apostle's mind. They represent,—ὕδωρ, the baptism of water which the Lord Himself underwent and instituted for His followers, αἷμα, the baptism of blood, which He Himself underwent, and instituted for His followers. And it is equally impossible to sever, as Düsterd. does, from these words, the historical accompaniments and associations which arise on their mention. The Lord's baptism, of itself, was indeed rather a result than a proof of his Messiah-

ship: but in it, taking St. John's account only, a testimony to His divine Sonship was given, by which the Baptist knew Him to be the Son of God: ἐγὼ ἑώρακα κ. μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν δ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, are his words, John i. 34; and when that blood was poured from His "riven side," he that saw it again uses the same formula, δ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκε. It cannot be that the word μαρτυρία being thus referred to two definite points of our Lord's life, should not apply to these two, connected as they are with ὕδωρ and αἷμα here mentioned, and associated by St. John himself with the remarkable preterite μεμαρτύρηκεν, of an abiding μαρτυρία in both cases. But these past facts in the Lord's life are this abiding testimony to us, by virtue of the permanent application to us of their cleansing and atoning power. And thus both our canons are satisfied, which certainly is not the case in Düsterdieck's interpretation, though they were laid down by himself), Jesus Christ (see above on οὗτος. As now, with the art. omitted, the words are merely the name, "Jesus Christ:" if it were inserted, the adjunct δ χριστός would be an oppositional predicate, and would necessarily send the thought back to the ἐλθὼν δι' ὕδ. κ. αἷμ. as a proof of the Messiahship of Jesus. It may be remarked, however, that in all the places where St. John uses this Name, it has a solemn meaning, and is by the emphasis thus thrown on the official designation of our Lord, nearly = Ἰησοῦς δ χριστός. Cf. John i. 17, xvii. 3: 1 John i. 3, ii. 1, iii. 23, iv. 2, v. 20: 2 John 3, 7): not in the water only, but in the water and in the blood (ἐν, see above on διὰ. The sense of the two is there shewn to be closely allied, ἐν giving rather the "element in which," διὰ, the medium through which. The art. before each dative shews not merely, as Huther, that ὕδωρ and αἷμα have been before named, but that they are well-known and solemn ideas. It is inserted not as matter of course, but as giving solemnity.

But why has the Apostle added this sentence? Schöttgen thought that it is to give Christ the preference over Moses, who came only by water (1 Cor. x. 2), and Aaron, who came only by blood (of sacrifice), whereas Christ united both. But this is too far-fetched. Baumgarten-Crusius again regards the words as directed against those who despised the Cross of Christ (1 Cor. i. 23): but a more definite expla-

o see ch. iv. 6 ° πνεῦμά ἐστιν ἡ ° ἀλήθεια. 7 ὅτι τρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαρτυ-
 ref. ABKLP
 nabcd
 fghjk
 lmo 13

for 2nd το πνευμα, χριστος 34 vulg arm-use Ambr., ms Aug. (*This reading is found in but one Greek copy which at this point is remarkably conformed to the vulg current in the 17th cent. The variation sprung from the confusion in Latin MSS of the contractions SPS and XPS. See Treg in Horne vol IV. p. 215.*)

7. aft στι ins οι N.

nation than this is required. And those can hardly be wrong, who find it in such words as those of the Baptist in John i. 25, ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι, μέσος ὑμῶν στήκει ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε: cf. the emphatic repetitions below, ib. ver. 31, ἡλθον ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι βαπτίζων, and ver. 33, ὁ πῦμας με βαπτίζειν ἐν ὕδατι. The baptism of Jesus was not one of water only, but one of blood,—Ὑδε ὁ ἀμὺνς τοῦ θεοῦ— and something more than that, which follows in the next clause): and the Spirit is that which witnesseth, because the Spirit is the truth (that is, as explained by the next verse, the Spirit is an additional witness, besides those already mentioned, to the Messiahship of Jesus, and in that, to the eternal life which God has given us in Him. This at once removes the meaning “that,” which some have given to ὅτι. It is not to the fact that the Spirit is the truth, that the Spirit gives witness: but the fact, that He is the truth, is that which makes Him so weighty a witness; which makes the giving of witness so especially His office.

Very various however have been the meanings here given to τὸ πνεῦμα. The scholium in Matthai understands, the spirit of our Lord (τὸ πν. τῆς ψυχῆς) which He when dying commended into His Father's hands. Augusti, who explains ὕδαρ and αἷμα of the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, sees in πνεῦμα, in connexion with John xx. 22 ff., a third Sacrament of *absolution*. Ziegler and Stroth regard it as = ὁ πνευματικός, i. e. St. John himself. (Ec. and Knapp regard it as = ὁ θεός—διὰ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος, ὅτε ὡς θεός ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν θεοῦ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνου λοιπόν, τὸ ἀνίσταῖν ἑαυτόν. τῇ δὲ τοῦ πνεύματος φωνῇ σημαίνεται ὁ θεός: thus making the threefold witness to the υἱοθεσία of Jesus, τὸ βάπτισμα, ὁ σταυρός, ἡ ἀνάστασις. Then again Socinus, Schlichting, Grot., Whitby, al., interpret it of the Divine power by which Christ wrought His miracles: “id est,” says Grot., “per μετανομίαν, admiranda ejus opera, a virtute divina manifeste procedentia.” But this, as well as Bede's interpretation, that the Spirit which descended on the Lord at His baptism is meant, inasmuch as it testified to His being “verus Dei filius,”—fails, in giving

no *present abiding* testimony such as the context requires. Others again understand by πνεῦμα the ministry of the word: so Aretius, J. Lange, Hunnius (“Spiritus per externam prædicationem verbi testificatur de Jesu Christo, atque simul intrinsecus in cordibus fidelium hanc Christi notitiam obsignat”), Luther, Piscator, Carpov., Rosenmüller (the Gospel), Seb.-Schmidt (“verbum evangelii et cum eo ministerium ecclesiasticum”), &c. Most of these, as well as Bengel, whose whole interpretation is confused by his attempt to force the interpolated words in ver. 7 into the context, understand πνεῦμα here and in ver. 8 differently. But nothing can be plainer than that we must not alter the meaning, where the *στ.* binds together the sentences so closely.

The above interpretations (to which we may add that of Sander, that τὸ πν. = τὸ χάρισμα, the transformation of a man which takes place by the agency of the Holy Spirit) failing to give any satisfactory account of the text, we recur to the simple and obvious meaning, *the Holy Spirit*. This is taken by Schol. L., Estius, Corn.-alap., Tirinus, Calvin, Calov., Lücke, Rickli, De Wette, Huther, Neander, Düsterdieck, al. And it seems fully to satisfy all the requirements of the passage. The Holy Spirit is He, who testifies of Christ (John xv. 26), who glorifies Him, and shews of the things which belong to Him (John xvi. 14). It is by the possession of Him that we know that we have Christ (ch. iii. 24). And the following clause, “because the Spirit is the Truth,” exactly agrees with this. He is the absolute Truth (John xiv. 17, xv. 26), leading into all the Truth (John xvi. 13 f.). And in this consists the all-importance and the infallibility of His witness. “Testimonium ejus haudquaquam rejici potest, quoniam Spiritus est veritas, quum sit Deus, ideoque nec falli potest, nec fallere.” Estius).

7.] “Johannes hic causam reddit, cur locutus fuerit non de Spiritu tantum, ejus præcipua in hoc negotio est auctoritas, verum etiam de aqua et sanguine, quia in illis etiam non exigua est testimonii fides, et ternarius numerus in testibus est perfectissimus.” Grot. For (from what has been just cited from Grot. it will be seen that “because” would be here, as so often,

ροῦντες, ⁸ τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ, καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ οἱ

7, 8. rec aft μαρτυροῦντες ins εν τω ουρανω ο πατηρ ο λογος και το αγιον πνευμα και ουτοι οι τρεις εν εσει και τρεις εισιν οι μαρτυροῦντες εν τη γη, with (34. 162) 173²-marg vulg(demid tol &c, not am fuld al₅₀), supposed to be alluded to or cited by Tert Cypr Phœbad(see below), clearly cited by Vig Fulg Cassiod Ansbet Ps-Jer(prologue to Cath epp), also(as given by Viet-vit) in a confession of faith drawn up at end of the 5th cent by Eugenius(or, as some, Vig), and further by many writers after the 9th cent: OMITTED in ALL GREEK MSS previous to the beginning of the 16th century; ALL the GREEK FATHERS (even when producing texts in support of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity: as e.g. by Clem Iren Hipp Dion Ath Did Bas Naz Nys Epiph Cæs Chr Procl Andr Damasc Ec Thl Euthym); ALL THE ANCIENT VERSIONS (including the Vulgate (as it came from Jerome, see below) and (though interpolated in the modern editions) the Syriac); AND MANY LATIN FATHERS (viz Novat Hil Lucif Ambr Faustin Leo Jer Aug Hesych Bede).

(The following is a statement of the most important details:—

I. Scholz numbers 192 cursive mss in the Acts and Catholic Epistles. Of these; *six* do not contain 1 John, viz. “55. 74. 85. 90. 157. 159;” *six* are defective at this point, viz. “53 (= Scrivener’s n). 103. 120. (122?) 130. 177;” *seven* are identical with mss named on our margin, viz. “13,” “24” = “1,” “31” = “m,” “61” = “111” = “o” (see Scriv.), “91” = “h,” and “102” = “K;” *two*, viz. “110” and “152,” are not mss at all but printed books; *one*, viz. Cantab. Kk 6. 4 (= *2068 of Nasmith’s index), is cited twice, first as “9,” and then as “112” (cf. “o”); and *three* more must be dismissed from the enumeration for separate reasons (“107” is a lectionary, and does not contain the pericopa, “44” represents not a ms but an ancient collection of various readings, and “83” is probably the same ms as “173”). We have thus left 165 (including (see prolegomena) “108” and “109”), all of which, together with H^r, and the *eighteen* given on the margin, 184 in all [*nineteen* are now given on the margin, making 185 in all R. H.], have been examined and found to omit the disputed passage. This statement however is not really quite as accurate and complete as at first sight it might seem to be. *Nine* of the number named above (viz. “c. f. 8. 39. 47. 49. 50. 52. 98”) may possibly be hereafter identified with others as yet denoted by a separate symbol, for it is not distinctly known where they are now preserved. When we say then that all known manuscripts, with the exception of two, omit the words in question; let it be understood that we mean, to begin with, 175 [176] mss to be found at the places indicated in the list prefixed to this volume; and in addition probably not less than 70 more seen and examined by trustworthy persons. (The nine named above; the ms entered as 182 a in our list; eighteen given by Scrivener, Introd. to N. T. Crit. pp. 199, 200; and about 50 lectionaries.) We have thus, at least 175 [176], possibly as many as 250 manuscripts, of all ages, to be set against 2 of the 16th century. Codex Ravianus at Berlin and two mss at Wolfenbüttel are sometimes brought forward to support the insertion. Cod. Rav. and one of the Wolf. mss were made from the printed text: the former “from the Complutensian Polyglott, imitating its very misprints” (Treg. on P. T.); part of the plan of the latter (written in the 17th century) is to give various readings from the Latin translations of Erasmus, Beza, &c. In the other Wolf. ms, and in that at Naples cited as “173,” the addition is only found on the margin and in writing not earlier than the 16th century. Even “34” and “162” cannot be admitted as trustworthy witnesses. Written at the time when the contest was going on in favour of the current Latin text as opposed to the Greek, they differ from the received text and from one another. Both read πατηρ λογος και πνευμα αγιον (an expression which it is instructive to compare, as to the omission of the articles, with Erasmus’ latin-derived text of Rev. xxii. 16—21. Erasmus himself, however (edd. 1527, 1535), *here* inserted the articles in his text, though in his quotation of “Cod. Brit.” they do not occur). “34” has εν τω ουρανω and εν τη γη;

too strong a causal rendering for *ἔτι*, and that even at the risk of identifying it with *γάρ*, logical accuracy requires the slighter causal conjunction) **those who bear witness are three** (τρεῖς εἰσιν is copula and predicate. The three are considered as living and speaking witnesses; hence the masculine form. By being *three*, they fulfil the requirements of the Law as to full

testimony: cf. Deut. xvii. 6, xix. 15: Matt. xviii. 16, 2 Cor. xiii. 1), **the Spirit, and the water, and the blood** (now, the Spirit is put first: and not without reason. The Spirit is, of the three, the only living and active witness, properly speaking: besides, the water and the blood are no witnesses without Him; whereas He is independent of them, testifying both in them and out of

Mat. xix. 5.
xxi. 42.
Luke iii. 5.
Rom. ii. 26

τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν.
Gen. xv. 6

q so John xi. 52. xvii. 23.

r John iii. 11, 32, 33.

ABKLP
8 a b c d
f g h j k
l m o 13

"162," απο του ουρανου and επι της γης. "162" omits the received ουτοι and inserts εις το bef εν εισι.

All the lectionaries which contain the passage omit the disputed words. (They are sometimes reckoned as about 50 in number, but are possibly much fewer.)

II. The Vulgate is cited in support of the disputed passage. It is true that it is found in the mass of the later mss of that version; but it is wanting in the two earliest (written in the 6th century), in those revised by Alcuin and in about fifty others; whilst those that contain it differ both as to the words themselves and as to their position. Some have it as it stands in the authorized editions: others (as demid tol) insert it after verse 8. Some have it in the ordinary form; others (and these after verse 8) *Sicut et in celo tres sunt, pater, verbum, et spiritus; et tres unum sunt.* (For minor variations, see Tischendorf.)

III. The testimony of the Latin fathers, taken as a whole, has been relied upon by the advocates of the received text.

It is as follows:—

"*Cæterum de meo sumet,*" inquit, "*sicut ipse de Patris.*" *Ita connexus Patris in Filio et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit coherentes alterum ex altero: qui tres unum sunt, non unus; quomodo dictum est: "Ego et Pater unum sumus," ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem.* (Tertull. adv. Praxean c. 25, vol. ii. p. 188.)

Si baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissionem peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissionem consecutus est, et sanctificatus est, et templum Dei factus est; . . . quæro cujus Dei? Si Creatoris; non potuit quia in eum non credidit: si Christi; non hujus fieri potuit templum, qui negat Deum Christum: si Spiritus Sancti, cum tres unum sint, quomodo Spiritus sanctus placatus esse ei potest. qui aut Filii aut Patris inimicus est? (Cypr. ad Jubaianum 12, Migne Patr. ii. p. 1117.)

Dicit Dominus "Ego et Pater unum sumus;" et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, "Et hi tres unum sunt." (Cypr. de unitate ecclesiæ, § 6, p. 503 f.)

Si ea quæ his significata sunt velimus inquirere non absurde occurrit ipsa Trinitas qui unus . . . est deus, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, de quibus verissime dici potuit "Tres sunt testes et tres unum sunt;" ut nomine spiritus significatum accipiamus Deum Patrem . . . ; nomine autem sanguinis, Filium . . . ; et nomine aquæ, Spiritum Sanctum. (Augustin. contra Maximin. Ariannum, lib. ii. c. 22, 5, vol. viii. p. 795.)

Sic alius a Filio Spiritus, sicut a Patre Filius. Sic tertia in Spiritu ut in Filio secunda persona: unus tamen Deus omnia, tres unum sunt. (Phœbadius, contra Arianos 22, Migne, vol. xx. p. 30.)

Plures tamen hic ipsam interpretationem mystica intelligunt Trinitatem. (Eucherius de Quæst. N. T. (Instruct. i. 2, Migne Patr. vol. i. p. 810 f.))

Johannes Evangelista . . . ad Parthos "Tres sunt" inquit "qui testimonium perhibent in terra, aqua, sanguis et caro, et tres in nobis sunt; et tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in celo Pater, Verbum, et Spiritus, et ii tres unum sunt." (Vigilius of Thapsus against Varimadus, i. 5, p. 367.) For this and further quotations, see Davidson's Bibl. Criticism and Tischendorf h. 1.)

The words cited from St. Augustine form the commencement of an elaborate justification of the mystical meaning assigned by him to "the spirit," "the water," and "the blood." Throughout the whole, there is no allusion to the disputed words; though

them), and the three concur in one (contribute to one and the same result: viz. the truth that Jesus is the Christ and that we have life in Him. Corn.-a-lap.'s mistake, "in unum, ad unum, scil. Christum," cannot have come (as Düsterd.) from a misunderstanding of the vulgate, seeing that it has "hi tres unum sunt:" but is merely an exegesis, and in the main a right one. But the words simply signify in themselves, "are in accord." And this their one testimony is given by the purification in the water of baptism into His name, John iii. 5: by the continual cleansing from all

sin which we enjoy in and by His atoning blood: by the inward witness of His Spirit, which He hath given us).

The question of the genuineness of the words read in the rec. at the end of ver. 7, has been discussed, as far as external grounds are concerned, in the digest; and it has been seen, that unless pure caprice is to be followed in the criticism of the sacred text, there is not the shadow of a reason for supposing them genuine. Even the supposed citations of them in early Latin Fathers have now, on closer examination, disappeared (see Digest)

πων ¹ λαμβάνομεν, ἡ ² μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ ³ μείζων ἐστίν, ὅτι ^{s John v 36.}

a simple quotation of that one sentence would have had greater controversial value than the most perfect proof of the symbolical meaning of the other clause. So far is he from knowing the words, that he brings forward John viii. 18 and xv. 26 to shew that it is not improper to speak of the Persons of the Ever Blessed Trinity as "witnesses." If he had had any thing plainer to urge, he would not have contented himself with "*NON ABSURDE occurrit ipsa Trinitas.*" The authority of so great a father would soon lead to the noting down of the substance of his interpretation, on the margin of the books belonging to the orthodox. From the margin to the text is but one step. At the end of the 5th century, Vigilus, perhaps (see Davidson), quotes the interpretation as part of the text. There is no real citation before this date. The passages brought forward from Tertullian and Cyprian contain only the words "*Et hi tres unum sunt;*" or the like: this being the Latin form of the corresponding clause in either verse, there is nothing in the words themselves to shew from which they came. In the two first passages it would be hard to prove that there is any thing more than a simple statement of the Catholic doctrine. In the third, Cyprian, treating of the unity of the Church, urges that very analogy between earthly and heavenly things, the acknowledgment of which seems to have led first to the use of "*hi tres unum sunt*" as a convenient formula in speaking of the Holy Trinity; next, to Augustine's mystical interpretation; and then, to the received gloss. With the teaching of his "master" Tertullian in his mind, Cyprian would not hesitate to speak as he does of the unchallenged verse; had his copies contained the words we reject, we might naturally expect that he would quote the whole passage as fitting in precisely with the course of his argument.

IV. The Greek words were first inserted in the Complutensian edition of 1514. When Erasmus enquired whether the editors really had mss so different from any he had seen, the answer given by one of them was, "*Sciendum est Græcorum codices esse corruptos; nostros vero (i. e. Latinos) ipsam veritatem continere.*" Erasmus unfortunately pledged himself to insert the words if they existed in any one Greek ms. A Codex Britannicus was at length found which contained them. Erasmus, in his 3rd edition (1522), fulfilled his promise. In his annotations, however (ed. 1535, p. 770), after giving the words precisely as they stand in Cod. Montf., he writes thus, "*Ex hoc igitur Codice Britannico reposuimus, quod in nostris dicebatur deesse: ne cui sit ausa calumniandi. Tametsi suspicor codicem illum ad nostros esse correctum.*" A. W. G.)

8. om οι τρεις εις το εν ειςιν 34. 162. (so also the vulgate in the Complutensian edition.)

9. for των ανθρωπων, του θεου Ν¹.

om 1st οτι K arm.

Something remains to be said on internal grounds, on which we have full right to enter, now that the other is secured. And on these grounds it must appear, on any fair and unprejudiced consideration, that the words are 1) alien from the context: 2) in themselves incoherent, and betraying another hand than the Apostle's. For 1) the context, as above explained, is employed in setting forth the reality of the substance of the faith which overcomes the world, even of our eternal life in Jesus the Son of God. And this is shewn by a threefold testimony, subsisting in the revelation of the Lord Himself, and subsisting in us His people. And this testimony is the water of baptism, the blood of atonement, the Spirit of truth, concurrent in their witness to the one fact that He is the Son of God, and that we have eternal life in Him. Now between two steps of this argument,—not as a mere analogy referred to at its conclusion,—insert the words "For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit:

and these three are one," and who can fail to see, unless prejudice have blinded his eyes, that the context is disturbed by the introduction of an irrelevant matter? Consequently, Bengel, one of the most strenuous upholders of the words, is obliged tamely to take refuge in the transposition of vv. 7 and 8 (which was perhaps the original form of its insertion in the vulgate; see Digest I. II. and the quotation by Vigilus), so as to bring into treatment the matter in hand, before the illustration of it is introduced. But even suppose this could be done; what kind of illustration is it? What is it to which our attention is directed? Apparently the mere fact of the triplicity of testimony: for there is not the remotest analogy between the terms in the one case and those in the other; the very order of them, differing as it does in the two cases, shews this. Is this triplicity a fact worthy of such a comparison? And then, what is the testimony in heaven? Is it borne to men? Certainly not: for God hath no man seen,

t (double ὅτι), *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἡμεμαρτύρηκεν* ABKLP
 ch iii 20. *ἡ περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ.* 10 δ ν πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ f g h j k
 u John i. 7, 8, 15, ii 25 and passim. John only. v John ii. 11, and usually. this ep., these three times only. m o 13

rec (for 2nd οτι) ἦν, with KL[P] rel arm Thl Ec: txt ABX 13 vulg coptt Cyr, Aug Bede.

as He is there: His only-begotten Son hath declared Him to us on earth, where all testimony affecting us must be borne. Is it a testimony to angels? Possibly: but quid ad rem? And then, again, what but an unworthy play on words can it be called, to adduce the *ἐν εἰσιν* on the one side, the essential unity of the ever blessed Godhead, and on the other the *εἰς τὸ ἐν εἰσιν*, the concurrence in testifying to one fact,—as correspondent to one another? Does not this betray itself as the fancy of a patristic gloss, in the days when such analogies and comparisons were the sport of every theological writer? And 2) the very words betray themselves. *δ πατήρ* and *δ λόγος* are never combined by St. John, but always *δ πατήρ* and *δ υἱός*. The very apology of Bengel, "*Verbi appellatio egregie convenit cum testimonio*," may serve to shew how utterly weak he must have felt the cause to be.

The best conclusion to the whole subject is found in the remark of Bengel himself on another occasion (cited by Lücke here), of the practice reprobated, of which he himself furnishes here so striking an instance: "male strenuus ii se præbent in bellis Domini, qui ita animum inducunt, 'Dogmati elenchoque meo opportunus est hic textus: ergo me ipse cogam ad eum protinus pro vero habendum: eumque ipsum, et omnia quæ pro eo corradī possunt, obnixè defendam.' Atqui veritas non eget fulcris falsis, sed se sola multo melius nititur." A sketch of the principal particulars of the dispute and of the books relating to it is given in Horne's Introduction, vol. iv. pp. 355—388.

9.] An argument *a minori ad majus*, grounded on the practice of mankind, by which it is shewn that God's testimony must be by all means believed by us. If we (mankind in general: all reasonable men) receive (as we do: *εἰ* with an indic.: cf. John vii. 23, x. 35, xiii. 14. On the expression *μαρτ. λαμβάνειν*, see reff. It is, to receive with approval, to *accept*) the testimony of men (*τῶν ἀνθρ.*, generic; *τῶν μαρτ.* in any given case. No special testimony need be thought of, as touching this present case: the proposition is general), the testimony of God is greater (supply in the argument, "and therefore much more ought we to receive that." The testimony of God here spoken of is

not any particular testimony, as the prophecies concerning Christ (Bede), or the testimony of the Baptist and other eye-witnesses to Him (Wetstein, Storr), or the Prophets, the Baptist, Martyrs, and Apostles (Bengel, Episcopus, al.): it is general, as is the testimony of men with which it is compared. The particular testimony pointed at by the general proposition is introduced in the following words): for (see above at the beginning of ver. 7. Here, there is an ellipsis: "and this maxim applies in the case before us, because"), the testimony of God is this, that He hath borne testimony concerning His Son (i. e. the testimony of God to which the argument applies is this, the fact that He hath borne testimony to His Son: *αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅτι* . . . , as in ver. 11. The correction to the easier ἦν, as in ver. 10, gives a wrong reference for *αὕτη*, making it refer back to that mentioned in vv. 6—8, and throws back also a wrong shade of meaning over ver. 9, making "the testimony of God" there particular instead of general. The absolute sense of *μεμαρτύρηκεν* is found in the Gospel, i. 32, xiii 21, xix. 35: see also vv. 6, 7 above).

10—12.] The perfect *μεμαρτύρηκεν*, ver. 9, shewed that the testimony spoken of is not merely an historical one, such for instance as Matt. iii. 17, which God *ἐμαρτύρησεν*, but one abiding and present. And these verses explain to us what that testimony is. He that believeth in the Son of God hath the testimony (just spoken of; *τοῦ θεοῦ*, as the gloss adds: see var. readd.) in him (i. e. in himself. The two readings do not differ in sense. The object of the divine testimony being, to produce faith in Christ, the Apostle takes him in whom it has wrought this its effect, one who habitually believes in the Son of God, and says of such an one that he possesses the testimony in himself. What it is, he does not plainly say till below, ver. 11. But easily enough here we can synthetically put together and conjecture of what testimony it is that he is speaking: the Spirit by whom we are born again to eternal Life, the water of baptism by which the new birth is brought to pass in us by the power of the Holy Ghost (John iii. 5, Tit. iii. 5), the Blood of Jesus by which we have reconciliation with God, and purification from our sins (ch. i. 7, ii. 2), and

θεοῦ ὃ ἔχει τὴν μαρτυρίαν ὃ ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ μὴ ἰσχυρεῖται πιστεῦσαι τὸν θεὸν ὃ ψεύσθηται ὃ πεποίηκεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐ πειπίστευκεν εἰς τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἣν μεμαρτύρηκεν ὁ θεὸς περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ. 11 καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία, ὅτι ὁ ζῶν αἰώνιον ἔδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεός, καὶ αὕτη ἡ βῶν ἐν τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. 12 ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν ὁ μὴ

w see John v. 38.
x of the Father, John v. 24.
Gal. ii. 6 (from Gen. xv. 6) al.
ych. i. 10 (ref.)
z John v. 32.
Rev. i. 2 only
a John x. 25.
x. ii. 2.
b John i. 4. v. 26.

c = ch. ii. 23 bis. 2 John 9. Rev. ii. 25. iii. 11.

d John v. 26 bis, 40. vi. 53. x. 10. xx. 31.

10. aft μαρτυρίαν ins του θεου Α b² d 13(appy) vulg copt aeth Bede: om BKL[P]N rel syrr sah arm Cyr, Thl Ec Aug. rec εαντω, with N rel spec Cyr, Ec: txt ABKL[P] d f g j k l 36 Thl. for θεω, νιω Α b² c d k vulg syr-mg; νιω του θεου 56 sah arm; νιω αυτου aeth; Jesu Christo spec: om am: txt BKL[P]N rel syrr copt Cyr, Thl Ec Aug Vig. (13 def.) ουκ επιστευκεν and εμαρτυρηκεν(sic) N: ουκ επιστευσεν Α d 3. (13.) 43. 65.

11. ο θεος bef ημιν Β h m 38 vulg syr sah.

εστιν bef η ζωη Α.

eternal life (John vi. 53 ff.),—these three all contribute to and make up our faith in Christ, and so compose that testimony, which the Apostle designates in ver. 11 by the shorter term which comprehends them all. This is rightly maintained by Düsterd, as the exegesis: identifying the μαρτυρία here with that in ver. 11, as against numerous expositors who make the one differ from the other. It is plain that all evasive senses of ἔχει ἐν αὐτῷ, such as “recipit in se” of Socinus, Grot., Rosenmüller, are inadmissible: he that believeth not God (St. John, as so frequently, proceeds to put his proposition in the strongest light by bringing out the opposite to it.

The reading τῷ θεῷ is internally as well as externally substantiated. The participle with the dative is wholly different from the same above with εἰς τὸν υἱόν. That is the resting trust of faith: this the mere first step of giving credit to a witness. Huther well fills in τῷ θεῷ by τῷ μεμαρτυρηκότι. And thus it is tacitly assumed that one who does not believe in the Son of God, gives no credit to God Himself) hath made Him a liar (perf. because the state of discredit implies a definite rejection still continuing. On the expression, see ch. i. 10), because he hath not believed in (here, not only, hath not credited, though that was the more shameful rejection of God's word: but now the full rejection—the refusal to believe in, cast himself on God's testimony) the testimony which God hath testified concerning His Son. 11.] Wherein this testimony consists. And the testimony (just spoken of) is this, that (consists in this, namely, that . . .) God gave (not, “hath given.” This is of especial importance here, where not the endurance of a state, but the fact of the gift having been once made, is brought out. The present assurance of our possessing this gift follows

in the next clause, and in ver. 12) to us (not “decrevit,” “promisit,” as Socinus, Schlichting, Episcopius, &c.,—nor as Bede, “dedit . . . sed adhuc in terra peregrinantibus in spe, quam daturus est in cœlis ad se pervenientibus in re”) eternal life, and (ὅτι is not to be supplied, nor does this clause depend on αὕτη ἐστὶν κ.τ.λ., but it is appositional and co-ordinate with it) this life is in His Son (is, as Düsterd. quotes from Joachim Lange, in Him, οὐσιωδῶς (John i. 4, xi. 25, xiv. 6), σωματικῶς (Col. ii. 9), ἐνεργητικῶς (2 Tim. i. 10). Here again, as ever in this Epistle, we have to guard against the evasive and rationalistic interpretations of Socinus, Grotius, Schlichting, al., such as “vitæ æternæ a Deo consequendæ rationem totam inveniri in ipso Jesu” of Socinus: “in pro per,” and “est pro contingit,” of Grot.: “illa vita æterna ipsa est quam Jesus revelavit,” of the same). 12.]

Conclusion of the whole argument from ver. 6: dependent on the last clause of ver. 11, and carrying it on a step farther, even to the absolute identity as matter of possession for the believer, of the Son of God, and eternal life. He that hath the Son, hath the life: he that hath not the Son of God, the life hath he not. First notice the diction and arrangement, on which Bengel has well remarked, “Habet versus duo cola: in priore non additur Dei, nam fideles norunt Filium: in altero additur, ut demum scientinfd eles, quanti sit non habere. Priore hemistichio cum emphasi pronuntiandum est habet: in altero, vitam.” This latter furnishes a simple and beautiful example of the laws of emphasis in arrangement: ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν—τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει.

Next, the ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν must not be explained away with Grotius by “verba illa retinere quæ Pater Filio mandavit,” nor ἔχειν τὴν ζωὴν, with the same, by “jus certum habere ad

^e John 1. 12. ^c ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ^d ζωὴν οὐκ ^d ἔχει. ¹³ ταῦτα ABKLP
ⁱⁱ 23. iii. ^{ve} ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, ἵνα εἰδῆτε ὅτι ^d ζωὴν ^d ἔχετε αἰώνιον, τοῖς ^{Na b c d}
¹⁸ only see ^{ch. iii. 23.} ^{ve} πιστεύουσιν ^{ve} εἰς τὸ ^e ὄνομα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ. ¹⁴ Καὶ ^{fg h j k}
^{sch. iii. 21 (reff.).} ^{ve} ^g ch. iii. 22. ^{ve} αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ⁱ παρῆρησία ἣν ⁱ ἔχομεν ⁱ πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐάν ^{l m o 13}
^{xv. 7 al. Ps.} ^{xxi. 4.} ^h Gal. i. 4. ⁱ Pet. i. 19. ^{ti} ^g αἰτώμεθα ^h κατὰ τὸ ^h θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ¹ ἀκούει ἡμῶν.
^{see Rom. viii.} ^{27. Eph. i. 5, 11.} ^{i = John ix. 31. xi. 41.}

13. rec aft υμιν ins τοις πιστευουσιν εις το ονομα του υιου του θεου, with KL[P] rel
 Thl Ec: om ABN 13(prob) vulg syrr coptt aeth arm Cassiod Bede. ^{αιωνιον} bef
 εχετε KL[P]N rel Thl Ec: txt AB c m 36 vulg Cassiod Bede. rec (for τοις
 πιστευουσιν) και ινα πιστευητε, with KL[P] rel arm Thl Ec: οι πιστευοντες AN³ 13
 Cassiod Bede: txt BN¹. (vss uncertain.)

14. εχωμεν A. for οτι εαν τι, ο τι αν Α: οτι ο εαν 13 vulg Syr aeth: οτι εαν m.

vitam æternam." The *having the Son* is the possession of Christ by faith testified by the Spirit, the water, and the blood: and the *having the life* is the actually possessing it, not indeed in its most glorious development, but in all its reality and vitality.

Thirdly, it must be remarked that the question as to whether eternal salvation is altogether confined to those who in the fullest sense have the Son (to the exclusion, e. g., of those who have never heard of Him), does not belong here, but must be entertained on other grounds. See note on 1 Pet. iii. 19. Düsterd. has remarked that the use of *ὁ μὴ ἔχων*, not *ὁ οὐκ ἔχων* (cf. *οἱ οὐκ ἡλεσμένοι* 1 Pet. ii. 10), shews that the Apostle is contemplating, at all events primarily, rather a possible contingency than an actual fact: and thus is, primarily again, confining his saying to those to whom the divine testimony has come. To them, according as they receive or do not receive it, according as they are *οἱ ἔχοντες* or *οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες* τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, it is a savour of life unto life, or of death unto death.

13.] This verse seems, as John xx. 30 f., like an anticipatory close of the Epistle: and its terms appear to correspond to those used in ch. i. 4. This view, which is maintained by Düsterd., is far more probable than that it should refer only to what has occurred since ver. 6, as ch. ii. 26 to ver. 18 ff. there (so De Wette): or only to vv. 11, 12, as Huther. Still less likely is it that the concluding portion of the Epistle *begins* with this verse, as Bengel, Baumg.-Crus., Lücke, Sander, and Tischendorf in his editions. These things wrote I to you that ye may know that ye have eternal life, (to you) that believe in the name of the Son of God (as to the reading, I believe the text, which is found in BN¹ only, to be the "fons lectionum." The unusual position of the dative seeming hard, it was altered to the nominative as in A al., or transposed with

its accompanying words, to follow *ὁ μὴ*. Then the final clause, not having been struck out, was adapted to the preceding *ἵνα εἰδῆτε*, or to John xx. 31, from whence came the reading (see Tischdf.) *πιστεύσητε*. The two readings come, in the sense, to much the same. If the rec. be followed, then the *πιστεύητε* must be interpreted "continue to believe". 14—21.] CLOSE OF THE EPISTLE. The link which binds this passage to ver. 13 is the *παρῆρησία*, taken up again from the *εἰδῆτε* *ὅτι* of that verse. This *παρῆρησία* is the very energizing of our spiritual life: and its most notable and ordinary exercise is in communion with God in prayer, for ourselves or for our brethren, vv. 14—17. Then vv. 18—20 continue the explanation of the "sin unto death," and the "sin not unto death," by setting forth the state of believers as contrasted with that of the world, and the truth of our eternal life as consisting in this. Then with a pregnant caution, ver. 21, the Apostle closes his Epistle.

14, 15.] *The believer's confidence as shewn in prayer.* And the confidence which we have towards Him (which follows as a matter of immediate inference from the fact of our spiritual life: see ch. iii. 19—21) is this, that if we ask any thing according to His will, He heareth us (this confidence may be shewn in various ways, including prayer as one, ch. iii. 22. And that one, of prayer, is alone chosen to be insisted on here. As regards the construction, there is no ellipsis between *ἡ παρ.* and *ὅτι*; "our confidence is this, (the confidence) that . . .," as some, e. g. Lücke, have thought. *ἡ παρῆρησία* is itself subjective, the feeling of confidence.

αὐτόν and *τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ* must by all analogy be referred to the Father, not to the Son, by whom we have access to the Father. See especially ch. iii. 21, 22.

The truth that God hears (*ἀκούει*, as in reff.) all our prayers, has been explained on ch. iii. 22. The condition here

15 καὶ ^k ἐὰν οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὁ ἄν ^ε αἰτώμεθα, ^{k w ind.,}
οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ ^{hn} αἰτήματα ἃ ^{gmn} ᾗτήκαμεν ⁿ παρ' ^{1 Thess. iii. 8.}
αὐτοῦ. 16 ἐὰν τις ἴδῃ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ ^{su} ὁ ἁμαρτάνοντα ^{εἰαν συ}
^{ῆσθα, Job}
^{xiii. 3. see}
^{Winer, edn.}
^{6, 7 at 2.}
^{1 Luke xxii.}
^{24. Phil. iv.}
^{6 only.}
^{m 1 Kings i.}
^{17. 3 Kings}
^{Exod. m. 22.}
^{2 Pet. i. 3.}
^{iii. 5. Dan. vi. 7 Theod.}
^{o here only. Exod. xxxii. 30.}
^{q see James i. 15, 20.}
^{r = ver. 11.}
^{n John iv. 9. Acts iii. 2. ix 2 James i. 5.}
^{p = John xi. 4. Luke xiv. 32. xix. 42. 2 Pet. i. 3.}

15. for εἰαν, *av* B: om vulg Did-int. AN¹ 19. 96 pass (*by homœotel*) from *ἡμων*
at end of last ver to *o av aiv.* in this: for οἶδαμεν, *ιδωμεν* N³ copt. for *av, εἰαν*
L[P]N³ a c d f g h k l 3. 36. 43. 66 Thl. (not B.) for *εχομεν, εαν εχωμεν* N¹(N³
disapproving *εαν*). for *παρ', απ B* N³ 13.

16. for ἴδῃ, *ειδῃ* 13 vulg lat-ff. *αιτησεις* and *δωσεις* N¹(but corrd). ins *μη*
bef αμαρτανουσιν and *αμαρτιαν* *bef μη πρ. θαν.* A.

attached, that the request be *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ*, is in fact no limitation within the reality of the Christian life, i.e. in St. John's way of speaking according to the true ideal. For God's will is that to which our glorious Head himself submitted himself, and which rules the whole course of the Christian life for our good and His glory: and he who in prayer or otherwise tends against God's will is thereby, and in so far, transgressing the bounds of his life in God: see James iv. 3. By the continual feeling of submission to His will, joined with continual increase in knowledge of that will, our prayers will be both chastened, and directed aright. If we knew His will thoroughly, and submitted to it heartily, it would be impossible for us to ask any thing, for the spirit or for the body, which He should not hear and perform. And it is this ideal state, as always, which the Apostle has in view. In this view he goes still farther in the next verse).

15.] And if we know that He heareth us whatsoever we ask (= our every petition: the condition, *κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ*, is omitted this time as being supposed to be fulfilled), we know that we have the petitions (τὰ αἰτήματα, 'res petitas,' as Huther from Lorinus) which we have asked from Him (notice the pres. *ἔχομεν* with the perf. *ᾗτήκαμεν*. The perf. reaches through all our past prayers to this moment. All these we *ἔχομεν*: not one of them is lost: He has heard, He has answered them all: we know that we have them in the truest sense, in possession. If the perf. were pres., *αἰτούμεθα*, the assertion *ἔχομεν* would be merely of habit, on each occasion: as it is, it is of the present possession of all past requests.

The *παρ' αὐτοῦ* belongs, by the arrangement of the words, to *ᾗτήκαμεν*, not to *ἔχομεν*, as Huther). 16, 17.] Join together the confidence concerning prayer

just expressed, and the all-essential Christian principle of brotherly love, and we have following, as matter of course, the duty, and the practice, of intercession for an erring brother. And of this, with a certain not strictly defined limitation, these verses treat. If any man see (on any occasion, *av*. "shall have seen") his brother (as throughout the Epistle, to be taken in the stricter sense: not "*proximus quicumque*," as Calov., but his Christian brother, one born of God as he is himself) sinning (Düsterd. remarks, that the present part. is not merely predicative, as would be the infin. *ἁμαρτάνειν*, but more graphic, as describing the 'brother' actually in the act and under the bondage of the sin in question) a sin not unto death (see below), he shall ask (the future conveys not merely a permission, "licebit," but a command, taking for granted the thing enjoined as that which is to happen), and shall give him life (*viz.* the *asker* shall give: not, as Beza, Piscator, Socinus, Grot., Benson, Bengel, Lücke, Sander, al., God shall give, though of course this is so in reality: but the words mean, he, interceding for his brother, shall be the means of bestowing life on him: "rogans vivificabit," as the æthiopic version. The vulg. evades it by "*dabitur ei vita*." This bestowal of life by intercessory prayer, is not to be minutely enquired into, whether it is to be accompanied with "*correctio fraterna*,"—whether it consists in the giving to the sinner a repentant heart (Grot., al.), but taken as put by the Apostle, in all its simplicity and breadth. *Life*, *viz.* the restoration of that divine life from which by any act of sin he was in peril and indeed in process of falling, but his sin was not an actual fall) for them that sin not unto death (the clause takes up and emphatically repeats the hypothesis before made,

s so John xvi. 26, xvii. 9
 bis Luke 1v. 38. Isa. xiv. 11.
 t John, vii. 19 ch. i. 9 only. Luke xixi. 27 al. Job xxxvi. 10.

ἁμαρτία^p πρὸς θάνατον οὐ^s περὶ ἐκείνης λέγω ἵνα
 ἐρωτήσῃ¹⁷ πᾶσα^t ἀδικία ἁμαρτία ἐστίν, καὶ ἐστὶν

ABKLP
 Na b c d
 f g h j k
 l m o 13

ins τις bef ἐρωτήσῃ·d 36. 43 Orig Tert₂; aft ἐρ. add τις vulg(not fuld lux tol) Syr
 Clem: ἐρωτήσης N³.

viz., that the sin of the brother is not unto death. It does so in the plural, because the αὐτῷ before being indefinite, all such cases are now categorically collected: q. d. "shall give this life, I repeat, to those who sin not unto death"). There is a sin unto death: concerning it I do not say that he should make request (leaving for the present the great question, I will touch the minor points in this verse. First, it necessarily by the conditions of the context involves what is equivalent to a prohibition. This has been denied by many Commentators, "Ora si velis, sed sub dubio impetrandi," says Corn.-a-lap. And it is equally denied, without the same implied meaning being given, by Socin., Schlichting, Grot., Carpov., Neander, Lücke, De Wette, Huther: some of these, as Neander, thinking it implied, that prayer may be made, though the obtaining of it will be difficult,—others, as De Wette, that it will be in vain, others as Huther, that St. John simply says such a case was not within his view in making the above command. And most of even those who have recognized the prohibition, strive to soften it, saying, as e. g. Lyra, that though "non est orandum pro damnatis," yet we may pray for such a sinner, "ut minus peccaret et per consequens minus damnaretur in inferno:" or as Bengel, "Deus non vult ut pii frustra orent, Deut. iii. 26. Si ergo qui peccatum ad mortem commisit ad vitam reducit, id ex mero provenit reservato divino." Calvin indeed holds fast the prohibition in all its strictness, but only in extreme cases: adding, "Sed quia rarissime hoc accidit, et Deus, immensas gratiæ suæ divitias commendans, nos suo exemplo misericordes esse jubet: non temere in quemquam ferendum est mortis æternæ iudicium, potius nos caritas ad bene sperandum flectat. Quod si desperata quorundam impietas non secus nobis apparet, ac si Dominus eam digito monstraret, non est quod certemus cum justo Dei iudicio, vel clementiores eo esse appetamus." Certainly this seems, reserving the question as to the nature of the sin, the right view of the οὐ λέγω. By an express command in the other case, and then as express an exclusion of this case from that command, nothing short of an implied prohibition can be conveyed.

The second point here relates to the difference between αἰτεῖν and ἐρωτᾶν. The first is *petere*, the second *rogare*: as in Cicero, Planc. x. 25, "Neque enim ego sic rogabam ut petere viderer, quia familiaris esset meus." Cf. Trench, N. T. Synonyms, pp. 140—143, edn. 1865. αἰτεῖν is more of the petition of the inferior: "in victum quasi et reum convenit," as Bengel: ἐρωτᾶν is more general, of the request of the equal, or of one who has a right. Our Lord never uses αἰτεῖν or αἰτεῖσθαι of His own requests to God, but always ἐρωτᾶν, John xiv. 16, xvi. 26, xvii. 9, 15, 20. It is true, Martha says, ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεόν, δώσει σοι ὁ θεός, John xi. 22, but it was in ignorance, though in simplicity of faith, see Bengel in loc.: Trench, p. 142: and my note, Vol. I. And this difference is of importance here. The αἰτεῖν for a sin not unto death is a humble and trusting petition in the direction of God's will, and prompted by brotherly love: the other, the ἐρωτᾶν for a sin unto death, would be, it is implied, an act savouring of presumption—a prescribing to God, in a matter which lies out of the bounds of our brotherly yearning (for notice, the hypothesis that a man sees a brother sin a sin unto death is not adduced in words, because such a sinner would not truly be a brother, but thereby demonstrated never to have deserved that name: see ch. ii. 19), how He shall inflict and withhold His righteous judgments.

And these latter considerations bring us close to the question as to the nature of the sin unto death. It would be impossible to enumerate or even classify the opinions which have been given on the subject. Dusterdieck has devoted many pages to such a classification and discussion. I can do no more than point out the canons of interpretation, and some of the principal divergences. But before doing so, ver. 17 must come under consideration. 17] All unrighteousness is sin (in the words πᾶσα ἀδικία we have a reminiscence of ch. i. 9, ἐὰν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, πιστὸς ἐστὶν καὶ δικαίος, ἵνα ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας καὶ καθάρσιον ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας, and also, but not so directly, of ch. iii. 4, which is virtually the converse proposition to this. Here the Apostle seems to say, in explanation of what he has just written,

ἁμαρτία οὐ ᾠ πρὸς θάνατον. 18 οἶδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ᾠ γε- u ch. iv. 7 reff.

17. om ov 13. 67¹ vulg syr sah æth-rom arm Tert(teste Wist). (Simly d in ver 16 has την for 1st μη.)

"SIN is a large word, comprehending all unrighteousness whatever: whether of God's children, or of aliens from Him." The thoughts which have been brought into these words,—that ἀδικία is a mild word, meant to express that every slight trip of the good Christian falls under the category of sin, and so there may be a sin not unto death,—or, on the other hand, that it is a strong word, as Grot., "ἀδικίαν vocat non quamvis ignorantiam aut obreptionem subitam, sed quicquid peccatur aut cum deliberatione aut dato ad deliberationem spatio,"—or thirdly, as Beza, that "peccata omnia hactenus paria sunt, ut vel minima minimi peccati cogitatio mortem æternam millies mereatur . . ." and "omnia per se lethalia esse peccata,"—are equally far from the meaning of the words, whose import is, as above, to account for there being a sin not unto death as well as a sin unto death); and there is a sin not (in this case not μή, because no hypothetical case is put, nor one dependent on judgment, but an objective fact) unto death (not having death for its issue: within the limit of that ἀδικία, from all of which God cleanseth all those who confess their sins, ch. i. 9).

Our first canon of interpretation of the ἁμαρτία πρὸς θάνατον and οὐ πρὸς θάνατον is this: that the θάνατος and the ζωή of the passage must correspond. The former cannot be bodily death, while the latter is eternal and spiritual life. This clears away at once all those Commentators who understand the sin unto death to be one for which bodily death is the punishment, either by human law generally, as Morus and G. Lange, or by the Mosaic law, as Schöttgen,—or by sickness inflicted by God, as our Whitby and Benson; or of which there will be no end till the death of the sinner, which Bede thinks possible ("Potest etiam peccatum ad mortem, p. usque ad mortem, accipi." But he rejects this himself), and Lyra adopts. This last is evidently absurd, for how is a man to know whether this will be so or not?

Our second canon will be, that this sin unto death being thus a sin leading to eternal death, being no further explained to the readers here, must be presumed as meant to be understood by what the Evangelist has elsewhere laid down concerning the possession of life and death. Now we have from him a definition immediately

preceding this, in ver. 12, ὁ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει τὴν ζωὴν· ὁ μὴ ἔχων τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν ζωὴν οὐκ ἔχει. And we may safely say that the words πρὸς θάνατον here are to be understood as meaning, "involving the loss of this life which men have only by union with the Son of God." And this meaning they must have, not by implication only, which would be the case if any obstinate and determined sin were meant, which would be a sign of the fact of severance from the life which is in Christ (see ch. iii. 14, 15, where the inference is of this kind), but directly and essentially, i. e. in respect of that very sin which is pointed at by them. Now against this canon are all those interpretations, far too numerous to mention, which make any atrocious and obstinate sin to be that intended. It is obvious that our limits are thus confined to abnegation of Christ, not as inferred by its fruits otherwise shewn, but as the act of sin itself. And so, with various shades of difference as to the putting forth in detail, most of the best Commentators, both ancient and modern: e. g. Aretius, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Piscator, Corn.-a-lap., Tirinus, Baumg.-Crus., Lücke, Huther, Düsterd.

Our third canon will help us to decide, within the above limits, what especial sin is intended. And it is, that by the very analogy of the context, it must be not a state of sin, but an appreciable ACT of sin, seeing that that which is opposed to it in the same kind, as being not unto death, is described by ἐάν τις ἴδῃ ἁμαρτανοντα. So that all interpretations which make it to be a state of apostasy,—all such as, e. g. Bengel's "peccatum ad mortem est peccatum non obivum, neque subitum, sed talis status animæ in quo fides et amor et spes, in summa, vita nova, extincta est,"—do not reach the matter of detail which is before the Apostle's mind.

In enquiring what this is, we must be guided by the analogy of what St. John says elsewhere. Our state being that of life in Jesus Christ, there are those who have gone out from us, not being of us, ch. ii. 19, who are called ἀντίχριστοι, who not only "have not" Christ, but are Christ's enemies, denying the Father and the Son (ii. 22), whom we are not even to receive into our houses nor to greet (2 John 10, 11). These seem to be the persons pointed at here, and this the sin: viz. the denial that Jesus is the Christ the

ν. John xii. 11, 12, 15. γεννημένος ἡ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει· ἀλλ' ὁ ἡ γεν- ABKLP
 1 Tim. v. 22. νηθεὶς ἡ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ τῆρεϊ αὐτόν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς οὐχ
 Jude 21. Rev. iii. 10. Prov. xvi. 17. w ch. ii. 13 reff. 8 a b c d e f g h j k l m o 13

18. ἀλλα B (sic: see table at end of prolegg) Orig. rec εαυτον, with KL[P]N
 rel Orig: txt A (ε written over the line by origl scribe) B vulg Jer.

incarnate Son of God. This alone of all sins bears upon it the stamp of severance from Him who is the Life itself. As the confession of Christ, with the mouth and in the heart, is salvation unto life (Rom. x. 9), so denial of Christ with the mouth and in the heart, is sin unto death. This alone of all the proposed solutions seems to satisfy all the canons above laid down. For in it, the life cast away and the death incurred strictly correspond: it strictly corresponds to what St. John has elsewhere said concerning life and death, and derives its explanation from those other passages, especially from the foregoing ver. 12: and it is an appreciable act of sin, one against which the readers have been before repeatedly cautioned (ch. ii. 18 ff., iv. 1 ff., vv. 5, 11, 12). And further, it is in exact accordance with other passages of Scripture which seem to point at a sin similarly distinguished above others; viz. Matt. xii. 31 ff., and, so far as the circumstances there dealt with allow common ground, with the more ethical passages, Heb. vi. 4 ff., x. 25 ff. In the former case, the Scribes and Pharisees were resisting the Holy Ghost (Acts vii. 51) who was manifesting God in the flesh in the Person and work of Christ. For them the Lord Himself does not pray (Luke xxiii. 34): they knew what they did: they went out from God's people and were not of them: receiving and repudiating the testimony of the Holy Ghost to the Messiahship of Jesus.

18—20.] *Three solemn maxims* of the Epistle regarding sin, and the children of God and the world, and our eternal life in Christ, are repeated as a *close* of the teaching of the Apostle. Ver. 18 seems to be not without reference to what has just been said concerning sin. In actual life, even our brethren, even we ourselves, born of God, shall sin, not unto death, and require brotherly intercession: but in the depth and truth of the Christian life, sin is altogether absent. It is the world, not knowing God, which lies under the power of the wicked one: God's new-begotten children he cannot touch: they are in and they know the True One, and in Him have eternal life. These maxims are introduced with a thrice-repeated *οἶδαμεν*, the expression of full persuasion and free confidence. They form a triumphant repetition of and anticipation of the attain-

ment of the purpose expressed in ver. 13, *ἵνα εἰδῇτε ὅτι ζωὴν ἔχετε αἰώνιον*.

18.] We know that every one who is born of God, sinneth not (see on ch. iii. 9, from which place our words are almost repeated. As explained there and in our summary of these verses there is no real inconsistency with what has been just said. And that there is none the second member of the verse shews): but he that hath been born of God (*γεννηθείς*, aor. this time. The perf. part. expresses more the enduring abidance of his heavenly birth, and fits better the habitual *οὐχ ἁμαρτάνει*: the aor. part., calling attention to the historical fact of his having been born of God, fits better the fact that the wicked one toucheth him not, that divine birth having severed his connexion with the prince of this world and of evil. So Düsterd. and Huther. See also the construction according to the true reading below. Sander, in apparent ignorance of the force of the tenses, has curiously taken them exactly vice versa: and Bengel has failed to hit the difference when he says, "Præteritum grandius quiddam sonat quam Aoristus: non modo qui magnum in regeneratione gradum assecutus, sed quilibet qui regenitus est, servat se." The distinction is ingenious, but is not contained in the tenses) it keepeth him ("it," viz. the divine birth, pointed at in the aor. part. *γεννηθείς*. So the vulg., but omitting the pendent nom., "sed generatio Dei conservat eum." It is this, and not the fact of his own watchfulness, which preserves him from the touch of the wicked one: as in ch. iii. 9, where the same is imported by *ὅτι σπέρμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει*, κ. οὐ δύναται ἁμαρτάνειν, *ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*. The rationalistic Commentators insist on *τῆρεϊ αὐτόν*, as shewing, as Socinus, "aliquid præstare eum atque efficere, qui per Christum regeneratus fuerit:" and the orthodox Commentators have but a lame apology to offer. Düsterd. compares *ἀγνίσει αὐτόν* ch. iii. 3. But the reference there is wholly different—viz. to a gradual and earnest striving after an ideal model; whereas here the *τῆρεῖσθαι* must be, by the very nature of the case, so far complete, that the wicked one cannot approach: and whose self-guarding can ensure this even for a day? Cf. John xvii. 15, *ἵνα*

^x ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ. ¹⁹ οἶδαμεν ὅτι ^y ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ^z ἔσμεν, καὶ ὁ ^{x = Job i. 12. Wisd. xviii. 20.} κόσμος ὅλος ^z ἐν ^w τῷ πονηρῷ ^z κεῖται. ²⁰ οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι ^{y ch ii 16 reff. z constr. here only. 2 Mace. iii 11.} ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ^a ἦκει, καὶ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ^b διάνοιαν ^c ἵνα
^{a = John viii 42. Heb. x. 7 (from Ps. xxxix. 7.). c w. pres ind., 1 Cor. ix. 6. Gal. ix. 17 but see notes on these places. Tit. ii. 4. (John xvii. 3. 1 Thess. iv. 13 v. 1.) b = Eph. iv 18. 1 Pet. i. 13 al. Prov. ix 10.}

20. for οἶδαμεν δε, και οιδ. A a d 13. 36 vulg spec syrr sah arm Did Ps-Ath Cyr : οἶδαμεν (alone) L[P] j æth Cyr Did-int: txt BKN rel copt Thl Œc. for δεδ., εδωκ. A a c 13 Did Cyr Ps-Ath.

τηρήσης αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, which is decisive. There is a possible construction of the clause which I do not remember to have seen suggested, but which should hardly be left out of account. *ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ* might be taken as meaning the Son of God: "He that was begotten of God keepeth him." But this would hardly suit the analogy of the Epistle: see e.g. ver. 1 and note), and the wicked one (Satan: see reff. and notes) doth not touch him (Düster. approves of Calvin's paraphrase, which is self-condemnatory—"continet se in Dei timore, nec se ita abripi patitur, ut extincto pietatis sensu diabolo et carni totum se permittat"—as the meaning of *ὁ πον. οὐχ ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ*. Of course the words must not be understood as saying that he is not tried with temptation by the evil one: but imply that as the Prince of this world had nothing in our blessed Lord, even so on His faithful ones who live by His life, the Tempter has no point d'appui, by virtue of that their *γέννησις* by which they are as He is. "Malignus appropinquat," says Bengel, "ut musca lychnum, sed non nocet, ne tangit quidem").

19] Application of that which is said ver. 18, to the Apostle and his readers: and that, in entire separation from *ὁ πονηρός*, the ruling spirit of this present world. We know (see summary above) that we (not emphatic: no *ἡμεῖς* as set over against *ὁ κόσμος*). It is not the object now to bring out a contrast, but to reassert solemnly these great axioms of the Christian life) are of God (i.e. born of God: identifying us with those spoken of ver. 18), and the whole world lieth in the wicked one (this second member of the sentence does not depend on the preceding *ἔτι*, but like those of vv. 18, 20, is an independent proposition. *τῷ πονηρῷ*, by the analogy of St. John's diction, is masculine, not neuter, as Lyra ("in maligno. i.e. in malo igne concupiscentiæ"), Socinus, Schlichting, Episcopius ("in peccandi consuetudine tenetur"), Grotius (but with an allusion to *ὁ πονηρός*), al., and E. V. ("lieth in wickedness"). This neuter sense can hardly stand after comparing ch. ii. 13, 14, iii. 8, 10, 14, iv. 4:

John xvii. 14 f., and above all after the preceding verse here. For *κεῖσθαι ἐν* in this sense, there is, as in reff., no other example. That in Polybius, vi. 14. 6, *ἐν τῇ συγκλήτῳ κεῖται*, "lies in the power or determination of the Senate," is an approximation, but not quite the same sense. *θεῶν ἐν γούνασι κεῖται*, so common in Homer, is another. The idea *in the power of*, and the local idea, seem to be combined. *ὁ πονηρός* is as it were the inclusive abiding-place and representative of all his, as, in the expressions *ἐν κυρίῳ*, *ἐν χριστῷ*, *ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, *ἐσμεν ἐν τῷ ἀληθινῷ*, ver. 20, the Lord is of His. And while we are *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ*, implying a birth and a proceeding forth and a change of state, the *κόσμος*, all the rest of mankind, *κεῖται ἐν τ. π.*, remains where it was, in, and in the power of, *ὁ πονηρός*. Some Commentators have been anxious to avoid inconsistency with such passages as ch. ii. 2, iv. 14, and would therefore give *κόσμος* a different meaning here. But there is no inconsistency whatever. Had not Christ become a propitiation for the sins of the whole world, were He not the Saviour of the whole world, none could ever come out of the world and believe on Him; but as it is, they who do believe on Him, come out and are separated from the world: so that our proposition here remains strictly true: the *κόσμος* is the negation of faith in Him, and as such lies in the wicked one, His adversary).

20.] Yet another οἶδαμεν: and that in general, as summing up all, the certainty to us of the Son of God having come, and having given us the knowledge of God, and of our being in Him: and the formal inclusion, in this one fact, of knowledge of the true God here, and life everlasting hereafter. Moreover (δέ closes off and sums up all: cf. 1 Thess. v. 23; 2 Thess. iii. 16; Heb. xii. 20, 22, al. fr. This not being seen, it has been altered to *και*, as there appeared to be no contrast with the preceding) we know that the Son of God is come (the incarnation, and work, and abiding presence of the Son of God, is to us a living fact. HE IS HERE—all is full of Him—*διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν καὶ φωνεῖ*

d 1 Thess i. 9. *γινώσκουμεν τὸν ἄλῃθινόν, καὶ ἐσμὲν ἐν τῷ ἄλῃθινῳ*, ABKLP
 e so Luke i. 32. Acts ix. 20, 22. *ἐν τῷ νύῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄλῃ-* ABKLP
 f John xvii. 3. see note. *ἐν τῷ νύῳ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄλῃ-* Na b c d
 i m o 13

rec *γινώσκουμεν*, with B²K rel Thl: txt AB¹L[P]² N c g¹ Cyr. for *τον, το* N¹.

aft *αλῃθινον* ins *θεον* A a d 13. 40-3. 65-6² vulg copt (æth) arm-usc Ath₂ Cyr₂

Did Bas Aug Pel. for *εσμεν, ωμεν* 34 vulg spec arm-usc Hil. *ησ. χρ. bef*

τω νω αωτου 162 am(with harl) Leo: om *ησ. χρ.* A vulg: txt BKL[P]² N rel demid
 (and tol) vss Ath_{smpe} Cyr Did Thl Ec Hil Faustin Aug Jer.—N¹ has *χῡ* by mistake

σε), and hath given (the subject to *δέδωκεν* is *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ*, not, as Bengel, "Deus" understood. It is the Son of God who is to us the bestower of this knowledge, see ver. 13: it is He who is here at the end of the Epistle made prominent, as it is He who is to us eternal life, and he who hath Him hath the Father) to us (an) understanding (*διάνοια*, the divinely empowered inner sense by which we judge of things divine: see Beck, *Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre*, p. 58. It is not the wisdom or judgment *itself*, but the faculty capable of attaining to it. Compare John i. 12, 13, xvii. 2 f., 6 f., 25 f.; 2 Cor. iv. 6; Eph. i. 18) that we know (with the indic. as in the other places where it occurs, or seems to occur, in the N. T., *ἵνα* must bear a sort of pregnant sense, of a purpose accomplished or at least secured. See note on *ἵνα* with the future indicative Gal. ii. 4, and cf. Rev. iii. 9, vi. 4, xiii. 12, xiv. 13, and for the present indicative, ref.: and see the whole discussed and examples given from later Greek writers, in Winer, edn. 6, § 41, b. 1. b, c) the true One (i. e. God: cf. John xvii. 3, *ἵνα γινώσκωσιν* (*-ουσιν* al.) *σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινόν θεόν*). The adjective *ἀληθινόν* is not subjective, = *ἀληθῆ*, but objective, in its usual sense of genuine, in distinction from every 'deus fictitiuus.' So Calvin: "verum Deum intelligit non veracem, sed cum qui revera Deus est eum ab idolis omnibus discernat. Ita verus fictitio opponitur." And thus the way is prepared for the warning against all false gods, ver. 21): and we are (again, as in vv. 18, 19, this second member is an independent proposition, not dependent on the *ὅτι* nor on the *ἵνα* as in the vulgate, "et simus . . .") in (see above on *καίτοι ἐν*, ver. 19) the true One (viz. God, as above), in His Son Jesus Christ (i. e. by virtue of our being in His Son Jesus Christ: this second *ἐν* is not in apposition with, but as *αὐτοῦ* shews, is expegetical of the former). This (viz. God, the Father: the *ὁ ἀληθινός*, who has been twice spoken of: see below) is the true God, and eternal life. There has been great controversy, carried on principally from doctrinal interests, respecting the

reference of this *οὗτος*: whether it is to be understood as above, or of *ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς χριστός*, just mentioned. The Fathers who were engaged against Arian error, and most of the orthodox expositors since, regarding the passage as a precious testimony for the Godhead of the Son, have maintained this latter view, rather doctrinally than exegetically. To this list belong Bede, Lyra, a-Lapide, Tirinus, Barthol.-Petrus (the continuator of Eusebius), Mayer, Luther, Calvin, Beza, Aretius, Piscator, Erasm.-Schmidt, Seb.-Schmidt, Spener, Whitby, Calov., Wolf, Joach. Lange, Bengel, Sander, Stier: and even Episcopus takes this view, not being able, says Düsterd., to bear the caprice and tortuousness of the Socinian exegesis. The opposite doctrinal interest has led many of those who deny this application: e. g. Schlichting (who combats the other view simply by abusing the Trinitarians), Socinus, Grotius, Benson, Samuel Clarke, Semler, which last takes *οὗτος* in as far as it belongs to *ἀληθ. θεός* as referring to the Father, in as far as to *ζῶῃ αἰώνιος*, to the Son. To these have succeeded another set of expositors with whom not doctrinal but exegetical considerations have been paramount: e. g. Wetstein, Lücke, De Wette, Rickli, Baumg.-Crusius, Neander, Huther, Hofmann (Schriftb. i. 128), Düsterdieck, Erdmann.

The grounds on which the application to Christ is rested are mainly the following: 1) that *οὗτος* most naturally refers to the last-mentioned substantive: 2) that *ζῶῃ αἰώνιος*, as a predicate, more naturally belongs to the Son than to the Father: 3) that the sentence, if understood of God the Father, would be aimless and tautological. But to these it has been well and decisively answered by Lücke and Düsterd., 1) that *οὗτος* more than once in St. John belongs not to the nearest substantive, but to the principal one in the foregoing sentence, e. g. in ch. ii. 22 and in 2 John 7: and that the subject of the whole here has been the Father, who is the *ὁ ἀληθινός* of the last verse, and the Son is referred back to Him as *ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ*, thereby keeping *Him*, as the primary subject, before the mind. 2) that as little can *ζῶῃ αἰώνιος*

θινὸς [†]θεὸς καὶ [†]ζωὴ [†]αἰώνιος. 21 ε Τεκνία, ^h φυλάξατε
ⁱ ἐαυτοὺς ^h ἀπὸ τῶν ^k εἰδώλων.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΤ Α.

3. 2 John 8. Jude 20, 21 al.

k 1 Thess. i 9 al. fr. Exod. xx. 4. cf. 1 Cor. viii. 10 al.

for χῶ. recs in η bef ζωη, with a n 36. 40 arm Ath₂ Thl : η ζωη η L[P] rel : ζωη η K a b² Ath₃ Cyr Antch : txt ABN¹ b¹ d j o 13 Cyr₁ Did₃ Ath₄ Euthal.

21. εαυτα BLN¹ c m : txt AK[P]N³ rel Thl (Ec, αυτοις a. rec at end ins αμην, with KL[P] rel : om ABN d 13 am (with demid tol) syrr coptt arm aeth.

SUBSCRIPTION. elz om, with a b c d g k l m o 13 : απο αφεσου f : τελος της α ιωαννου επιστολης ητις γραφη απο εφεσου j : Steph ιω. επιστ. καθολικη πρωτη εγραφη εν στιχοις σογ' (with K ?) : ιω. ευαγγελιστου επ. α' [137(Sz)] : του αγιου και πανευφημου αποστολου ιω. και θεολογου επιστολη καθολικη α' L : txt ABN¹, and, prefg επιστ., P].

be an actual predicate of Christ as of the Father. He is indeed ἡ ζωὴ ch. i. 2, but not ἡ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. Such an expression used predicatively, leads us to look for some expression of our Lord's, or for some meaning which does not appear on the surface to guide us. And such an expression leading to such a meaning we have in John xvii. 3, αὕτη δὲ ἐστὶν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ, ἵνα γινώσκωσιν σε τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, καὶ ὃν ἀπέστειλας Ἰησοῦν χριστόν. He is eternal life in Himself, as being the fount and origin of it : He is it to us, seeing that to know Him is to possess it. I own I cannot see, after this saying of our Lord with σὲ τὸν μόνον ἀληθινὸν θεόν, how any one can imagine that the same Apostle can have had in these words any other reference than that which is given in those : 3) this charge is altogether inaccurate. As referred to the Father, there is in it no tautology and no aimlessness. It serves to identify the δ ἀληθινός mentioned before, in a solemn manner, and leads on to the concluding warning against false gods. As in another place the Apostle intensifies the non-possession of the Son by including in it the alienation from the Father also, so here at the close of all, the ἀληθινός θεός, the fount of ζωὴ αἰώνιος, is put before us as the ultimate aim and end, to be approached ἐν τῷ νῷ αὐτοῦ, but Himself the One Father both of Him and of us who live through Him. 21.] Parting warning against idols. Little children (see reff. He parts from them with his warmest

and most affectionate word of address), keep yourselves from idols (the εἰδῶλον is properly a figure of an imaginary deity, —while an ὁμοίωμα is that of some real person or thing made into an object of worship. So in an old Etymologicum ineditum in Biel sub voce (Düsterdieck),—τὸ μὲν εἰδῶλον οὐδεμίαν ὑπόστασιν ἔχει, τὸ δὲ ὁμοίωμα τινῶν ἐστὶν ἵνδαλμα καὶ ἀπείκασμα. So Rom. i. 23, 1 Cor. x. 19, xii. 2, and especially ref. 1 Thess., where, as here, θεός (ὢν καὶ ἀληθινός) is opposed to εἰδῶλα. And there seems no justification for the departing from the plain literal sense in this place. All around the Christian Church was heathenism : the born of God and the κείμενοι ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ were the only two classes : those who went out of one, went into the other : God's children are thus then finally warned of the consequence of letting go the only true God, in whom they can only abide by abiding in His Son Jesus Christ, in these solemn terms,—to leave on their minds a wholesome terror of any the least deviation from the truth of God, seeing into what relapse it would plunge them. This is a more satisfactory view than that taken by Düsterdieck, that having so long and so much warned them against error in Christian doctrine, he could not part without also warning them against that of which they were indeed in less danger, relapse into heathenism :—and far better than that of Hammond, al., that the εἰδῶλα were the fictions of Gnostic error).

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Β.

^a 3 John 1. ¹ Ὁ ^a πρεσβύτερος ^b ἐκλεκτῇ ^c κυρία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ABKLP
see 1 Pet. v. 1. Philem. 9. ^d αὐτῆς, οὗς ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ ^d ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος, ^e ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ ^e ἐγνωκότες τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ² διὰ τὴν
^b ver. 13. ^f ἀλήθειαν τὴν ^g μένουσαν ^h ἐν ἡμῖν, ⁱ καὶ ⁱ μεθ' ἡμῶν ἔσται <sup>v v. 1 to 5 m mu-
tiated.</sup>
Matt xx. 16. Luke xviii. 7. Tit. i. 1. 1 Pet. i. 1. Ps cv. 23.
c ver. 5 only. (Isa. xxiv. 2) αἱ γυναῖκες κυραὶ καλοῦνται ἀπὸ τεσσαρεςκαίδεκα ἐτών, Epictet. Enchirid c 40.
d 1 John iii. 18 reff. e John viii. 32 see 1 Tim. ii. 4. iv. 3. 2 Tim. ii. 25. iii. 7. Tit i. 1. Heb. x.
25. 1 John ii. 21. f 1 John i. 8. ii. 4. g see 1 John ii. 14 (reff.) 24. h change of constr.,
see Luke xvii. 31. 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13. Winer, edn. 6, § 63. ii. 1. i so 1 John iv. 17.

TITLE. Steph ἐπιστολὴ ἰωαννου δευτερα, with [P(β)] k 36(β): elz ιω. του απο-
στολου επιστ. καθολ. δευτ.: του αγιου αποστ. ιω. του θεολογου επιστ. δευτ. L: ιω. καθ.
επ. δευ. h: ιω. επ. καθ. δευτ. m(Treg expr. "sic fuit anno 1853"): ιω. επ. καθ. β' K l:
θειος ιω. ταδε δευ. τοις προτεροιουσιν i: in A the title is torn away: ιω. επ. β' 13: ιω. επ.
δευ. o: txt BN.

VERSE 1. for καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ, οὐκ ἐγώ δε A 73 syr-pk Thl: καὶ οὐκ ἐγώ δε L.

2. for μένουσαν, ἐνοικουσαν A, ουσαν d 13 copt. [for ἡμιν, υμιν P c j 100-4.]

1—3.] ADDRESS AND GREETING. The
elder (the Apostle, known by this name:
see prolegg. "On the writer of the
Epistle") to the (not, an: see prolegg.
"To whom the Epistle was written") elect
lady (see prolegg. *ibid.*), and to her chil-
dren whom (οὗς, masc., probably embraces
the whole, mother and children of both
sexes: see 3 John 1. Ver. 4 is no reason
why we should regard the masc. relative
as applying to sons only: when proceeding
to single out some for praise, as there, he
naturally speaks in the masculine) I love
in truth (not merely, in reality, as Ec.,
ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἐπιπλάστως ἀγαπᾶν, σόματι:
but in truth, such truth being the result,
as stated below, of the truth of the Gospel
abiding in him: "amor non modo verus
amor, sed veritate evangelica nititur."
Bengel. See 1 John iii. 18, and note on
iii. 19), and not I alone, but also all
who know the truth (there is no need
to limit this πάντες to all dwelling in or
near the abode of the Writer, as Grot.,
Carpzov., De Wette, al., or all who were

personally acquainted with those addressed,
as Lücke: it is a general expression: the
communion of love is as wide as the com-
munion of faith), on account of the truth
(objective: God's truth revealed in His
Son, see 1 John ii. 4), which abideth in
us, and shall be with us (the Apostle
continues the construction as if he had
previously written ἡ μένει) for ever (cf.
John xiv. 16, 17. These words are a re-
miniscence of our Lord's words there, παρ'
ὑμῖν μένει, καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔστί. The future
is not the expression of a wish, as some,
e.g. Lücke, have supposed; but of con-
fidence, as that also which follows, which
takes its tinge and form from this): there
shall be with us (by the ἡμῶν the Apostle
includes *himself* in the greeting, as he had
before done in the introductory clauses.
ἔσται, again, not a wish: see above: we
must of necessity connect this second ἔσται
with the first. But the very fact of a
greeting being conveyed, must somewhat
modify the absolute future sense, and in-
troduce something of the votive character.

εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ³ ἔσται ¹ μεθ' ἡμῶν ^{kl} χάρις, ^{km} ἔλεος, ^{klm} εἰ- ^k ^{1 Tim. i. 2.}
 ρήνῃ, παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ παρὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ ^{2 Tim. i. 2.}
 υἱοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς, ^d ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ ἀγάπῃ. ^{1 Rom. i. 7.}

⁴ n Ἐχάρην ⁿ λίαν ὅτι εὗρηκα ^o ἐκ τῶν τέκνων σου ^{1 Cor. i. 3.}
^P περιπατοῦντας ^P ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καθὼς ^a ἐντολὴν ^a ἐλάβωμεν ^{2 Cor. i. 2.}
¹ ^{4.} Philom. 3. ¹ Pet. i. 2. ² Pet. i. 2. ^{4.} Rev. i. 4. ^m Jude 2 only. ¹ ² ³ ⁴ ⁵ ⁶ ⁷ ⁸ ⁹ ¹⁰ ¹¹ ¹² ¹³ ¹⁴ ¹⁵ ¹⁶ ¹⁷ ¹⁸ ¹⁹ ²⁰ ²¹ ²² ²³ ²⁴ ²⁵ ²⁶ ²⁷ ²⁸ ²⁹ ³⁰ ³¹ ³² ³³ ³⁴ ³⁵ ³⁶ ³⁷ ³⁸ ³⁹ ⁴⁰ ⁴¹ ⁴² ⁴³ ⁴⁴ ⁴⁵ ⁴⁶ ⁴⁷ ⁴⁸ ⁴⁹ ⁵⁰ ⁵¹ ⁵² ⁵³ ⁵⁴ ⁵⁵ ⁵⁶ ⁵⁷ ⁵⁸ ⁵⁹ ⁶⁰ ⁶¹ ⁶² ⁶³ ⁶⁴ ⁶⁵ ⁶⁶ ⁶⁷ ⁶⁸ ⁶⁹ ⁷⁰ ⁷¹ ⁷² ⁷³ ⁷⁴ ⁷⁵ ⁷⁶ ⁷⁷ ⁷⁸ ⁷⁹ ⁸⁰ ⁸¹ ⁸² ⁸³ ⁸⁴ ⁸⁵ ⁸⁶ ⁸⁷ ⁸⁸ ⁸⁹ ⁹⁰ ⁹¹ ⁹² ⁹³ ⁹⁴ ⁹⁵ ⁹⁶ ⁹⁷ ⁹⁸ ⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰ ¹⁰¹ ¹⁰² ¹⁰³ ¹⁰⁴ ¹⁰⁵ ¹⁰⁶ ¹⁰⁷ ¹⁰⁸ ¹⁰⁹ ¹¹⁰ ¹¹¹ ¹¹² ¹¹³ ¹¹⁴ ¹¹⁵ ¹¹⁶ ¹¹⁷ ¹¹⁸ ¹¹⁹ ¹²⁰ ¹²¹ ¹²² ¹²³ ¹²⁴ ¹²⁵ ¹²⁶ ¹²⁷ ¹²⁸ ¹²⁹ ¹³⁰ ¹³¹ ¹³² ¹³³ ¹³⁴ ¹³⁵ ¹³⁶ ¹³⁷ ¹³⁸ ¹³⁹ ¹⁴⁰ ¹⁴¹ ¹⁴² ¹⁴³ ¹⁴⁴ ¹⁴⁵ ¹⁴⁶ ¹⁴⁷ ¹⁴⁸ ¹⁴⁹ ¹⁵⁰ ¹⁵¹ ¹⁵² ¹⁵³ ¹⁵⁴ ¹⁵⁵ ¹⁵⁶ ¹⁵⁷ ¹⁵⁸ ¹⁵⁹ ¹⁶⁰ ¹⁶¹ ¹⁶² ¹⁶³ ¹⁶⁴ ¹⁶⁵ ¹⁶⁶ ¹⁶⁷ ¹⁶⁸ ¹⁶⁹ ¹⁷⁰ ¹⁷¹ ¹⁷² ¹⁷³ ¹⁷⁴ ¹⁷⁵ ¹⁷⁶ ¹⁷⁷ ¹⁷⁸ ¹⁷⁹ ¹⁸⁰ ¹⁸¹ ¹⁸² ¹⁸³ ¹⁸⁴ ¹⁸⁵ ¹⁸⁶ ¹⁸⁷ ¹⁸⁸ ¹⁸⁹ ¹⁹⁰ ¹⁹¹ ¹⁹² ¹⁹³ ¹⁹⁴ ¹⁹⁵ ¹⁹⁶ ¹⁹⁷ ¹⁹⁸ ¹⁹⁹ ²⁰⁰ ²⁰¹ ²⁰² ²⁰³ ²⁰⁴ ²⁰⁵ ²⁰⁶ ²⁰⁷ ²⁰⁸ ²⁰⁹ ²¹⁰ ²¹¹ ²¹² ²¹³ ²¹⁴ ²¹⁵ ²¹⁶ ²¹⁷ ²¹⁸ ²¹⁹ ²²⁰ ²²¹ ²²² ²²³ ²²⁴ ²²⁵ ²²⁶ ²²⁷ ²²⁸ ²²⁹ ²³⁰ ²³¹ ²³² ²³³ ²³⁴ ²³⁵ ²³⁶ ²³⁷ ²³⁸ ²³⁹ ²⁴⁰ ²⁴¹ ²⁴² ²⁴³ ²⁴⁴ ²⁴⁵ ²⁴⁶ ²⁴⁷ ²⁴⁸ ²⁴⁹ ²⁵⁰ ²⁵¹ ²⁵² ²⁵³ ²⁵⁴ ²⁵⁵ ²⁵⁶ ²⁵⁷ ²⁵⁸ ²⁵⁹ ²⁶⁰ ²⁶¹ ²⁶² ²⁶³ ²⁶⁴ ²⁶⁵ ²⁶⁶ ²⁶⁷ ²⁶⁸ ²⁶⁹ ²⁷⁰ ²⁷¹ ²⁷² ²⁷³ ²⁷⁴ ²⁷⁵ ²⁷⁶ ²⁷⁷ ²⁷⁸ ²⁷⁹ ²⁸⁰ ²⁸¹ ²⁸² ²⁸³ ²⁸⁴ ²⁸⁵ ²⁸⁶ ²⁸⁷ ²⁸⁸ ²⁸⁹ ²⁹⁰ ²⁹¹ ²⁹² ²⁹³ ²⁹⁴ ²⁹⁵ ²⁹⁶ ²⁹⁷ ²⁹⁸ ²⁹⁹ ³⁰⁰ ³⁰¹ ³⁰² ³⁰³ ³⁰⁴ ³⁰⁵ ³⁰⁶ ³⁰⁷ ³⁰⁸ ³⁰⁹ ³¹⁰ ³¹¹ ³¹² ³¹³ ³¹⁴ ³¹⁵ ³¹⁶ ³¹⁷ ³¹⁸ ³¹⁹ ³²⁰ ³²¹ ³²² ³²³ ³²⁴ ³²⁵ ³²⁶ ³²⁷ ³²⁸ ³²⁹ ³³⁰ ³³¹ ³³² ³³³ ³³⁴ ³³⁵ ³³⁶ ³³⁷ ³³⁸ ³³⁹ ³⁴⁰ ³⁴¹ ³⁴² ³⁴³ ³⁴⁴ ³⁴⁵ ³⁴⁶ ³⁴⁷ ³⁴⁸ ³⁴⁹ ³⁵⁰ ³⁵¹ ³⁵² ³⁵³ ³⁵⁴ ³⁵⁵ ³⁵⁶ ³⁵⁷ ³⁵⁸ ³⁵⁹ ³⁶⁰ ³⁶¹ ³⁶² ³⁶³ ³⁶⁴ ³⁶⁵ ³⁶⁶ ³⁶⁷ ³⁶⁸ ³⁶⁹ ³⁷⁰ ³⁷¹ ³⁷² ³⁷³ ³⁷⁴ ³⁷⁵ ³⁷⁶ ³⁷⁷ ³⁷⁸ ³⁷⁹ ³⁸⁰ ³⁸¹ ³⁸² ³⁸³ ³⁸⁴ ³⁸⁵ ³⁸⁶ ³⁸⁷ ³⁸⁸ ³⁸⁹ ³⁹⁰ ³⁹¹ ³⁹² ³⁹³ ³⁹⁴ ³⁹⁵ ³⁹⁶ ³⁹⁷ ³⁹⁸ ³⁹⁹ ⁴⁰⁰ ⁴⁰¹ ⁴⁰² ⁴⁰³ ⁴⁰⁴ ⁴⁰⁵ ⁴⁰⁶ ⁴⁰⁷ ⁴⁰⁸ ⁴⁰⁹ ⁴¹⁰ ⁴¹¹ ⁴¹² ⁴¹³ ⁴¹⁴ ⁴¹⁵ ⁴¹⁶ ⁴¹⁷ ⁴¹⁸ ⁴¹⁹ ⁴²⁰ ⁴²¹ ⁴²² ⁴²³ ⁴²⁴ ⁴²⁵ ⁴²⁶ ⁴²⁷ ⁴²⁸ ⁴²⁹ ⁴³⁰ ⁴³¹ ⁴³² ⁴³³ ⁴³⁴ ⁴³⁵ ⁴³⁶ ⁴³⁷ ⁴³⁸ ⁴³⁹ ⁴⁴⁰ ⁴⁴¹ ⁴⁴² ⁴⁴³ ⁴⁴⁴ ⁴⁴⁵ ⁴⁴⁶ ⁴⁴⁷ ⁴⁴⁸ ⁴⁴⁹ ⁴⁵⁰ ⁴⁵¹ ⁴⁵² ⁴⁵³ ⁴⁵⁴ ⁴⁵⁵ ⁴⁵⁶ ⁴⁵⁷ ⁴⁵⁸ ⁴⁵⁹ ⁴⁶⁰ ⁴⁶¹ ⁴⁶² ⁴⁶³ ⁴⁶⁴ ⁴⁶⁵ ⁴⁶⁶ ⁴⁶⁷ ⁴⁶⁸ ⁴⁶⁹ ⁴⁷⁰ ⁴⁷¹ ⁴⁷² ⁴⁷³ ⁴⁷⁴ ⁴⁷⁵ ⁴⁷⁶ ⁴⁷⁷ ⁴⁷⁸ ⁴⁷⁹ ⁴⁸⁰ ⁴⁸¹ ⁴⁸² ⁴⁸³ ⁴⁸⁴ ⁴⁸⁵ ⁴⁸⁶ ⁴⁸⁷ ⁴⁸⁸ ⁴⁸⁹ ⁴⁹⁰ ⁴⁹¹ ⁴⁹² ⁴⁹³ ⁴⁹⁴ ⁴⁹⁵ ⁴⁹⁶ ⁴⁹⁷ ⁴⁹⁸ ⁴⁹⁹ ⁵⁰⁰ ⁵⁰¹ ⁵⁰² ⁵⁰³ ⁵⁰⁴ ⁵⁰⁵ ⁵⁰⁶ ⁵⁰⁷ ⁵⁰⁸ ⁵⁰⁹ ⁵¹⁰ ⁵¹¹ ⁵¹² ⁵¹³ ⁵¹⁴ ⁵¹⁵ ⁵¹⁶ ⁵¹⁷ ⁵¹⁸ ⁵¹⁹ ⁵²⁰ ⁵²¹ ⁵²² ⁵²³ ⁵²⁴ ⁵²⁵ ⁵²⁶ ⁵²⁷ ⁵²⁸ ⁵²⁹ ⁵³⁰ ⁵³¹ ⁵³² ⁵³³ ⁵³⁴ ⁵³⁵ ⁵³⁶ ⁵³⁷ ⁵³⁸ ⁵³⁹ ⁵⁴⁰ ⁵⁴¹ ⁵⁴² ⁵⁴³ ⁵⁴⁴ ⁵⁴⁵ ⁵⁴⁶ ⁵⁴⁷ ⁵⁴⁸ ⁵⁴⁹ ⁵⁵⁰ ⁵⁵¹ ⁵⁵² ⁵⁵³ ⁵⁵⁴ ⁵⁵⁵ ⁵⁵⁶ ⁵⁵⁷ ⁵⁵⁸ ⁵⁵⁹ ⁵⁶⁰ ⁵⁶¹ ⁵⁶² ⁵⁶³ ⁵⁶⁴ ⁵⁶⁵ ⁵⁶⁶ ⁵⁶⁷ ⁵⁶⁸ ⁵⁶⁹ ⁵⁷⁰ ⁵⁷¹ ⁵⁷² ⁵⁷³ ⁵⁷⁴ ⁵⁷⁵ ⁵⁷⁶ ⁵⁷⁷ ⁵⁷⁸ ⁵⁷⁹ ⁵⁸⁰ ⁵⁸¹ ⁵⁸² ⁵⁸³ ⁵⁸⁴ ⁵⁸⁵ ⁵⁸⁶ ⁵⁸⁷ ⁵⁸⁸ ⁵⁸⁹ ⁵⁹⁰ ⁵⁹¹ ⁵⁹² ⁵⁹³ ⁵⁹⁴ ⁵⁹⁵ ⁵⁹⁶ ⁵⁹⁷ ⁵⁹⁸ ⁵⁹⁹ ⁶⁰⁰ ⁶⁰¹ ⁶⁰² ⁶⁰³ ⁶⁰⁴ ⁶⁰⁵ ⁶⁰⁶ ⁶⁰⁷ ⁶⁰⁸ ⁶⁰⁹ ⁶¹⁰ ⁶¹¹ ⁶¹² ⁶¹³ ⁶¹⁴ ⁶¹⁵ ⁶¹⁶ ⁶¹⁷ ⁶¹⁸ ⁶¹⁹ ⁶²⁰ ⁶²¹ ⁶²² ⁶²³ ⁶²⁴ ⁶²⁵ ⁶²⁶ ⁶²⁷ ⁶²⁸ ⁶²⁹ ⁶³⁰ ⁶³¹ ⁶³² ⁶³³ ⁶³⁴ ⁶³⁵ ⁶³⁶ ⁶³⁷ ⁶³⁸ ⁶³⁹ ⁶⁴⁰ ⁶⁴¹ ⁶⁴² ⁶⁴³ ⁶⁴⁴ ⁶⁴⁵ ⁶⁴⁶ ⁶⁴⁷ ⁶⁴⁸ ⁶⁴⁹ ⁶⁵⁰ ⁶⁵¹ ⁶⁵² ⁶⁵³ ⁶⁵⁴ ⁶⁵⁵ ⁶⁵⁶ ⁶⁵⁷ ⁶⁵⁸ ⁶⁵⁹ ⁶⁶⁰ ⁶⁶¹ ⁶⁶² ⁶⁶³ ⁶⁶⁴ ⁶⁶⁵ ⁶⁶⁶ ⁶⁶⁷ ⁶⁶⁸ ⁶⁶⁹ ⁶⁷⁰ ⁶⁷¹ ⁶⁷² ⁶⁷³ ⁶⁷⁴ ⁶⁷⁵ ⁶⁷⁶ ⁶⁷⁷ ⁶⁷⁸ ⁶⁷⁹ ⁶⁸⁰ ⁶⁸¹ ⁶⁸² ⁶⁸³ ⁶⁸⁴ ⁶⁸⁵ ⁶⁸⁶ ⁶⁸⁷ ⁶⁸⁸ ⁶⁸⁹ ⁶⁹⁰ ⁶⁹¹ ⁶⁹² ⁶⁹³ ⁶⁹⁴ ⁶⁹⁵ ⁶⁹⁶ ⁶⁹⁷ ⁶⁹⁸ ⁶⁹⁹ ⁷⁰⁰ ⁷⁰¹ ⁷⁰² ⁷⁰³ ⁷⁰⁴ ⁷⁰⁵ ⁷⁰⁶ ⁷⁰⁷ ⁷⁰⁸ ⁷⁰⁹ ⁷¹⁰ ⁷¹¹ ⁷¹² ⁷¹³ ⁷¹⁴ ⁷¹⁵ ⁷¹⁶ ⁷¹⁷ ⁷¹⁸ ⁷¹⁹ ⁷²⁰ ⁷²¹ ⁷²² ⁷²³ ⁷²⁴ ⁷²⁵ ⁷²⁶ ⁷²⁷ ⁷²⁸ ⁷²⁹ ⁷³⁰ ⁷³¹ ⁷³² ⁷³³ ⁷³⁴ ⁷³⁵ ⁷³⁶ ⁷³⁷ ⁷³⁸ ⁷³⁹ ⁷⁴⁰ ⁷⁴¹ ⁷⁴² ⁷⁴³ ⁷⁴⁴ ⁷⁴⁵ ⁷⁴⁶ ⁷⁴⁷ ⁷⁴⁸ ⁷⁴⁹ ⁷⁵⁰ ⁷⁵¹ ⁷⁵² ⁷⁵³ ⁷⁵⁴ ⁷⁵⁵ ⁷⁵⁶ ⁷⁵⁷ ⁷⁵⁸ ⁷⁵⁹ ⁷⁶⁰ ⁷⁶¹ ⁷⁶² ⁷⁶³ ⁷⁶⁴ ⁷⁶⁵ ⁷⁶⁶ ⁷⁶⁷ ⁷⁶⁸ ⁷⁶⁹ ⁷⁷⁰ ⁷⁷¹ ⁷⁷² ⁷⁷³ ⁷⁷⁴ ⁷⁷⁵ ⁷⁷⁶ ⁷⁷⁷ ⁷⁷⁸ ⁷⁷⁹ ⁷⁸⁰ ⁷⁸¹ ⁷⁸² ⁷⁸³ ⁷⁸⁴ ⁷⁸⁵ ⁷⁸⁶ ⁷⁸⁷ ⁷⁸⁸ ⁷⁸⁹ ⁷⁹⁰ ⁷⁹¹ ⁷⁹² ⁷⁹³ ⁷⁹⁴ ⁷⁹⁵ ⁷⁹⁶ ⁷⁹⁷ ⁷⁹⁸ ⁷⁹⁹ ⁸⁰⁰ ⁸⁰¹ ⁸⁰² ⁸⁰³ ⁸⁰⁴ ⁸⁰⁵ ⁸⁰⁶ ⁸⁰⁷ ⁸⁰⁸ ⁸⁰⁹ ⁸¹⁰ ⁸¹¹ ⁸¹² ⁸¹³ ⁸¹⁴ ⁸¹⁵ ⁸¹⁶ ⁸¹⁷ ⁸¹⁸ ⁸¹⁹ ⁸²⁰ ⁸²¹ ⁸²² ⁸²³ ⁸²⁴ ⁸²⁵ ⁸²⁶ ⁸²⁷ ⁸²⁸ ⁸²⁹ ⁸³⁰ ⁸³¹ ⁸³² ⁸³³ ⁸³⁴ ⁸³⁵ ⁸³⁶ ⁸³⁷ ⁸³⁸ ⁸³⁹ ⁸⁴⁰ ⁸⁴¹ ⁸⁴² ⁸⁴³ ⁸⁴⁴ ⁸⁴⁵ ⁸⁴⁶ ⁸⁴⁷ ⁸⁴⁸ ⁸⁴⁹ ⁸⁵⁰ ⁸⁵¹ ⁸⁵² ⁸⁵³ ⁸⁵⁴ ⁸⁵⁵ ⁸⁵⁶ ⁸⁵⁷ ⁸⁵⁸ ⁸⁵⁹ ⁸⁶⁰ ⁸⁶¹ ⁸⁶² ⁸⁶³ ⁸⁶⁴ ⁸⁶⁵ ⁸⁶⁶ ⁸⁶⁷ ⁸⁶⁸ ⁸⁶⁹ ⁸⁷⁰ ⁸⁷¹ ⁸⁷² ⁸⁷³ ⁸⁷⁴ ⁸⁷⁵ ⁸⁷⁶ ⁸⁷⁷ ⁸⁷⁸ ⁸⁷⁹ ⁸⁸⁰ ⁸⁸¹ ⁸⁸² ⁸⁸³ ⁸⁸⁴ ⁸⁸⁵ ⁸⁸⁶ ⁸⁸⁷ ⁸⁸⁸ ⁸⁸⁹ ⁸⁹⁰ ⁸⁹¹ ⁸⁹² ⁸⁹³ ⁸⁹⁴ ⁸⁹⁵ ⁸⁹⁶ ⁸⁹⁷ ⁸⁹⁸ ⁸⁹⁹ ⁹⁰⁰ ⁹⁰¹ ⁹⁰² ⁹⁰³ ⁹⁰⁴ ⁹⁰⁵ ⁹⁰⁶ ⁹⁰⁷ ⁹⁰⁸ ⁹⁰⁹ ⁹¹⁰ ⁹¹¹ ⁹¹² ⁹¹³ ⁹¹⁴ ⁹¹⁵ ⁹¹⁶ ⁹¹⁷ ⁹¹⁸ ⁹¹⁹ ⁹²⁰ ⁹²¹ ⁹²² ⁹²³ ⁹²⁴ ⁹²⁵ ⁹²⁶ ⁹²⁷ ⁹²⁸ ⁹²⁹ ⁹³⁰ ⁹³¹ ⁹³² ⁹³³ ⁹³⁴ ⁹³⁵ ⁹³⁶ ⁹³⁷ ⁹³⁸ ⁹³⁹ ⁹⁴⁰ ⁹⁴¹ ⁹⁴² ⁹⁴³ ⁹⁴⁴ ⁹⁴⁵ ⁹⁴⁶ ⁹⁴⁷ ⁹⁴⁸ ⁹⁴⁹ ⁹⁵⁰ ⁹⁵¹ ⁹⁵² ⁹⁵³ ⁹⁵⁴ ⁹⁵⁵ ⁹⁵⁶ ⁹⁵⁷ ⁹⁵⁸ ⁹⁵⁹ ⁹⁶⁰ ⁹⁶¹ ⁹⁶² ⁹⁶³ ⁹⁶⁴ ⁹⁶⁵ ⁹⁶⁶ ⁹⁶⁷ ⁹⁶⁸ ⁹⁶⁹ ⁹⁷⁰ ⁹⁷¹ ⁹⁷² ⁹⁷³ ⁹⁷⁴ ⁹⁷⁵ ⁹⁷⁶ ⁹⁷⁷ ⁹⁷⁸ ⁹⁷⁹ ⁹⁸⁰ ⁹⁸¹ ⁹⁸² ⁹⁸³ ⁹⁸⁴ ⁹⁸⁵ ⁹⁸⁶ ⁹⁸⁷ ⁹⁸⁸ ⁹⁸⁹ ⁹⁹⁰ ⁹⁹¹ ⁹⁹² ⁹⁹³ ⁹⁹⁴ ⁹⁹⁵ ⁹⁹⁶ ⁹⁹⁷ ⁹⁹⁸ ⁹⁹⁹ ¹⁰⁰⁰

^{3.} om εσται μεθ' ημων A.—elz υμων, with K rel vulg syr copt: txt BL[P]N g¹ k l 13
 am syr-pk sah Thl-comm Ec-comm. for 1st παρα, απο N¹ c 42. 57. 126. om
 2nd παρα N¹ f an. rec ins κυριου bef ιησ. χρ., with KL[P]N rel tol syr copt arm
 Thl Ec: om AB (d) vulg syr-pk (sah) æth. for του πατρος, αυτου f: αυτου του
 πατρος N¹.

^{4.} for ελαβομεν, ελαβον N 13. 28.

It is as Bengel, "votum cum affirmatione"—a wish expressed by a confident assertion of its fulfilment) *grace, mercy, peace* (see reff. Trench says well, N. T. Synonyms, pp. 164, 5, edn. 1865, "χάρις has reference to the *sins* of men, ἔλεος to their *misery*. God's χάρις, His free grace and gift, is extended to men as they are guilty: His ἔλεος is extended to them as they are miserable." And thus χάρις always comes first, because guilt must be done away, before misery can be assuaged: see further in Trench, and in Düsterdieck, h.l. εἰρήνῃ is the whole sum and substance of the possession and enjoyment of God's grace and mercy; cf. Luke ii. 14; Rom. v. 1 (x. 15); John xiv. 27, xvi. 33) from God the Father and from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father (from the Father as their original fountain, who of His great love hath decreed and secured them for us: from Jesus Christ the Son of the Father, this solemn title being used for the more complete setting forth of the union of Jesus with the Father in the essence of the Godhead), in truth and love (not to be understood of the Holy Spirit, the third Person in the blessed Trinity, as Lyra,—nor to be joined with τοῦ υἱοῦ τ. πατρὸς, "filio verissimo et dilectissimo," as Barthol.—Petrus (continuator of Estius) and Whitby, nor to be filled up by "ut perseveretis," as Corn.—a-lap,—nor to be taken as adding two more to χάρις ἔλεος εἰρήνῃ, making ἐν = cum, as Tirinus and Schlichting;—nor as Grot., al.—is it "per cognitionem veri et dilectionem mutuam: nam per hæc Dei beneficia provocamus, conservamus, augemus:" but the real sense is an approximation to this last;—truth and love are the conditional element in which the grace, mercy, and peace are to be received and enjoyed. So Bengel, Lücke, De Wette, Huther, Düsterdieck).

⁴—11.] *Truth and love*: These were the two ground-tones of the Epistle. And now the Apostle proceeds to describe his joy at

finding the children of the ἐκλεκτῇ κυρίᾳ walking in truth (ver. 4), and to enforce the commandment to love one another (5, 6): and this in presence of the fact that many deceivers are in the world who would rob us of our Christian reward, and of our share in God (7—9). These are not to be treated as brethren, nor greeted, lest we partake of their evil deeds (10, 11). ^{4.]} I rejoiced greatly (at some definite time indicated by the aor., *perhaps*: and so it is taken by Huther and Düsterdieck; but it may also be the epistolary aor., as ἔγραψα so often: and this is made more probable by the perf. εὗρηκα which follows. See however 3 John 3), that I have found (there is not a word nor a hint of the assumption of Sander, that this finding was the result of proof and trial. The most obvious interpretation is, that at some place where the Apostle was, he *came upon* these who are presently mentioned: as in Acts xviii. 2, (ὁ Παῦλος) . . . ἦλθεν εἰς Κόρινθον καὶ εὗρών τινα Ἰουδαίον ὄν. Ἀκύλαν, κ.τ.λ.) of thy children (no τινάς is needed as a supply: it is contained in the participle which follows) walking in truth (i.e. not only in honesty and uprightness, but in that truth which is derived from and is part of the truth of God and Christ: see above on ver. 1. Again, there is no hint whatever given that the rest, or that others, of her children were not walking in truth. The Apostle apparently, as above, in some place where he was, lit upon these children of the κυρία, and sends her their good report. Respecting the rest, he makes no mention nor insinuation) according as we received commandment from the Father (viz. to walk in the truth: not, as Lücke, to love one another, making this clause a further description of the manner in which they were walking in truth. And τοῦ πατρὸς must not be taken with ἐκ., πά- τέρα νῦν τὸν χριστὸν καλεῖ, ἐπεὶ κα- τὰ τὴν ἐστὶ τῶν διὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας αὐτῆς

1 John i. 3 ^{ref.} παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. 5 καὶ νῦν ἔρωτῶ σε, κυρία, οὐχ ἄς ἐντολὴν γράφων σοι καὶ νῦν, ἀλλὰ ἡν εἶχομεν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, ἵνα ἀγαπῶμεν ἀλλήλους. 6 καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγάπη, ἵνα περιπατῶμεν κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ. αὕτη ἡ ἐντολή ἐστίν, καθὼς ἡκούσατε ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἵνα ἐν αὐτῇ περιπατήτε 7 ὅτι πολλοὶ πλάνοι ἐξήλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον, οἳ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες Ἰησοῦν χρισ-

1 John i. 3 ^{ref.} constr. i. Luke vi. 38. John iv. 47. xvii. 15. ^t ver. 1. u 1 John ii. 7 ^(ref.). v 1 John iii. 11 ^{ref.}. w constr., 1 John iii. 23 ^{ref.}. x = Mark vii. 5. Rom viii 4. xiv. 15. 1 Cor. iii 3 ^y 1 John iii 11 ^z 1 John i. 6, 7 ^{ref.} a here bis. Matt xxiii 63. 2 Cor. vi 8. 1 Tim. iv. 1 only. Jer. xxiii 32 only. b 1 John iv. 1 ^{ref.}. c constr., 1 John iv. 2.

for παρα, απο A 73. om του B.

5. Steph (for γραφον) γραφω, with c^p d¹ 65-6 syrr: txt ABKL[P]N rel 40 vulg sah Thl Ec.—καινην bef γρ. σοι AN d m 13. 36. 65 vulg copt. ins εντολην bef ην N (syrr-w-ast sah). ειχαμεν AN: εχομεν a b¹ c h j k l² m (Treg) o: ειχωμεν 13.

6. aft αυτου ins και καθως (but marked for erasure) N¹. rec εστιν bef η εντολη, with L[P]N rel vulg-ed copt arm Thl Ec Lucif: txt ABK m 13 am syr. (in N λη of εντολη is not written, but αυτου is added.) ins ινα bef καθως AKN m 13. 36 vulg copt arm (of these all but A m omit it below). περιπατετε L o 13 Thl: περιπατησητε N. [P def.]

7. rec (for εξηλθον) εισηλθ., with KL[P] rel Thl Ec: txt ABN d 36 vulg syrr sah

παρὰ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ πατρὸς δοθέντων νῦν, which is unlikely and unprecedented,—but as applying to the Father, as in ver. 6).

5.] And now (so καὶ νῦν, coupling to what has gone before, 1 John ii. 28. It has also a force of breaking off, and passing to that which is the main subject, or most in the Writer's thoughts, which here is, that this walking in truth is a walking after God's commandments in love) I entreat thee (see on ἐρωτάω and αἰτέω, 1 John v. 15, 16. Here ἐρωτῶ carries, as Schlichting, "blandior quædam admonendi ratio:" with the assumed fact of a right thus to entreat) lady, not as writing to thee a new commandment, but (as writing to thee . . . the construction is not strictly logical) that which we had from the beginning (see on this, 1 John ii. 7), that (ἵνα here is not expegetical of ἐντολή, as so often in St. John, but is to be taken in its proper sense, as the aim of ἐρωτῶ, and dependent on it) we love one another (the expression of the commandment in the first person is a mark of gentleness and delicacy: a sign that he who wrote it kept the commandment himself.) 6.] And ("eine eigenthumliche Kreisbewegung der Gedanken, wie Johannes sie liebt." Düsterd.) this is the love (ἡ ἀγάπη here is subject, not predicate: the love (intended by this command) is this, i. e. may be thus described), that (the explicative ἵνα of St. John) we walk according to His commandments. The commandment (the one commandment in which God's other commandments are summed up) is this, even as ye heard from the beginning that ye should walk in it (the apodosis to αὕτη ἐστίν begins with καθὼς: = "is this,

even that which ye heard from the beginning, that ye should walk in it," viz. in ἀγάπη. ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, as above, ver. 5, and 1 John ii. 7).

7.] The condition of Love is Truth, see ver. 3. And the necessity of fresh exhortation to walk in love, in that love whose condition is truth, lies in the fact that there are many deceivers gone forth, denying the Truth: of whom we are to beware, and not, by extending to them a spurious sympathy, to become partakers with them. Because (see above. ὅτι cannot be referred to βλέπετε ἑαυτοῦς, ver. 8, for its apodosis, as is done by Grot., Carpov., J. Lange, as this would involve a length of protasis, broken by a parenthetical clause, οὐτὸς ἐστίν κ.τ.λ., quite alien from St. John's style. Nor can we well understand ὅτι with Bengel, "ratio cur jubeat retinere audita a principio:" because the foregoing is not a command "retinere audita a principio;" this latter particular being only introduced by the way, not as a principal feature) many deceivers (makers to wander, see ref.) went forth (here probably, on account of the aor., "from us," as in 1 John ii. 19. In 1 John iv. 1, it is perf., ἐξεληλύθασιν, where I have preferred the sense, "are gone forth from him who sent them," viz. the evil one. Huther prefers this latter sense here also) into the world (namely) they who confess not (instead of οὐχ ὁμολογοῦντες, the Apostle writes οἳ μὴ ὁμολογοῦντες, thereby not merely characterizing the πλάνοι as not confessing &c., but absolutely identifying all who repudiate the confession which follows, as belonging to the class of πλάνοι. The subjective μὴ is the necessary consequence

τὸν ἄ^d ἐρχόμενον ἐ^eν σαρκί. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄ^a πλάνος καὶ ὁ ἄ^f ἀντίχριστος. ὁ ἄ^g βλέπετε ἡ^h ἐαυτούς, ἵνα μὴ ἄ^k ἀπολέ-
σητε ἃ ἱⁱ ἐίργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ μ^m μισθὸν ποⁿ πλήρη ῥ^r ἀπολά-
βητε. 9 πᾶς ὁ ᾧ^a προάγων καὶ μὴ ἱⁱ μένων ἱⁱ ἐν τῇ ῥ^r διδασχῇ
12. xvi. 10 al. † h Mark xxi. 9. k = Matt. x.
42. Mark ix. 41 al. Isa. xlix. 20. 1 = John vi. 27. m John iv. 36. Matt. x. 42. Luke
vi. 23 al. n Ruth ii. 12. o = Mark iv. 28. p = Luke xvi. 25. xviii.
30. xxiii. 41. Col. iii. 24. Num. xxiv. 14. q = Mark xi. 9. Luke xviii. 39. (see note.)
r = John viii. 31. see 1 John iii. 24 reff. s = John vii. 16, 17. xviii. 19. Rev. ii. 14, 15, 24.

arm Ps-Chr Iren-int Bede.—θαν Α.

om 2nd δ Ν k 3.

8. αὐτοὺς KL, eos Iren-int Lucif. rec ἀπολεσάμεν and ἀπολαβήμεν, with
KL[P] rel: txt AB(Ν) d f j 13. 36. 40 vulg syrr coptt æth arm Ps-Chr Isid Thl-comm
Ec-comm Iren-int Lucif. 13 [not B, as Bch: see table] has ἀπολεσῆται: ἀπολησθε
Ν¹.—for εἰργασάμεθα, εἰργασάσθε ΑΝ d f j 13. 36 vulg syrr coptt æth arm Ps-Chr &c:
txt BKL[P] rel 40(so Zacagni) syr-ing sah. (ηγρ. Β¹.) πλήρης L.

9. rec (for προάγων) παραβαίνων, with KL[P] rel syrr Thl Ec, ambulans extra coptt:
txt ABΝ, præcedit am(with fuld harl al) sah, recedit vulg(with demid al) Did-int

of such an arrangement, involving an hypothesis within the limits of the relative ὅλ,—the repudiation of the confession: see 1 John iv. 3, note) **Jesus Christ coming in (the) flesh** (ἐρχόμενον, altogether timeless, and representing the great truth of the Incarnation itself, as distinguished from its historical manifestation (ἐλθόν, 1 John v. 6), and from the abiding effect of that historical manifestation (ἐληλυθότα, 1 John iv. 2): and all three, as confessions of the Person Ἰησοῦς χριστός, distinguished from the accus. with infin. construction: see note on 1 John iv. 2. He who denies the ἐρχεσθαι ἐν σαρκί, denies the *possibility* of the Incarnation: he who denies the ἐλθεῖν or ἐληλυθέναι, denies its *actuality*. Other interpretations, such as that of Ec., εἰπὼν δέ, ἐρχόμενον ἐν σαρκί, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐλθόντα, ἐμφαίνοντός ἐστιν ὡς τοὺς ἀθετοῦντας λέγει τὴν δευτέραν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν, . . . that of Erasm., Schlicht., Bengel,—“*qui veniebat*,” and of Baumg.-Crus., “*who was to come*,” are beside the mark). This (viz., “he that fulfils the above character.” No supply, such as ὅς οὖν μὴ ταῦτα ὁμολογεί, Ec., is needed. See the same construction, 1 John ii. 22) is the deceiver and the antichrist (see notes on 1 John ii. 18, 22, as to the personal relation of these πολλοί to the one great Antichrist of prophecy. The οὗτος, pointing to a class, makes each one of these, in his place, a representative and “præcursor Antichristi”).

8.] The warning is suddenly introduced without any coupling particle, and becomes thereby so much the more solemn and forcible. **Look to yourselves** (the construction with the reflexive pronoun is not usual, see reff. ἐαυτούς here probably implies not as Bengel, “me absente,” but “yourselves,” that ye contrasted with the deceivers, that ye too become not as they), **that ye lose**

not the things which we wrought (i.e. that ye, Christian converts, lose not that your Christian state of truth and love which we, Apostles and Teachers, wrought in you. This not being understood, the verbs have been altered in the various texts to the first or to the second person to conform to one another. The Apostles were God's ἐργάται, Matt. ix. 37, 38; Luke x. 2, 7; 2 Tim. ii. 15: the ψευδαπόστολοι were ἐργάται δόλιοι, 2 Cor. xi. 13, κακοὶ ἐργάται, Phil. iii. 2: the true ἐργον was to cause men to believe on Christ, John vi. 29: and this ἐργον the false teachers put in peril of loss), but receive reward in full (what μισθός? The connexion of εἰργασάμεθα with μισθόν must not be broken. The idea is a complex one. Ye, our converts, are our μισθός in the day of the Lord: and this has suggested the use of the well-known word, even where it manifestly applies not to the teachers but to the taught, whose μισθός is the eternal life, which shall receive on that day its glorious completion: which is ἔχειν τὸν υἱόν, κ. τὸν πατέρα: see 1 John iii. 2.

If this reading be right, the use which Roman-Catholic expositors, as Bart-Petrus, Mayer, al., have tried to make of this verse to establish the merit of human works (“opera bona per Spiritum Dei facta mercedem apud Deum mereri,” B.-Petrus), falls at once to the ground. Nor indeed does it fare much better if either of the other readings be taken. If the whole be in the first person, then the apostolic μισθός, the souls which are to be their hire, must be understood: if in the second, no human merit, but the reward laid up for faithfulness, and for every thing done in His name, must be understood, which is reckoned of grace, and not of debt).

9.] Explanation of this *loss*, that it is the non-possession of God, which

t 1 John ii. 23. *τοῦ χριστοῦ θεὸν οὐκ ἔχει ὁ ἰ μένων ἔν τῇ ὁ διδασχῇ, οὗτος* ABKLP
 u = John xviii. 29. Ac x. xxv. 18. 2 Pet. ii. 11. Jer. xlii. (xxxix.) 16. *καὶ τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει.* 10 εἴ τις ἔρχεται f g h j k l m o 13
 v = John vi. 21. xix. 27. see also John i. 12. v 43. *πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ταύτην τὴν διδασχὴν οὐ φέρει, μὴ λαμβάνετε αὐτὸν ἔως οἰκίαν, καὶ χαίρειν αὐτῷ μὴ λέγετε·*
 w Matt. xxvi. 49. Luke i. 28. Acts xv. 23. xxiii. 28. *ὁ λέγων γὰρ αὐτῷ χαίρειν κοινωνεῖ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ τοῖς πονηροῖς.*
 James i. 1. Isa. xlviii. 22. Esdr. vii. 9. x = & constr., Rom. xv. 27. 1 Tim v 22. (Heb ii. 14 reff.) Isa. xlv 9 (11) Ald. Compl. Wisd. vi. 23 (25). y John ii. 19. vii. 7. 1 John iii. 12 Col. i. 21. 2 Tim. iv. 18 only.

Lucif. aft *μενων και μη* is repeated, but marked for erasure by N¹. rec aft 2nd *διδασχῇ* ins *του χριστου*, with KL[P] rel copt æth Thl Ēc; *αυτου* syr-pk syr-w-ast Lucif₂: om ABN 13 vulg sah arm Did-int Fulg. transp *πατερα* and *υιου* A (m) 13 am(with demid fuld harl tol) Fulg (m om 2nd *τον*): txt BKL[P]N rel syrr copt æth arm Thl Ēc Did-int Lucif₂.

10. aft *την*, ε was written by N¹ and erased [*την* is repeated by B¹(Tischdf)].

11. rec *γαρ* bef *λεγων*, with KL[P] rel Iren Thl Ēc Lucif: txt ABN m 13. om *αυτω* K k l Ēc.

is incurred by all who abide not in Christ's teaching. Every one that goeth before (you) (such I believe to be the meaning of the somewhat difficult *προδῶν*: every one who would set up for a teacher, *ἐμ-προσθεν τῶν προβάτων πορευόμενος*, as John x. 4, and they following. The expositors who take this reading interpret it, "goeth forward too fast," "maketh false and unsound advance," regarding it, either as ironical (so Huther), or as serious (so Düsterdieck), and not abiding in the doctrine of Christ (i.e. in Christ's doctrine,—that truth which Christ Himself taught. This is far more likely than that the gen. should be objective, as Bengel ("in doctrina, quæ Jesum docet esse filium Dei"), Lücke, Sander, al.: and thus we have the personal gen. after *διδασχῇ* wherever it occurs in the N. T.: cf. Matt. vii. 28 ||, Mark iv. 2, John xviii. 19, Acts ii. 42, al. fr.), hath not God (see 1 John ii. 23, v. 12, notes): he that abideth in the doctrine, that man hath both the Father and the Son (see as above. The order in the text is the theological one, the Father being mentioned first, then the Son. That in A &c. (see digest) is the logical and contextual one, seeing that the test is, abiding in the doctrine of Christ. Thus he has Christ, and through Him, the Father).

10, 11.] The exercise of the love of the brethren is conditioned and limited by the truth: and is not to be extended to those who are enemies and impugnors of the truth. Those who harbour or encourage such, make common cause with them, and their evil deeds. If any cometh to you, and bringeth not (the indic. after *εἰ* shews that the case supposed actually existed: that such persons were sure to come to them:

cf. John xi. 12, 2 Cor. ii. 5, 1 John iv. 11. It is not = *ἐάν* with subj., which always carries a purely hypothetical force, corresponding to an interrogation, whereas the other corresponds to an assertion: e.g. in 1 John ii. 15, *ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν κόσμον*, which may be resolved, "Does any among you love the world? If he do," &c. On the other hand, *εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρὸς ὑμᾶς* may be resolved, "Some will come to you," &c., "If any does," &c.) this doctrine (the expression *ταύτην τὴν διδασχὴν οὐ φέρει* points out the person as a teacher, not a mere traveller seeking hospitality. And the *οὐ*, not *μή*, distinctly reverses the *φέρει*: he not only comes without this doctrine, but by so doing brings the contrary doctrine. The absence of testimony for the truth is, in one who brings any testimony at all, equivalent to testifying for error), receive him not into (your) house, and do not bid him good speed: for he that biddeth him good speed, partaketh in his evil deeds (these words must be understood with their right reference: "non de iis qui alieni semper fuerunt ab ecclesia, 1 Cor. v. 10, sed de iis qui volunt fratres haberi et doctrinam evertunt," as Grot. These were not to be received with the *φιλοξενία* with which all Christian brethren were to be entertained. Such reception of them would in fact be only opening an inlet for their influence. But this is not the point on which the Apostle mainly dwells. It is the *κοινωνία* which the host in such a case would incur with them and their anti-christian designs, by encouraging them. And this is further impressed by the caution against saying *χαίρειν* to them: which is to be understood not with Clem.-Alex., of the solemn salutation after prayer, "quoniam in oratione quæ fit in domo, post-

12 ^z Πολλά ^z ἔχων ὑμῖν ^z γράφειν οὐκ ^a ἐβουλήθην διὰ ^z 3 John 13.
^b χάρτου καὶ ^c μέλανος· ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω ^d γενέσθαι πρὸς constr., John
 ὑμᾶς καὶ ^e στόμα πρὸς ^e στόμα λαλήσαι, ἵνα ἡ ^f χαρὰ vii. 26. xvi.
 ὑμῶν ἢ ^f πεπληρωμένη. 13 ἀσπάξεται σε τὰ τέκνα τῆς 12.
 ἀδελφῆς σου τῆς ^g ἐκλεκτῆς. a 1 aor. pass.,
 Matt. i. 19.
 James i. 18.
 iv. 4 only.
 Exod. x. 27.
 b here only.
 Jer. xliii.
 (xxxvi.) 2 A,
 6 A^h, 23 only
 (-τιον, ib.
 ver. 4, &c.).
 d Acts vii. 31. x.
 e 3 John 14. = Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 4 only (4 Kings
 f 1 John

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Β.

c = 2 Cor. iii. 3. 3 John 13 only ^z. (Matt. v. 36. Rev. vi. 5, 12 only. Zech. vi. 2.)

10, 13. 1 Cor. ii. 3. xvi. 10. see John vi. 25.

e 3 John 14. = Jer. xxxix. (xxxii.) 4 only (4 Kings

xxi. 16 Ald., eis AB). στ. κατά στ., Num. xii. 8. ἔπος πρὸς ἔπος, Plato, Sophist. p. 217.

l. 4 reff.

g ver. 1 reff.

12. for *ἔχων*, *ἔχω* A^h N¹ o *æth*: but in A, *ν* is written over the line by an ancient, perhaps the original, scribe. γράφει A g 73. (ἐβουλήθην, so ABKL[P]^h N¹ a b g h l m o 36. 40 Thl.) for *ἀλλὰ ἐλπίζω*, *ἐλπ. γὰρ* A d 13. 36(sic) vulg copt *æth* arm: txt BKL[P]^h N¹ rel syrr sah Thl *Æc*.—*ἀλλ' L*[P] a h j m. rec (for *γενέσθαι*) *ελθεῖν*, with KL[P] rel tol syrr-pk sah *æth* arm: txt ABN d 13 vulg syrr Thl. *στοματι* N¹. rec *ἡμῶν*, with KL[P]^h N¹ rel syrr (sah) arm Thl *Æc*: txt AB c 13 vulg copt *æth*. *πεπληρωμένη* bef η BN vulg(exe am) Thl.—N¹ has ην, N³ ἦ(sic), having erased *ν*.

13. rec at end ins *αμην*, with KL rel fuld syrr Thl *Æc*, *vale* some-mss-of-vulg; η *χαρις μεθ' υμῶν* or *μετα σου* 68-9. 103 syrr-pk syrr-w-ast *æth*-rom arm: om AB[P]^h N¹ d 13 vulg copt Bede.

SUBSCRIPTION. elz om, with rel: *τέλος στχ λ' h*: *ιωαννου επιστολη β'* L: txt ABN. [P doubtful.]

quam ab orando surgitur salutatio gaudii est et pacis indicium." Adumbrat. in 2 Joan. juxt. fin., p. 1011 P. (not in Migne): nor with Corn.-a-lap., of all intercourse whatever, "omne colloquium, omne consortium, omne commercium cum hæreticis:" but it is a further intensification of the exclusion from the house, and forms a climax, *καὶ μή = μηδέ*: do not even, by wishing him *χαίρειν*, good speed, and if spoken by a Christian, *God* speed, identify yourselves with his course and fortunes. If you do, you pronounce approval of his evil deeds, and so far share his guilt, advancing their success by your wishes for it.

This command has been by some laid to the fiery and zealous spirit of St. John, and it has been said that a true Christian spirit of love teaches us otherwise. But as rightly understood, we see that this is not so. Nor are we at liberty to set aside direct ethical injunctions of the Lord's Apostles in this manner. Varieties of individual character may play on the surface of their writings: but in these solemn commands which come up from the depths, we must recognize the power of that One Spirit of Truth which moved them all as one. It would have been infinitely better for the Church now, if this command had been observed in all ages by her faithful sons).

12, 13.] CONCLUSION. Having many things to write to you, I would not

(communicate them) by means of paper and ink ("ὁ χάρτης," says Lücke, "the Egyptian papyrus, probably the so-called Augustan or Claudian,—τὸ μέλαν, the ink, commonly made of soot and water thickened with gum,—ὁ κάλαμος (3 John 13), the writing-reed, probably split, μεσοσχιδῆς or μεσότομος,—were the N. T. writing materials"), but I hope to come to you (reff., and note on Rev. i. 9) and to speak mouth to mouth (so *πρόσωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον* 1 Cor. xiii. 12. *στόμα πρὸς στόμα* in Xen. Mem. ii. 6. 32 is not said of conversation), that your joy may be filled full (see 1 John i. 4, viz. by hearing from the mouth of the Apostle himself those messages of life and truth which he forbore writing now; not, as Schlichting and Benson, by his bodily presence: still less as Bart.-Petrus, "Apostolos non omnia voluisse scripto committere quæ ad salutem pertinentia vellent nota esse fidelibus, sed multa sermone solo tradidisse" (see also Corn.-a-lapide h. l.), than which it is hardly possible to imagine a sillier comment: for *the first Epistle was written* with this very same view, i. 4). There greet thee the children of thine elect sister (these words are variously interpreted according as the *κυρία* is understood of a lady, or of a church. The non-mention of the *κυρία* herself here seems, it must be confessed, rather to favour the latter hypothesis). See on the whole, the prolegomena.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Γ.

a 2 John 1 reff. 1 'Ο ^aπρεσβύτερος Γαίω τῷ ^bἀγαπητῷ, ὃν ἐγὼ ἀγαπῶ
 b 1 John ii. 7 reff. Ps. ^cἐν ἀληθείᾳ.
 xiv tit. 2 'Αγαπητέ, περὶ πάντων ^dεὔχομαί σε ^eεὐδοῦσθαι καὶ
 c 1 John iii. 18 reff. ^fὕγιαίνειν, καθὼς ^eεὐδοδοῦταί σου ἡ ψυχή. 3 ^gἐχάρην C ^hεχαρην
 d Acts xxv. 29 xxvii. 29. Rom. ix. 3. f ⁱὑγιαίνειν, καθὼς ^eεὐδοδοῦταί σου ἡ ψυχή. 3 ^gἐχάρην C ^hεχαρην
 2 Cor. xiii. 7. 9. James i. 6 only. Num. xi. 2. e here bis. Rom. i. 10. 1 Cor. xvi. 2 only. Gen. xlii. 3, 23. ABCKL
 al. (-δός, Num. xiv. 41. -δός. Prov. xxx. 29.) f Luke v. 31. vii. 10. xv. 27 only (exc. 1 Tim. i. 10 al). P a b c
 in pastoral epp. met.). Gen. xlii. 6. g Luke xxiii. 8. 2 John 4 only. d f g h j k
 l m o 13

TITLE. Steph ἐπιστολὴ ἰωαννου τριτῇ: elz ω. του αποστολου επιστ. καθολικη τριτῇ:
 ἀλλὰ πάλιν τριτὰ ταῦτα περικλυτός ἰωαννης f: ω. τρ. επ. h: επ. τρ. ω. καθ. k: ω. επ.
 καθ. γ' l: ω. καθ. τρ. m: επ. ω. καθ. γ' o: ω. επ. γ' C: επ. τρ. του αγιου αποστ. ω.
 L: A's title is lost: txt BN. [P doubtful.]

1.] ADDRESS. The elder (see prolegg. to the two Epistles) to Caius the beloved (on Caius, see prolegg. The epithet τῷ ἀγαπητῷ seems to be used this first time in a general sense: cf. ἐγὼ below), whom I (for my own part: Caius was generally beloved, and the Apostle declares that he personally joins in the affection for him) love in (the) truth (see 2 John 1, note. 'Εν ἀληθείᾳ ἀγαπᾷ ὁ κατὰ κύριον ἀγαπῶν ἐνδιαθέτω ἀγάπῃ, Ec.). 2—4.] *Wish that Caius may prosper, as his soul prospers: and ground of this latter assertion.* Beloved (the repetition of ἀγαπητέ is due perhaps more to the fact that the direct address begins here, than to any specific motive, such as the supposed ill-health of Caius, as Düsterd. from Lücke (but not in his 3rd edn.)), I pray that concerning all things thou mayest prosper (περὶ πάντων is taken by many, e.g. Beza (E. V.), Wahl, Lücke (1st edn.), al., and recently by Düsterd., as signifying "above all things:" for which they allege Hom. Il. a. 287, ἀλλ' ὅδ' ἀνὴρ ἐθέλει περὶ πάντων ἔμμεναι ἄλλων. But it has been urged on the other side 1) that Homeric usage is no real index to N. T. usage:

2) that the meaning in Homer is not that sought here: 3) that it would be unnatural for the Apostle to pray for Caius's bodily health and prosperity "above all things." And hence the other modern Commentators, Lücke (edn. 2), De Wette, Huther, Sander, have taken the above meaning: which cannot be impugned, as Düsterd., by saying that περί is never found joined with εὐδοῦσθαι, or that ἐν πᾶσιν would be more natural than περὶ πάντων. περί with a gen. is too usual signifying reference, to be set aside or judged of by the consideration of the verb which precedes: St. John himself uses it with verbs of very various classes. εὐδοῦσθαι is pass. of εὐδοῶ, of which the neut. form is εὐδοέω, from εὐδοία, to have a καλὴ ὁδός: -ῶ, to make, or give a καλὴ ὁδός. So Hesych., εὐδοῶσει, κατευθυνεῖ εὐωδάσθῃ, ἡτοιμάσθῃ. So that the pass. εὐδοῦσθαι comes to much the same as the intrans. εὐδοεῖν. Its use is common, and regular, in the LXX. See notes on reff., and Lücke's and Düsterd.'s account of the usages, here) and be in health (i.e. bodily health. περὶ πάντων, in all probability, does not belong to ὕγιαίνειν, but only to

γὰρ ἡ ^hλίαν ἐρχομένων ^hἀδελφῶν καὶ ⁱμαρτυρούντων σου ^h = Acts ix. 30. al. fr.
τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, ^j καθὼς σὺ ^k ἐν ἀληθείᾳ ^k περιπατεῖς. ⁴ ^lμειζο- ⁱ = Rom. iii.
τέραν ^{mn} τούτων οὐκ ἔχω χαράν, ⁿ ἵνα ^o ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ ²¹ † constr.,
τέκνα ^k ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ^k περιπατοῦντα. ¹² here bis, ver.
22. John iii.
26. v. 33.
xviii. 37.
Luke iv. 22.
j = Acts xv. 14
only.
k here bis.
l John 4 only.
see 1 John i.
6, 7.

vv. 5—
10 m
multi-
liated.

⁵ ^b Ἀγαπητέ, ^p πιστὸν ^q ποιεῖς ^δ ἐὰν ἐργάσῃ εἰς τοὺς
ⁱ ἀδελφούς ^r καὶ ^r τοῦτο ^s ξένους, ⁶ οἱ ⁱ ἐμαρτύρησάν σου τῇ
1 here only. †. m plur. indef., see 1 Cor. vi. 11.
23. Acts vii. 12. p = 1 John i. 9.
r Rom. xiii. 11. 1 Cor. vi. 6, 8. Eph. ii. 8. Phil. i. 28.
xvii. 21. Eph. ii. 19. Heb. xi. 13 only. Ruth ii. 10.
n constr., John xv. 13. o constr., Luke iv.
q so οὐχ' Ἑλληνικὸν τοῦτο ποιεῖς, Liban. ad Max.
s = Matt. xxv. 35, &c. xxvii. 7. Acts
(-νίζειν, Heb. xiii. 2. -νοδοχεῖν, 1 Tim. v. 10.)

VERSE 3. om γαρ & d 13. 65. 100 vulg sah æth arm. B omits the -των of μαρτυρούντων. om συ Α.

4. χαρὰν bef ουκ εχω C 68 æth, χ. ταυτης ουκ εχω m (syr coptt).—εχω B¹ (ita cod). —χαρην B 7. 35 vulg(not tol) coptt. rec om τη, with C-corr KL[P]N rel Thl Cc: ins AB(ita cod) C¹.

5. εργαζη Α. (quidquid operaris vulg Jer.) rec (for τουτο) εις τους, with KL[P] rel Thl Cc: τους, oing εις, d: txt ABCN vss.

6. for ος, δ K.

εὐδοῦσθαι: the latter verb is a particular, taken out of the former, which is general), even as thy soul prospereth (viz. ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πολιτείᾳ, Ec.: as is shewn by what follows. There is a passage in Philo, Quis rer. div. hæres, § 58, vol. i. p. 514, in which the well-being of body and soul are similarly compared: ὅταν εὐδοῇ μοι τὰ ἐκτὸς πρὸς εὐπορίαν καὶ εὐδοξίαν εὐδοῇ τὰ σώματος πρὸς ὑγίαν τε καὶ ἰσχύιν, εὐδοῇ δὲ καὶ τὰ ψυχῆς πρὸς ἀπόλαυσιν ἀρετῶν). For I rejoiced greatly when the brethren came and testified to thy truth (the participles ἐρχ. and μαρτ. are in reality timeless, and convey merely the reason of the ἐχάρην: but such a connexion is given in English by the temporal adverb, which has in this case rather a ratiocinative than a purely temporal force. In σου τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, the subst. is necessarily subjective—thy share of that Truth in which thou walkest, see below), even as (almost = how that, see below) thou walkest in truth (this clause is not an independent one, adding the testimony of the Apostle to that of the brethren,—“as (I know that) thou walkest &c.” but is expegetical of the former clause, and states the substance of the testimony of the brethren, as is shewn by what follows, ἀκούω τὰ ἐμὰ τ. κ.τ.λ.).

4.] Explains ἐχάρην λίαν above. I have no greater (the form μείζοτερος is condemned by some (Phryn. Lob. p. 186, Ec. h. l.) as barbarous. But these comparatives of comparatives and superlatives are found both in classical and in N. T. Greek: see Eph. iii. 8, and note) joy than this (lit. “than these things:” following

the usage by which ταῦτα is so often put where one thing only is intended: cf. the formula, καὶ ταῦτα, “idque:” so Plato, Phæd. p. 62, D, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνόητος ἄνθρωπος τὰχ' ἂν οἰσθῇ ταῦτα, φευκτέον εἶναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσπότου. See Kühner, Gr. ii. p. 48), that (explicative, as constantly in St. John after the demonstrative pronoun) I hear of my children walking in the truth (on the participial construction, see note on 2 John 7. The expression τέκνα here seems rather to favour the idea that the κυρία of the 2nd Epistle is a Church: but see proleg. to 2 John).

5—8.] *Praise of the hospitality shewn by Caius; and reason of that praise.* Beloved (beginning again of new address: see above on ver. 2), thou doest a faithful act (ἔξιον πιστοῦ ἀνδρός, as Ec. and most interpreters. De W. and Bengel explain it “fidele facis: facis quiddam quod facile a te pollicebar mihi et fratribus.” But the other is better. In πιστὸς ὁ λόγος, 1 Tim. i. 15 al., there is possibly the same allusion: not only a saying worthy of credit, but one belonging to those who are of the (πίστις) whatsoever thou workest (the aor. betokens these deeds as summed up in one and characterized as πιστόν) towards (so the Lord in Matt. xxvi. 10 describes His anointing by Mary thus, καλὸν ἔργον ἐργάσατο εἰς ἐμέ) the brethren, and that (and those brethren), strangers (φιλοξενία is an especial mark of Christian ἀγάπη, Rom. xii. 13, 1 Tim. iii. 2, Tit. i. 8, Heb. xiii. 2, 1 Pet. iv. 9), who (the above-named ξένοι ἀδελφοί) bore testimony to thy love in the presence of the church (viz. where St. John was at

t = Acts iv. 10. xix. 9. 1 Cor. 1. 29. u = Acts x 33. 1 Cor vii. 37. 38. Phil. iv. 14. James ii. 8. 19. 2 Pet. 1. 19. 2 Chron. vi. 8. v Acts xv 3 xx. 38. xxi. 5. Rom. xv. 24 al + 1 Mace xii 4 al Jos. Antt xx. 2. 5. w Rom. xvi. 2. Eph. iv. 1. Phil. i. 27. Col. i. 10. 1 Thess. ii. 12 only +. Wisd. vii. 15. xvi. 1. Sir. xiv. 11 only. z = Matt v. 41 (ellips.). ix. 16. xv. 26. xxi. 13. Rom. i. 5 only. y = Luke ix. 6. Acts xv. 40 al. z = Matt xxi. 34. Exod. xxx. 16. a 1 John iii 22 reff. b Matt v. 47 vi. 7 xviii. 17 only + (-κως, Gal. ii. 14). c = 1 John ii. 6 reff. d = here (Acts i. 9 ii. 15 Luke vii. 43 x 30) only. Ps. xxix. 1. οἱ εὐποροὶ τοὺς ἐνδεεῖς ὑπολαμβάνουσιν, Strabo, p. 653 Diod. Sic. xii. 67.

ABCKL
F^a a b c
d f g h i k
l m o 13

for ους, ου B¹. ποιησας προπεμψεις C arm. (*benefaciens deduces* vulg-ed, but not am fuld &c.)

7. γαρ is repeated in N. elz aft *ονοματος* ins *αντον*, with b g m o vulg syr-pk syr-w-ast æth-ms arm : om ABCKL[P]N rel am coptt arm. ἐξηλθον B^N. om των C. rec (for *εθνικων*) *εθνων*, with KL[P] rel Thl (Ec, *gentilibus* am sah : txt ABCN 13. 40, *gentilibus* fuld tol copt.

8. rec *απολαμβ.*, with C-corr KL[P] rel : txt ABC¹N 13 vulg.

the time of writing. They were Evangelists, ver. 7 : and thus would naturally give the church an account of their missionary journey, during which they were so hospitably treated by Caius : whom thou wilt do well if thou forward on their way (as Bengel says, the future is a "morata formula hortandi." The aor. part. presents no difficulty : it will then, and not till then, be a good act, when it is done. And this would only be expressed by the fut. with an aor. part. : οὓς καλῶς ποιήσεις προπέμπων would be liable to be rendered "whom thou wilt benefit by forwarding &c."—the present part. being, in such a conjunction, timeless, and merely ratiocinative. On προπέμπ., see reff. and Tit. iii. 13) *worthily of God* (this qualification belongs to προπέμπας, not as Carpzov., who supplies a *καί* before ἀξίως, to ποιήσεις,—“well and *worthily of God*.” The words mean, in a manner worthy of Him whose messengers they are and whose servant thou art). For on behalf of the Name (of Christ : see the second ref., and cf. Ignat. ad Eph. 3 and 7, pp. 648 f., and ad Philad. 10, p. 705, δοξάσαι τὸ ὄνομα. Bengel says, “subandi, Dei, Lev. xxiv. 11. Conf. Jac. ii. 7.” But neither of these places applies. O. T. usage is naturally no guide for us here ; and St. James alludes to the name of Christ) they went forth (on their missionary journey : not, as Beza, Erasm.-Schmidt, Wolf, Carpzov., Bengel, “were driven forth.” see more below), taking nothing (receiving nothing by way of benefaction or hire : even as St. Paul in Achaia, 1 Cor. ix. 18, 2 Cor. xi. 7 ff., xii. 16 ff., 1 Thess. ii. 9 ff. : against Huther, who denies the applicability of the comparison, seeing that in St. Paul’s case they were *Christian churches* : but so must these have been,

before they would contribute to the support of their missionaries. Notice μηδέν ; implying that it was their own deliberate purpose ; refusing to take any thing : οὐδέν would have expressed only the *fact*, which might have arisen from the remission of the *εθνικοί*, and might have been considered by themselves as a hardship. This is the force of μηδέν, and not as Dusterd., that οὐδέν would only have stated the *fact*, but by μηδέν the Apostle presents it for the consideration of his readers) from the heathens (reff. The expositors spoken of above under ἐξηλθον, take these words as belonging to it, “expulsi sunt a paganis,” and interpret μηδέν λαμβάνοντες, “nihil secum asportantes,” “omnibus rebus spoliati.” Grot., who takes ἐξηλθον of expulsion, understands it to have been “a Judæa, per Judæos incredulos, ob Christum.” and takes the rest as meaning “potuerant in ista calamitate adjuvari misericordia τῶν ἐξω, sed maluerunt omnia Christianis debere.” But the whole interpretation is forced and unnatural, and the ordinary one obvious, and very suitable, considering the motive put forward in ver. 8, which clearly shews them to have been workers for God’s truth. The pres. part. λαμβάνοντες indicates, not what they did *when* they ἐξηλθον, but their habit after their setting out : and is as so often, indicative of norm, without any particular time being pointed out. So that we need not, with Huther and Dusterd., imagine that there is an allusion to a missionary *maxim*, to take nothing from the heathen, in accordance with which they acted). We therefore (ἡμεῖς, contrast to the *εθνικοί* : οὐδ, because they μηδέν λαμβάνουσιν ἀπὸ τ. ἐθνικῶν) ought to support (see Strabo in reff. Notice the allusion to λαμβάνοντες above. The word

ἵνα ^e συνεργοὶ γινώμεθα τῇ ^f ἀληθείᾳ. ^g Ἐγγραφά τι τῇ ^e ἐκκλησίᾳ· ἀλλ' ^h ὁ ^g φιλοπρωτεύων αὐτῶν Διοτρέφης οὐκ ^h ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς. ¹⁰ διὰ τοῦτο, ἐὰν ἔλθω, ⁱ ὑπομνήσω αὐτοῦ τὰ ἔργα ^h ἀποιεὶ λόγοις πονηροῖς ^j φλυαρῶν ἡμᾶς, καὶ μὴ ^k ἄρκομένους ἐπὶ τοῦτοις ^l οὔτε αὐτοὺς ^h ἐπιδέχεται ^g ^{τὸς, Polyb.}

^{frag. 115.)} ^h here bis only+. ¹ Macc. xii. 8 al. ^{Polyb. vi. 24. 7.} see notes. ⁱ Luke ^{xxiii. 61.} ^{John xiv. 26.} ² Tim. ii. 14. ^{Tit. iii. 1.} ² Pet. i. 12. ^{Jude 5 only+.} ^{Wisd. xviii. 22} only. ^(-μνησις, 2 Pet. i. 13) ^j here only+. ^(not transit elsw.) ^{Xen. Anab. iii. 1. 26.} ^(-πος, 1 Tim. v. 13.) ^k elsw. v. dat., ^{Luke iii. 14.} ¹ Tim. v. 8. ^{Heb. xiii. 5.} ² Macc. v. 15. ^{(act., Matt. xxv. 9.} ^{John vi. 7.} ^{xiv. 8.} ² Cor. xii. 9 only.) ^l so ^{John iv. 11.} ^{v. 37, 38.}

γινόμεθα C c: γενομεθα K f¹ 36(sic) Thl.

for αληθεια, εκκλησια AN¹.

9. εγγραφας B.

rec om ti, with KL[P] rel ath Thl Ec: for τι, αν N³ d 13. 36.

40 syri, scripsissem forsitan vulg: αν τι 29. 66²: txt ABCN¹ coptt.

10. for εαν αν A.

ins eis bef ημας C. (garriens in nos vulg.)

does not seem to signify "receive hospitably," as some have explained it, nor does it imply, as Ec., Thl., appealing to *ὑπέλαβόν με ὡσεὶ λέων ἔτοιμος εἰς θήραν*, Ps. xvi. 12, anticipating, not waiting to be asked, in the exercise of good offices) such persons, that we may become fellow-workers (with them) for the truth (this, and not as vulg. "ut cooperatores simus veritatis" (so Luth., Grot., Bengel, al.), is the construction. Those with whom one is *συνεργός*, are put in the *gen.*, see Rom. xvi. 3, 9, 21, 1 Cor. iii. 9 al. The dat. is com-modi: to promote the cause of the truth: so *συνεργοὶ εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τ. θεοῦ*, Col. iv. 11.—*συνεργὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ*, 1 Thess. iii. 2).

9, 10.] *Notice of the hostility of Diot-rephes.* I wrote somewhat to the church (the τι does not imply that the thing written was specially important, nor on the other hand does it depreciate; but merely designates indefinitely: cf. Acts xxiii. 17, *ἔχει γὰρ ἀπαγγεῖλαι τι αὐτῷ*, and Luke vii. 40, *Σίμων, ἔχω σοὶ τι εἰπεῖν*: and Matt. xx. 20. The contents of the Epistle are not hinted at. The "scrip-sissem forsitan" of the vulgate (*ἔγραψα ἄν*, see var. readd.) has arisen from a foolish notion that the Apostle must not be represented as having written any thing which has been lost to us. The *ἐκκλησία* is apparently the church of which Caius was a member: not as Bengel, that out of which the missionaries of ver. 7 had gone forth): howbeit (ἀλλά after an affirmative sentence is stronger than the mere adversative *but*: see Kühner, Gr. ii. p. 436) Diot-rephes who loveth pre-eminence (ὁ ὑπαρπάζων τὰ πρωτεία as the ancient Schol. He appears to have been not, as Bede, "hæresiarcha temporis illius quidam superbus et insolens, malens nova dicendo primum sibi usurpare scientiæ quam antiquis sanctæ Ecclesiæ, quæ Johannes præ-

dicabat, humiliter auscultare mandatis:" so much is not implied in the words, but only that he was an ambitious man who willed that not the Apostle but himself should rule the church) over them (the members of the church, implied in the word *ἐκκλησία*. The *gen.* after verbs of pre-eminence, as *ὁς ἀριστεύεσκε μάχεσθαι Τρώων*, Il. ζ. 460: *καλλιστεύσει πασῶν τῶν ἐν Σπάρτῃ γυναικῶν*, Herod. vi. 161. See Kühner, ii. p. 197) receiveth us not (does not recognize our authority: here in an improper sense, but in the next verse probably literal: see there. Its more usual sense in Polybius, who uses it frequently, is to *admit of*, τοῦ καιροῦ οὐκ ἐπιδεχο-μένου καταμονήν, iii. 79. 12. The *ἡμᾶς* wants no explanation such as "*monita nostra*," "*συστατικὰς nostras*," or the like: in rejecting the Apostle's person, he rejected all his influence). On this account, if I should come (see for *ἐάν* 1 John ii. 28), I will bring to mind (i. e. as Bede, "in omnium notitiam manifestius arguendo producam:" see reff. No αὐτόν is understood: it is not to his mind, but to the minds of all) his works which he doeth (what they were, is explained by the participle following), prating against us (this is the best rendering of *φλυαρῶν*, which conveys not only the *λοιδωρῶν*, *κακολογῶν* of Ec., but also that the reproaches were mere tattle, worth nothing, irrelevant: so Eustathius on Il. χ. 361, in Raphael, h. l., τὸ ἐν οὐ δέοντι λόγοις προΐεαι φλυεῖν λέγεται κ. φλυαρεῖν. Cf. 1 Tim. v. 13) with wicked speeches: and not satisfied with (ἀρκεῖσθαι is ordinarily (see reff.) with a dative: the ἐπὶ, as in *χαίρειν ἐπὶ*, and similar expressions, introduces the ground on which the ἀρκεῖσθαι superimponitur) this (more probably plur., as in ver. 4, where the whole matter in question is meant, than as agreeing with the *λόγοι πονηροί*, which had not been the only

m = John ix. 34, 35. Prov. xxii 10. n ver. 1. o 2 Thess. iiii. 7, 9. Heb. xiii. 7 only. r. Wisd. iv. 2. BN. xv. 9 only. (-μητής, Heb. vi. 12.) p Rom. iii. 9. vii. 21. xii. 21 bis xii. 4 bis. xvi. 19. 1 Cor. xiii. 5 only. 17. Luke vi. 45. Rom. i. 10 vii 13 bis i Pet. iii. 13 2 Kings xiv 17. s Luke vi. 9 Mk. 33, 35. 1 Pet. ii. 15, 20 iii. 6, 17 only Num. x. 32. (-α, 1 Pet. iv. 19. -ός, 1 Pet. ii. 14.) t 1 John ii. 16 i eff. u Mark iii. 4; L. 1 Pet. iii. 17 only Lev. v. 4. (-ος, 1 Pet. iii. 16.) v 1 John iii. 6 y 1 John i. 3 reff. x so ver. 8

τοὺς ἀδελφούς¹ καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους κωλύει καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας^m ἐκβάλλει. 11 n Ἀγαπητέ, μὴ^o μοι^q τὸ κακόν, ἀλλὰ^q τὸ ἀγαθόν. ὁ^s ἀγαθοποιῶν^t ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστίν· ὁ^u κακοποιῶν οὐχ^v ἑώρακεν^y τὸν θεόν. 12 Δημητρίῳ^w μεμαρτύρηται ὑπὸ πάντων καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς^x ἀληθείας·^y καὶ ἡμεῖς^y δὲ

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h j k
l m o 13

for βουλομενους, επιδεχομενους C vulg syr-pk syr-mg sah arm: txt ABKL[P]N rel am syr-txt copt aeth Thl Ec. om εν N b h [not B, Tischdxf expr].

11. rec ins δε bef κακοποιων, with L a h m tol copt aeth arm Thl Ec Did-int: ins και bef o kak. syr-pk: om ABCK[P]N rel 40 vulg syr(Treg) sah.

12. ins εκκλησιας και bef της αληθειας C syr-pk syr-mg arm. (α, λ, η re-written by an ancient hand in A; there is no reason to suppose that the original scribe wrote εκκλησιας, see Woide.) υπο [C]N.

things mentioned of him), neither doth he himself receive the brethren (here επι-δέχομαι seems best taken in its literal sense, as in Polyb. xxii. 1. 3, *ἀπαντας ἐπεδέχετο φιλανθρώπως* (if the reading can be depended upon), of entertaining hospitably, see 2 John 10. The ἀδελφοί are probably the same as in ver. 5, the travelling missionaries), and (so καὶ after οὐτε in reff., and Eur. Iph. Taur. 595 f., *εἰ γὰρ οὐτε δυσγενής, καὶ τὰς Μυκῆνας οἶσθα*. τε is more frequently found, see Kühner, Gramm. ii. p. 441. The occurrence of the construction explains itself. It is found when the negative form of the first member of a series of connected clauses, is not possible or not convenient in the second or any following one. Here it might have been, but not so forcibly expressed, οὐτε τοὺς βουλομένους ἐξ) hinders (by forbidding: cf. 1 Thess. ii. 16) those that would (receive them), and casts them (those that would receive the brethren: not, as C. F. Fritzsche, Carpzov., al., the travelling brethren themselves) out of the church (manifestly, by excommunication, which owing to his influence among them he had the power to inflict. There is no difficulty, nor any occasion to take the word as pointing at that which Diotrephes was attempting to do or threatening to do, and so as spoken in irony (Huther): the present tense indicates his habit, as ἐπιδέχεται and ποιεῖ above. He was evidently one in high power, and able to forbid, and to punish, the reception of the travelling brethren. See prolegg.).

11.] Upon occasion of the hostility just mentioned, St. John exhorts Caius to imitate not the evil but the good,—pro-

bably as shewn in the praises of Demetrius which follow. Beloved, imitate not evil (τὸ κακόν, abstract), but good (abstract also). He that doeth good, is from God (is born of God, and has his mission and power from Him: as so often in the first Epistle): he that doeth evil, hath not seen God (so in reff., *pās ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτόν*, where see note. And yet this expression is called by Lücke and De Wette "unjohanneisch," and 1 John iv. 20, adduced to prove it, where the word ἑώρακεν is used in its literal physical sense).

12.] *The praise of Demetrius.* Testimony hath been borne to Demetrius by all (scil. who know him, and have brought report concerning him: "nemo qui non"), and by the truth itself (it is not very easy to explain this expression. If we understand it that the reality of facts themselves supports the testimony of the πάντες, we have abundance of authority for the expression in classical usage: Wetst. gives, from Demost. contra Neær. (qu. page?), *δεῖ δ' ὑμᾶς ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἀκουσάντας τῆς τε κατηγορίας καὶ τῆς ἀπολογίας οὕτως ἥδη τὴν ψῆφον φέρειν*: de corona, p. 232, *τούτων τοιούτων ὄντων καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας οὕτω δεικνυμένων*. And from Æsch., contra Timarch., *καταμεμαρτυρημένους ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐαυτοῦ βίου καὶ τῆς ἀληθείας*. And thus Ec. (*ὅπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἀλ., τοῦ ἐνεργοῦς λόγου· εἰσι γὰρ τινες οἷς μαρτυρεῖται μὲν ἀρετῇ, κατεψευσμένη δὲ ἐπὶ ἀπράκτῳ λόγῳ*), Corn.-a-lap., Bart. Petr., Grot. ("rebus ipsis"), Joach.-Lange, Carpzov., G. Lange, al., and Beausobre, who (Düsterd.) explains it "sa conduite est un témoignage réel

μαρτυροῦμεν, καὶ ^zοἶδας ὅτι ἡ ^zμαρτυρία ἡμῶν ^zἀληθής ^zἐστίν. z John v. 32.
xxi. 24.
2 John 12.
b 2 Cor. iii. 3.
2 John 12
(reff.) only †.
c = here only.
Ps xlv. 1.
(Matt xi. 7.
Rev. xi. 1
al.)
d 2 John 12
reff.

¹³ Πολλὰ ^aεἶχον γράψαι σοι, ἀλλ' οὐ θέλω διὰ ^bμέλανος καὶ ^cκαλάμου σοι γράφειν, ¹⁴ἐλπίζω δὲ εὐθέως σε ἰδεῖν, καὶ ^dστόμα πρὸς ^dστόμα λαλήσομεν. ¹⁵^eεἰρήνη σοι.

e John xx. 19, 26. 1 Pet. v. 14. Judg. vi. 23.

rec (for ο.δας) οἰδατε, with KL rel syrr Thl Œc: οἰδαμεν b² c h: om και οιδας a: txt ABC[P]N d g 36 vulg D-lat coptt æth arm. ἀληθης εστιν bef η μαρτυρια ημων m æth: αληθ. ημ. εστ. η μαρτ. C 68.

¹³. rec (for γραψαι σοι) γραφειν, with KL[P] rel Œc: txt ABCN m 40 D-lat syrr coptt æth arm Thl, *tibi scribere* vulg. [αλλα B(Tischdf, expr)]. for ου θελω, ουκ εβουληθην A vulg. καλαμου (itacism) L. rec (for γραφειν) γραψαι, with KL[P] rel Thl Œc: txt ABCN m.—γρα. bef σοι A 13 vulg D-lat syrr copt: om σοι arm.

¹⁴. rec ιδειν bef σε, with KL[P]N rel copt Thl Œc: txt ABC m vulg D-lat (σε is omd in both edns of Mai, the reading of B is as here stated: see table at end of prolegg). [for προς, προ B¹(Tischdf).] λαλησωμεν K Thl: λαλησαμεν N¹, but o is written over a (l m?).

de sa vertu." But there are two reasons against this view: 1) that it does not correspond to the objective fact asserted in the *μεμαρτύρηται*, nor to the parallelizing of this testimony with that of the *πάντες* and that of the Apostle: and 2) that thus the Christian and divine sense of ἡ ἀλήθεια which St. John seems always to put forward, would be entirely sunk. Nor is the former of these met either by Schlichting, who says, "si ipsa veritas loqui posset, homini isti præberet testimonium virtutis et probitatis," or by Lücke, "if infallible Christian truth itself, cf. ver. 3, could be asked, it would bear favourable witness of him." Against both there is the *μεμαρτύρηται*, as matter of fact, not of hypothesis. Baumg.-Crus. would understand that Demetrius had done much for the truth, and his deeds were his witness: but this is hardly a witness of ἡ ἀλήθεια to him. Sander takes refuge in the extraordinary supposition, that the Holy Spirit had revealed to the Apostle the truth respecting Demetrius. Huther regards the testimony borne by the truth to be that furnished by the *πάντες*, whose evidence was decisive, not from their credit as men, but because they all spoke of and from the truth of Christ dwelling in them. This would reduce this new *μαρτυρία* to the former, and would in fact besides include the following in it likewise. The best interpretation is that of Düsterdieck (from whom much of this note is derived). The objective Truth of God, which is the divine rule of the walk of all believers, gives a good testimony to him who really walks in the truth. This witness lies in the accordance of his walk with the re-

quirement of God's Truth. It was the mirror in which the walk of Demetrius was reflected: and his form, thus seen in the mirror of God's Truth, in which the perfect form of Christ is held up to us (1 John ii. 6, iii. 3, 16), appeared in the likeness of Christ; so that the mirror itself seemed to place in a clear light his Christian virtue and uprightness, and thus to bear witness to him): yea, we too (see ref. and note there. The contrast here is between his own personal testimony (for to that and not to any collective one does *ἡμεῖς* refer) and the two testimonies foregoing) bear testimony, and thou knowest that our testimony is true (see ref.).

^{13—15.} *Close of the Epistle.* I had (not, as Huther, for *εἶχον ἄν*: it is a pure imperfect, describing that which has not come to pass, but might have done so under certain conditions: cf. Acts xxv. 22: Rom. ix. 3, also alleged by Düsterd. is not quite a case in point. He gives the meaning here well: "I had indeed much to write: that I have not written it is owing to this, that I wish not, &c.") many things to write to thee, howbeit I will not to write (present, not only "to write them," which would be aorist, but to write at all, to write any more) by means of ink and reed (see on 2 John 12): but (on the other hand) I hope immediately to see thee, and (then) we shall speak mouth to mouth (see 2 John 12). Peace be to thee (beautifully paraphrased by Lyra, "Pax interna conscientiæ, pax fraterna amicitia, pax superna gloriæ.") Remember our Lord's legacy, John xiv. 27, and His greeting after the Resurrection, *εἰρήνη ὑμῖν*, John xx. 19, 26). The

^f John x. 3
only.

ἀσπάζονται σε οἱ φίλοι. ἀσπάζου τοὺς φίλους ^f κατ'
ὄνομα.

ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ Γ.

...j.
ABCKL
P R a b c
d f g h k
l m o 13

15. for φίλοι, ἀδελφοί A d m 13 syr-mg æth. ασπασαι N. at end ins
αμην L 15. 26; *vale* tol.

SUBSCRIPTION. elz om, with rel: τέλος h: ἐπιστολή γ' του αγίου αποστολου ιωαννου
L: ιωαννου επιστολη γ' C: txt ABN. [P doubtful.] Here, as elsewhere, B spells
ιωαννου with only one ν.

friends salute thee. Salute the friends
by name ("non secus ac si nomina eorum
præscripta essent." Bengel). The reason
why St. John mentions φίλοι (see John xi.
11, xv. 15; Acts xxvii. 3), and not ἀδελ-
φοί (1 Cor. xvi. 20; Phil. iv. 21; Eph. vi.

23), is probably to be found in the per-
sonal character of the Epistle, not ad-
dressed as from an Apostle to a church,
but as from a friend to his friend, in which
mutual friends on both sides would be the
senders and receivers of salutation.

ΙΟΥΔΑ.

..C

1 Ἰούδας Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ^a δούλος, ἀδελφὸς δὲ Ἰακώ- ^a Phil. i. 1.
 βου, τοῖς ^b ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ^b ἡγαπημένοις καὶ Ἰησοῦ χριστῷ ^b here only.
^c τετρημένοις ^d κλητοῖς. ² ἔλεος ὑμῶν καὶ ^e εἰρήνη καὶ ^c = John xvii.
^e ἀγάπη ^f πληθυνθείη. ^d = Rom. i. 6,
 7. 1 Cor. i.
 24.

c here only. see 2 John 3 reff.

f 1 Pet. i. 2. 2 Pet. i. 2. Dan. iii. 31 (98).

TITLE. elz ιουδα του αποστολου επιστολη καθολικη [with P?]: Steph επ. τ. ιουδα καθ.: επ. του αγιου αποστ. ιουδα L al Thl: αλλος αδελφοθεος ταδ' ιουδας ευσεβεεισιν f: επ. ιουδα αδελφου ιακωβου k: ιουδα καθολικη επ. h o: ευ. επ. καθ. l m: ιουδα επιστολη A(appy) CK 13. 36(sic): txt BN.

VERSE 1. χριστου bef ιησου K[P] b c d k l o 40 demid tol: txt ABLN rel vss Orig Synop Lucif. rec (for ηγαπημενοις) ηγιασμενοις, with KL[P] rel Thl: txt ABN vulg syr coptt arm Orig Ephr Synop Ec Thl-comm Lucif Aug Cassiod Bede. (13 def.) 2. om 1st και K.

1, 2.] *Address and greeting.* Judas, a servant of Jesus Christ (δούλος, probably not here in the wider sense, in which all Christians are servants of Christ—but in that special sense in which those were bound to His service who were employed in the preaching and disseminating of His word: see reff.: on the absence of any official designation, see prolegomena), and brother of James (see prolegomena), to the called (in the sense of St. Paul (reff.); effectually drawn by God the Father to the knowledge of the Gospel), beloved in (the phrase is one not elsewhere found, and difficult of interpretation. The meanings “by,” = ὑπό, cf. 2 Thess. ii. 13, ἀδελφοὶ ἡγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου; “on account of,” understanding ἡγαπημένοις “beloved by the writer,” are hardly admissible. The only allowable sense of ἐν seems to be, “in the case of,” “as regards,” understanding of course that the love of the Father is spoken of) God the Father (St. Paul ordinarily in his greetings adds ἡμῶν to θεὸς πατὴρ, cf. Rom. i. 7; 1 Cor. i. 3; 2 Cor. i. 2; Eph. i. 2; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 2.

2 Thess. i. 1; Philem. 3. But he has θεὸς πατὴρ absolutely in the following places; Gal. i. 1, 2; Eph. vi. 23; Phil. ii. 11; 2 Thess. i. 2; 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; Tit. i. 4; as also St. Peter, 1 Pet. i. 2; 2 Pet. i. 17; St. John, 2 John 3. It became more frequently used, as might be expected, in the later days of the canon) and kept for Jesus Christ (reserved, to be His at the day of His coming: the dative is commodi. If the question be asked, kept by whom? the answer must be, by God the Father: though constructionally the words are not connected. Observe the perfect participles, giving the signification “from of old and still”): mercy to you and peace and love be multiplied (all three proceeding from God: God’s mercy, God’s peace, God’s love: see ver. 21. In the somewhat similar passage, Eph. vi. 23, εἰρήνη τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κ. ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς κ. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, the love and faith are clearly, in themselves, the gift of God: mutual love or love towards God. But the other seems better here).

g¹ John n 7 3 ε 'Αγαπητοί, ^h πᾶσαν ⁱ σπουδὴν ^j ποιούμενος γράφειν C αγα-
 ref^t ὑμῖν περὶ τῆς ^k κοινῆς ἡμῶν σωτηρίας, ^l ἀνάγκην ¹ ἔσχον ABCKL
 h = Acts iv. 29. γράφαι ὑμῖν ^m παρακαλῶν ⁿ ἐπαγωνίζεσθαι τῇ ^o ᾧ παῖς P a b c
 xx. 19 Rom. ^p παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ^q ἁγίοις ^r πίστει. ^s Παρεισέδυσαν γάρ d f g h k
 Phil. n. 29. ^t τινες ἄνθρωποι, οἱ ^u πάλαι ^v προγεγραμμένοι εἰς τούτο το l m o 13
 2 Pet. i. 5 al.
 fr.
 i Rom. xii. 8.
 Heb. vi. 11.
 2 Pet. i. 5.
 Exod. xii. 11.
 j pres. part., = Acts xiii. 28 al. k = Acts ii. 44 iv. 32 Tit. i. 4 only. 2 Macc ix. 21. l Luke xiv.
 18. [xxii. 17.] i Cor vii. 37. Heb. vii. 27. Jos. Antt xvi. 9 3 aor = 1 Pet. v. 12. m = Rom. xii.
 1. 1 Pet. ii. 11 al. fr. n here only t. (ἀγωνίζ., Sir. iv. 28) o = Heb. vi. 4. ix. 26, 27, 28 x.
 2. 1 Pet. iii. 18. ver. 5. p Acts xvi. 4. 2 Pet. ii. 21 al. q = Acts ix. 13, 32, 41 xxvi. 10 Rom.
 i. 7 al. fr. (Ps. xv. 3.) r = Rom. i. 5. Gal. i. 23 iii. 23, 25. s here only t. Plutarch and
 Philo, &c in Wtstst t Heb. i. 1 ref^t u Rom. xv. 4. Gal. iii. 1. Eph. iii. 3 only t. Esdr. vi.
 31 f(πρoσy. A). 1 Macc. x. 38 only

3. **Ν** joins αγαπητοι to ver 2. ins του bef γράφειν **Ν**. rec om ημων, with
 KL[P] rel copt æth: ins AB C(appy) **Ν** 36 syrr sah arm Cyr Thl Lucif, υμων in 6. 25
 vulg Ephr Bede. (13 def.) aft σωτηρίας ins και ζωης **Ν**. for γράφαι, γραφιν **Ν**.
 4. παρεισεδυσαν B(ita cod). ins και bef παλαι **Ν**.

3, 4.] *Purpose, and occasion, of the Epistle.* 3.] Beloved (only found in the beginning of an Epistle here and 3 John 2), giving all diligence (the phrase σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι is only found here: see reff. and especially 2 Pet. It implies more than mere earnest desire: a man's σπουδὴ is necessarily action as well as wish: "giving diligence" seems the exact idea required. The participle like other present participles is contemporaneous with the verb to which it is attached, viz. ἔσχον: cf. John ix. 25, τυφλὸς ὃν ἔσθι βλέπω, "I, who am a blind man, now see") to write to you concerning the common salvation (thus must the sentence be arranged, and not as Lachm. al., with a comma after ὑμῖν, and joining περὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἡμ. σωτηρίας to the next clause. For thus the participial clause loses all its weight and propriety, and indeed the apodosis likewise: see below. περὶ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας may mean, concerning the fact of our common salvation, brought in by Christ; or concerning the means of attaining that salvation, i. e. the doctrines and practices by which it is to be forwarded. Perhaps the latter is here preferable. On the idea conveyed by κοινῆς, see reff. and 2 Pet. i. 1), I found it necessary (reff.: not, as E. V., "it was needful:" nor as Grot., "nihil potius habui, quam ut:" the ἀνάγκη was not part of the σπουδὴν ποιῆσθαι, but supervened on it owing to the circumstance to be mentioned in the next verse) to write to you (notice the aorist here following the present before: I was most desirous to write (present expressing merely the general fact of writing) . . . : but I found it necessary to write (at once: to have written, "epistolam absolvere") . . .) exhorting (you) to contend earnestly for (cf. συναλοῦντες τῇ πίστει, Phil. i. 27: the ἐπί gives the purpose for which the fight is to

be waged) the faith (objective here: the sum of that which Christians believe: "fides quæ creditur" not "quæ creditur") once for all ("particula valde urgens: nulla alia dabitur fides," Bengel. This is obscured by the "once" of the E. V., which represents merely "olim," not "semel") delivered to the saints (i. e. Christians: believers, as in reff. The meaning then of this verse is, that St. Jude, who was before earnestly desirous to write to the Church universal concerning the salvation which is common to us all (De Wette, after Sherlock, supposes that St. Jude was actually engaged on a larger and more general Epistle, and was compelled to break it off by the necessity mentioned. This may have been so: but we can hardly gather so much from the words), found urgent occasion at once to do so, respecting not merely nor directly that common salvation, but one point, viz. the keeping inviolate the faith once for all delivered to God's people. And the reason of this necessity which arose, now follows). 4.] For there crept in (aor. explaining the arising of the occasion of his thus writing. On παρεισέδυσαν, cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1, παρεισέξουσιν, and note: also Gal. ii. 4, where we have both παρεισέκτους and παρεισήλθοι. Secrecy, and lack of legitimate introduction, are plainly expressed in this word. "Crept in," viz. into the Christian church) certain men ("le mot *times* a quelque chose de méprisant, comme dans Gal. ii. 12," Arnaud. And so, it may be observed, has ἄνθρωποι in this connexion) (men) who have been of old written down in prophecy (by the οἱ προγεγρ. these persons are again brought up and designated; q. d. "namely, the very men who &c." προγεγραμμένοι has been variously interpreted. The prep. may have two meanings: either 1) that of time, previously, as in Gal. iii. 1, where

^v κρίμα, ^w ἀσεβεῖς, τὴν τοῦ ^x θεοῦ ἡμῶν ^{xy} χαριτα ^z μετα-
 τιθέντες εἰς ^a ἀσέλγειαν, καὶ τὸν μόνον ^{bc} δεσπότην καὶ
 κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν χριστὸν ^{cd} ἀρνούμενοι. ^d εἴ-
 μνησαι δὲ ἱμάς βούλομαι, ^e εἰδότας ^f ἅπαξ ^g πάντα, ὅτι

only. Ps i 1. x = Tit. ii 11. 1 Pet. v. 12 see 2 Pet. ii. 18.
 z Heb. vii. 12 reff. a Mark vii. 22. Rom. xii. 13. 2 Cor. xii. 21. 1 Pet. iv. 3 al. + Wind
 b = (see note) Luke ii. 29. Acts iv. 24. Rev. vi. 10. Jer. iv. 10. c 2 Pet. ii. 1. d 1 John
 ii. 22, 23 reff. e 3 John 10 reff. f 1 John ii. 20. g = ver. 3.

1ec (for χαριτα) χαριν, with CKL[P]N rel: txt AB. rec aft δεσποτην ins θεον,
 with KL[P] rel syrr Thl: om ABCN b¹ d o 13. 36 vulg coptt æth arm Ephr Did Ps-
 Chr Cyr Lucif Cassiod Bede.

5. for δε, ουν C Lucif. rec aft ειδοντας ins υμας, with KLN rel Ec Thl: om
 ABC² c d 13. 36 vulg syrr coptt æth arm Cyr Lucif Jer. (C¹ doubtful.) om απαξ
 here, insg it bef λαον below, N 163 arm: bef οτι K. rec (for παντα) τουτο, with
 KL rel sah Ec Thl: txt ABC²N 13 vulg syr copt æth arm Ephr Cyr Lucif Jer, παν-

the various meanings of the word are discussed: 2) that of publicity, "*openly*," taking "to proscribe" as the sense of the word. But it is against this latter that this sense is never found in the N. T.: and that "proscribed," if taken in its usual meaning, will not admit of εἰς τοῦτο τὸ κρίμα following it. Wolf's interpretation, "qui dudum sunt accusati in hoc iudicium," lets go the proscripti altogether. There can be little doubt then that we must keep πρὸς to its temporal sense, as indeed do Ec., Thl. (but understanding the reference wrongly: προγεγραμμένους δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔλεγεν, ὅτι καὶ Πέτρος κ. Παῦλος περὶ αὐτῶν εἶρηκεν ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάτοις χρόνοις ἐλεύσονται πλάνοι τοιοῦτοι κ.τ.λ.), and most recent Commentators. Then, thus understanding it, to what time and fact are we to refer such designation of them? Clearly not to God's eternal purpose, in this place, from the term πλάι, which, as Huther remarks, is never used of that purpose, but points to some fact *in time*. And if so, then the previous writing down of these men can only point to the O. T. prophecies. In that case there is a pregnant construction, "of old fore-described (and destined)." What special description of them is intended, might be difficult to say were it not for the quotation below ver. 14 from the prophecy of Enoch. The warnings contained in the historical facts adduced below may also be meant. It may be observed that the ultra-prædestinarians, Beza and Calvin, find, as we might expect, strong defence for their views in their interpretation here. Beza indeed gathers from this place, "hoc æternum Dei decretum non modo eventum rerum, sed ipsas imprimis personas comprehendere" to this judgment (what judgment, or rather result of judgment? "Iudicium de quo mox," as Bengel: the sentence which St. Jude has in his mind and proceeds in the following verses to unfold.

κρίμα, as so often, though not = κατά-κριμα, yet gets the condemnatory meaning from the character of the context), *impious, changing the grace of our God (τὴν χάριτα, the gift of grace, the state of salvation, in which our sins are forgiven us and we are admitted into the freedom of God's children. ἡμῶν, drawing closer the bond of God's true children to Him and one another, and thus producing greater abhorrence of those who have thus abused His grace) into lasciviousness (the words might mean, "perverting the grace of our God in the direction of, for the purpose of, lasciviousness:" and so De Wette: but it is against this, that μετατιθέναι in reff. is simply to change, not to pervert: and we therefore must understand, as above, that they made the state of grace and Christian liberty into a state of (moral) licence and wantonness: as Bede, "hanc ejus gratiam transferunt in luxuriam, qui nunc tanto licentius et liberius peccant quanto minus se vident asperitate legis de admissis facinoribus examinari")*, and denying (see 2 Pet. ii. 1) *the only Master, and our Lord Jesus Christ* (in 2 Pet. ii. 1 δεσπότης is used of Christ: which circumstance might tempt us to refer it to Christ here also: and so Bengel, De Wette, Stier, al. But probability seems to weigh on the other side. In every other place (see reff.) δεσπότης is used of God: 2) the addition *μόνος* seems to bind this meaning to it here: (3) the denial of God by disobeying His law is the epexegetic resumption of the last clause: 4) δεσποτην κ. κύριον are hardly distinguishable if both applied to Christ. For these reasons I must agree with Huther, in regarding the rejected θεόν as having been, although a gloss, yet a true one: and would remind the reader, once for all, that the reference of any term in the parallel place of 2 Peter is no guide for us here, seeing that it belongs to the ex-

h = Matt. i. 21. Ἰησοῦς ἡ λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου ἰσώσας, κ τὸ δεύτερον ABCKL
Nab c d
f g h k l
m o 13
 Luke ii. 32. αἱ φ. Deut.
 iv. 20. τοὺς ἰμὴ ἰπιστεύσαντας ἀπόλεσεν. ὁ ἀγγέλους τε τοὺς
 i John xii. 27. μὴ ἰτηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτὸν ἄρχήν, ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀπολιπόντας
 1 Macc. ii. 59. ἡ ἰτηρήσαντας τὴν ἑαυτὸν ἄρχήν, ἀλλὰ ὁ ἀπολιπόντας
 k 2 Cor. xii. 2. τὸ ἰδίου οἰκητήριον, ἰ εἰς κρίσιν ἰ μεγάλης ἰ ἡμέρας
 Gen. xxii. 15 j xxxvii.
 36. 12 Thess. i. 12. m = Rev. xvi. 15 reff. n = Eph. i. 21. iii. 10. Col. i. 16. ii. 10 al. Gen. xli. 13.
 o = here (2 Tim. iv. 13, 20. Tit. i. 5. Heb. iv. 6, 9. x. 26) only. p = Gal. vi. 9 al. q 2 Cor. v. 2 only
 xxxii j xxx. j 30 Alid r John xii. 7. Acts xxi. 21. 1 Pet. i. 4. 2 Pet. ii. 4. s = Matt. x.
 15. xi. 22. 2 Thess. i. 5 al. fr. Isa. i. 24. t = Rev. vi. 17 reff.

tas syr-pk. (C¹ is lost.) rec (for ἰησοῦς) ο κυριος, with (C¹ P) KL rel syr Synop
 Ec Thl, κυριος N: ο θεος C² 5. 8. 68 tol syr-pk arm Clem Lucif: txt AB(sic: see table)
 13 vulg coptt aeth Cyr Did-int Jer Cassian.

6. for τε, δε A f vulg syr copt Ath-4-mss Thl Jer Cassiod: txt BCKLX rel syr-pk sah
 aeth arm Clem Orig Ath-mss Ec Lucif Vig. for αλλα, αλλα C a h k m Ath Thl.

tremely curious relation of the two passages to each other, that many common terms are used in different senses).

5—7] *Examples of Divine vengeance.*

5.] *First example:* unbelieving Israel in the wilderness. Cf. Heb. iii. 16—iv. 5. But (solemn contrast to the conduct just mentioned) I wish to remind you, knowing as ye do (better here than “although ye know,” on account of ἀπαξ. “Causa, cur admonest duntaxat; quia jam sciant, semelque cognitum habeant.” Bengel. The E. V. is doubly wrong: in rendering εἰδώς as an aor. part., “though ye . . . knew,” and in giving to ἀπαξ the signification of “*olim*,” “*once*”) once for all (i.e. having once for all received the knowledge of) all things (all that refers to that of which I am speaking: the τοῦτο of the rec. was a good explanation: but πάντα is more forcible, and carries with it a latent admonition, to apply other examples for yourselves), that Jesus (critical principles seem to require this remarkable reading. It is not entirely preceded by 1 Cor. x. 4: for there St. Paul uses not the personal human name, but χριστός, in which there is no such difficulty. The only account to be given seems, that the Person designated by the two names being the same, they became sometimes convertibly used in popular exhortation. On the fact see Exod. xiv. 19; xxiii. 20, 23; xxxii. 2; Isa. lxiii. 9, where however note the remarkable rendering of the LXX, having saved the people (perhaps “a people:” λαός is not one of those words of which we can say that they are constantly found without the art. where yet their meaning is definite: cf. Acts xv. 14, Rom. x. 21, 2 Cor. vi. 16, Heb. viii. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 9 (10). But we are never safe in strictness on this point in these later Epistles; and especially when an objective case is thus thrown forward into emphasis, which emphasis often does the work of the definite article) out of the land of Egypt, secondly (not as E. V., “afterward:” still less with Grot., Wolf, “*ex contrario*”

but it indicates a second deed of the Lord, His first-mentioned having been the deliverance out of Egypt. By this τὸ δεύτερον the former aor. part. is marked as being not contemporary with but antecedent to the aor. verb following) destroyed them that believed not (viz. by forbidding their entrance into the land of promise (cf. Heb. iii. 18), and slaying them in the wilderness. This example is not mentioned in 2 Pet. ii., but instead of it, the judgment of the flood).

6.] *Second example:* the rebel angels. See 2 Pet. ii. 4. And (τε shews that the connexion with the foregoing is very close) angels, those which kept not (ἀγγέλους is probably indefinite, and then the art. τοὺς designates those angels who are meant. μὴ stands with the part., not οὐ, because μὴ τηρήσαντας conveys not only the fact (cf. οἱ οὐκ ἡλεπμένοι, 1 Pet. ii. 10), but the reason for what follows: cf. Matt. xviii. 25, μὴ ἔχοντος αὐτοῦ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ παθεῖναι. See Acts xxi. 34: Luke xii. 47, ἐκεῖνος δ δοῦλος δ . . . μὴ ἐτοιμάσας μὴδὲ ποιήσας . . . δαρήσεται πολλάς: and many more examples in Winer, edn. 6, § 55, where the whole matter is ably discussed) their own dignity (some interpret ἀρχή, as E. V., “first estate,” “original condition.” So Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza, “*originem*.” Stier, “*ihren erften Grund*.” some again, “*the government which was over them*,” viz. that of God: so Ollarius in a dissertation on this passage, cited in Wolf, h. 1. But seeing that angels are often in the N. T. called ἀρχαί, as they also were among the Jews, and that such meaning answers best to the parallel clause which follows, there can be little doubt that the Vulg. “*principatum*” is right. The fact alluded to is probably that which is obscurely indicated in Gen. vi. 2. See prolegomena, but left their own (proper) habitation (viz. heaven), He hath kept (τητήρηκεν, in sharp contrast to τοὺς μὴ τηρήσαντας. The word is a pregnant one, ἔθηκεν or περιέθηκεν, τοῦ

k John xviii. 28. Tit. i. 15 (bis). Heb. xii. 5 only. Ezek. xxvii. 6. 1 Eph. i. 21. Col. i. 16. 2 Pet. ii. 10 only. m Mark vii. 9. Luke x. 16. John xii. 48. 1 Cor. i. 19. Gal. ii. 21 al. Isa. xlviii. 8. (-τησις, Heb. vii. 18) n = 2 Pet. ii. 10 only. (see Philo in note.) o = 2 Pet. ii. 2, 10 al. fr. Isa. lii. 5. p 1 Thess. iv. 16 only +. see Dan xii. 1 LXX. q = Acts xi. 2 (but w. πρός) only. (ver. 22) Jer. xv. 10. r Acts xvii. 2, xix. 8, xx. 7 al. Exod. vi. 27. 2 Macc. xi. 20. s Acts xxiv. 25 only. t = Acts v. 13. Rom. v. 7. 1 Cor. vi. 1. 2 Cor. x. 12. Esth. vii. 5. u (see Polyb. under g.) = John vii. 24. viii. 16. 2 Pet. ii. 11. Deut. xix. 6. v = Rom. ii. 5 only. Gen. xxxvii. 21. = φέρειν, Acts xxv. 18. 2 Pet. ii. 11. w Rev. xiii. 1. xvii. 3. Ezek. xxxv. 12. (μοῦς, 2 Pet. ii. 11.) x gosp. (exc. John) passim. elsewhere, 2 Tim. iv. 2 only. Zech. iii. 2 (? see note).

κυριότηας N Orig.-int.

(ἀλλά, so AB.)

9. for ο δε and οτε, ο τε or οτε and τότε B.

[σοι is repeated by B¹]

for κυριος, ο θεος N¹, ο κυριος N³.

following the same destructive courses. In like manner nevertheless (i.e. notwithstanding these warning examples) these men in their dreams (ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι, by the construction of the sentence which proceeds with σάρκα μὲν μαινοῦσιν, κυρ. δὲ ἀθετοῦσιν, δόξας δὲ βλασφημοῦσιν, —must belong not to the first member alone, but to all. This necessity precludes the whole class of meanings represented by “de somniis, in quibus corpus pollutur:” explained by Calv., “est metaphorica loquutio, qua significat, ipsos esse tam hebetes, ut sine ulla verecundia ad omnem turpitudinem se prostituant.” And those being got rid of, and *a fortiori* the interpretation given by Bretschneider, “falsus oraculis decepti, vel falsa oracula edentes” (see ref.),—we have but this left, that the word should represent that state of dreaming in the sleep of sin, out of which men are so often called on to awake to righteousness and the light of Christ: so (in Huther) Hornerus: “tam insipientes sunt, ut quasi lethargo quodam sopiti non tantum impure vivant, sed etiam quæ non norunt tam audacter vituperent:” and Arnaud (ibid.), “cependant ceux-ci, comme des gens qui agissent sans savoir ce qu’ils font, comme s’ils rêvaient, pour ainsi dire. . . .”) defile the flesh (by unnatural lusts, as in ver. 7. σάρκα, generally: not, “their flesh,” but our common flesh), and despise lordship and speak evil of glories (of what sort? Calv., Beza, Grot., Leclerc, Wolf, Semler, al., understand those of kings and Cæsars: Ec. alt., Hammond, include ecclesiastical rulers and Apostles. But to neither of these meanings can vv. 9, 10 be fitted: and it becomes therefore necessary to understand the words of celestial lordships and dignities: probably in both cases those of the holy angels. So De Wette: similarly Huther, but understanding κυριότητα of God, and δόξας of the angels.

It is against this last view, that κυριότης, in reff. Eph. Col., is used of angels. Philo de Monarchia i. 6, vol. ii. p. 218, says, δόξαν δὲ σὴν εἶναι νομίζω τὰς σε δορυφορούσας δυνάμεις. The ancient interpretations were curious, as given in the Oxf. Catena: τὴν μίαν κυριότητα κ. δόξαν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος βλασφημοῦντες:—again, δόξας ἐκάλεσε τὰς δύο διαδόχους, ὡς ὁ Παῦλος φησὶν, εἰ γὰρ ἡ διακονία τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα, πολλὰ μᾶλλον ἡ διακονία τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξα: and so Severus also, and (Ec. alt.): 9.] But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed concerning the body of Moses, dared not (by the context, from reverence for Satan’s former glory) bring against him a judgment of evil speaking (i.e. as E. V., a railing accusation: a sentence savouring of, belonging to, βλασφημία; not as Calov., “ultionem de blasphemia sumere:” the blasphemy is not one spoken *by*, but *against*, the devil), but said, The Lord rebuke thee (the source of the tradition to which St. Jude here refers as familiar to his readers, is not known with any certainty. Origen, περὶ ἀρχῶν, iii. 2. 1, vol. i. p. 138, says, “primo quidem in Genesi serpens Evam seduxisse describitur: de quo in Ascensione Mosis, ejus libelli meminit in Epistola sua Apostolus Judas, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis, ait. . . .” (Ec. h. l. says, λέγεται τὸν Μιχαὴλ τὸν ἀρχάγγελον τῇ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ταφῇ δεδιηκοηκέναι, τοῦ διαβόλου τοῦτο μὴ καταδεχομένου, ἀλλ’ ἐπιφέροντος ἔγκλημα αὐτῷ τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου φόνου, ὡς αὐτοῦ ὄντος τοῦ Μωϋσέως, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μὴ συγχωρεῖσθαι αὐτὸν τυχεῖν ἐντίμου ταφῆς. No such tradition is found in any apocryphal or rabbinical book now extant. In the targum of Jonathan in Deut. xxxiv. 6, it is stated that the grave of Moses was given into the special custody of Michael. See also several Rabbinical

δὲ ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν ^γβλασφημοῦσιν, ὅσα δὲ ^zφυσικῶς ὡς ^γver. 8. 2 Pet. ii. 12.
 τὰ ^aἄλογα ^bζῶα ^cἐπίστανται, ^dἐν τούτοις ^{de}φθείρονται. ^zhere only +. Diiod. Sic. xx.
 11 ^fοὐαὶ αὐτοῖς, ὅτι τῇ ^gοδῶ τοῦ Κάιν ^hἐπορεύθησαν, ^{55.} (κόσ, 2 Pet. ii. 12.)
^a = 2 Pet. ii. 12 (Acts xxi. 12) only. (Exod. vi. 12. Num. xi. 12.) Wisd xi. 15 only. b Rev. iv. 6 ref. c Acts xxi. 17. xv. 34. 2 Cor. vii. 2. xi. 2. Eph. iv. 22 only. d 2 Pet. ii. 12. Rev. xix. 2. e as above (d). f 1 Cor. John) & Rev. passim. elsewhere, 1 Cor. ix. 16 only. g = 2 Pet. ii. 15. 3 Kings xv. 34.

legends having more or less reference to the point in Wetstein. Some, mentioned as early as Severus in the Catena, have given an allegorical interpretation, understanding by τὸ σῶμα Μωϋσέως the law, or Jewish polity, or even people: and, thus interpreting, fix the occasion very variously: at the giving of the law (τινὲς in Severus): at the siege under Hezekiah, or the rebuilding under Zerubbabel (Starck, in Wolf). All such explanations are of course out of the question: and the literal matter of fact alone to be held fast. It is, however, remarkable, that the same words, ἐπιτιμῆσαι (ἐν) σοι κύριος, are spoken by the angel (κύριος, LXX) to the devil in Zech. iii. 1—3. This has led some, e. g. Bede, to imagine, that this was the occasion referred to, when Joshua and Satan stood as adversaries concerning the deliverance of Israel from captivity. Another and more curious explanation is given in the Catena: *ὅτε ἤγαγεν (ὁ Μιχαήλ) Μωϋσῆν ἐν τῷ ὕρῳ ἔνθα μετεμορφώθη ὁ κύριος, τότε ἔλεγεν ὁ διάβολος τῷ Μιχαήλ, ἐφύσατο ὁ θεὸς εἰσαγαγὼν τὸν Μωϋσῆν, ἔνθα ὥμοσε μὴ εἰσελθεῖν αὐτόν.* The whole matter is thoroughly discussed, and every source of illustration exhausted, in Rampf, Der Brief Judæ u. s. w. pp. 201—253. His conclusion, in which I entirely agree, is that St. Jude took the incident from primitive tradition, which tradition slightly modified, is also given by the prophet Zechariah. That the incident is related as matter of fact, and not as an “argumentum ad hominem,” is evident by the very form of it. That, being thus related as matter of fact, it is matter of fact, is a conclusion which will or will not be made, according as we are or are not persuaded of the authenticity of our Epistle as a part of canonical Scripture: and according as we esteem that canonical Scripture itself).

10.] *Contrast of the behaviour of these persons to that just related.* 2 Pet. ii. 12. These on the other hand, whatever things they know not, speak evil of (the reference in ὅσα μὲν οὐκ οἶδασιν is to the spiritual world. Those who understand κυριότητα and δόξας above of human authorities, are at a loss for an explanation here: so Arnaud, “il est assez difficile

de préciser, quelles étaient ces choses qu’ignoraient ces impies”): but whatever things naturally, as the irrational animals, they understand (viz. the objects of sense: of which σάρξ ver. 8 has already been mentioned as one. φυσικῶς, as Ec., φυσικῇ ὁρμῇ ἀδιακρίτως: Wetst. cites Xen. Cyr. 7, μάχη, ἣν ὁρῶ πάντας ἀνθρώπους φυσικῶς ἐπισταμένους: but it appears from Sturz, Lex. Xen. φύσις, 1. f. that the place is Cyr. ii. 3. 5, and the word φύσει, not φυσικῶς. In Xen. Apol. Socr. iii. 9. 1, we have ἡ ἀνδρεία πότερον εἴη διδασκτὸν ἢ φυσικόν. In 2 Pet. ii. 12, the comparison to irrational creatures is not confined to the sort of knowledge which they have, but is extended to the persons themselves and their conduct), in these (in the element and region of these) they corrupt themselves (or, are depraved).

11.] The description is interrupted by a denunciation on them for having followed in the steps of former ungodly men. Woe unto them (see reif.: from which it appears that Bengel is not exact, when he says “uno hoc loco unus hic apostolus vae intentat”): for they went by the way (the dat. is probably one of rule, cf. reif., rather than one following ἐν understood. The aorists ἐπορεύθησαν, &c. are probably proleptic, as looking back on their course; as those in John xvii.,—ἐγὼ σε ἐδόξεσα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, &c. In an English version we are almost compelled to render these by our perfect, “they have gone,” &c.) of Cain (how? Ec. answers, διὰ τῆς ἀδελφοκτονίας, by perverse doctrine, or even according to his interpretation of ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι above, by abusing that process by which men might be born into the world: Grot., “Cain fratri vitam caducam ademit: illi fratribus adimunt æternam.” But these explanations do not seem to fit the context, where as yet no indication has been given of their seducing power. Some (e. g. Lyra) have answered, from their persecuting the believers: but neither does this appear in the context: others, as De Wette and Arnaud, have regarded Cain simply as a representative of all bad men: Schneckenb., as that of all unbelievers, according to Jewish tradition (“respondit Cain . . . non est iudicium nec iudex, nec est aliud sæculum,”

ⁱ Rom. i. 27. Eph. iv. 14. James v. 20. 2 Pet. ii. 18. iii. 7 al. Jer. xlii. 17. k 2 Pet. ii. 13. 15. Micah iii. 11. (constr. see note.) n = here only +. q Luke i. 74. 1 Cor. xvi. 10. Phil. i. 14 only. p 2 Pet. ii. 13 only +. r Jos. Antt. iv. 8. 7. (ἐὺναχ., Judth i. 16.) Sir. xxxvii. 29. see note. s Heb. xii. 3 reff. t g h k l o 13

καὶ τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ ^kμισθοῦ ¹ἐξεχύθησαν, καὶ τῇ ^{ABCKL} ^{Nabcd} ¹³ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορέ ἀπώλοντο. ¹³ οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς ¹³ἀγάπαις ὑμῶν ^oσπιλάδες, ^pσυνευαχούμενοι ^qἀφόβως,

12. aft οὗτοι εἰσιν ins γογγυσταὶ μεμψιμοῖροι κατα(κα (sic) ^{N¹}) τας ἰδίας(om ἰδίας ^{N¹}) ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν πορευόμενοι (ver 16) C²N¹ arm (sah aeth). (C¹ is lost: N³ corrects κατα but disapproves the whole insertion.) rec om α, with C²(but see above) KN¹ rel vulg Ec Thl Lucif: ins A B(sic: see table at end of prolegg) LN³ 13. 86 syrr coptt Pallad Did-int Aug. for αγαπαίς, απαταίς AC: ευχαίς 6. 66²: txt BKL¹ rel vss Pallad Ec Thl Lucif Did-int Aug. for υμων, αυτων A vulg syr-pk arm Lucif Bede: txt BCKL¹ rel syr coptt aeth Ec Thl Lucif Did-int. (αυτων, though written by A¹, is over an erasure.) aft συνευαχουμενοι ins υμιν C copt (sah) arm.

&c. Targ. Hieros. ad Gen. iv. 7: see also Philo, "quod deterius," &c., p. 155 ff., De agriculturâ, p. 169. De Wette). The most probable answer is that given by Stier and Huther, that the point of comparison is that selfish regard and envy which was at the root of Cain's sin, and rushed after (ἐκχυθῆναι, "effundi in," as Tacitus, Ann. i. 54, "Mæcenate effuso in amorem Bathylli:" so Polyb. xxxii. 11. 4, οἱ δ' εἰς ἐταιράς ἐξεκέχυντο: Clem. Al. Strom. ii. 20 (118), p. 491 P., εἰς ἡδονὴν ἐκχυθέντες) the error of Balaam for reward (such, and not as De Wette, "they were poured out (ruined) by the deception of the reward of Balaam." So also Horneius, "deceptione mercedis qua deceptus fuit Balaam, effusi sunt." For this latter disturbs the parallelism of the three clauses, in which we have τῇ δδφ τοῦ Κάιν, . . . τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ Βαλαὰμ, . . . τῇ ἀντιλογία τοῦ Κορέ, strictly correlative. De Wette's reasons for his view are (1) that the ordinary rendering severs the purpose, "for reward," from the error of Balaam: 2) that "for reward" does not suit ἐξεχύθησαν, which implies recklessness. But it may be answered to 1) that this by no means follows: for under the μισθοῦ may be well implied, "as Balaam did," or we may take μισθοῦ—ἐξεχύθησαν as one idea, "they ran-greedily-for reward," and τῇ πλάνῃ τοῦ B., after the error of Baalam, i. e. as Balaam did in his πλάνῃ: and to 2) that although ἐκχυθῆναι implies recklessness, yet it may be reckless pursuit of some favourite end, as in "alienari in libidinem." As to the construction, πλάνῃ may be either the normal dative, as τῇ δδφ above, or the dat. of direction, = εἰς τὴν πλάνην: and the gen. μισθοῦ is the usual one of price, as in 1 Cor. vii. 23, τιμῆς ἡγοράσθητε), and perished in the gainsaying (ἀντιλογία, either the instrumental dative, "perished by gainsaying, as Korah," or the dative

with ἐν implied, "perished in," i. e. as included in, "the gainsaying of Korah," i. e. when we read of Korah and his company perishing in their gainsaying, we read of these too, as perishing after the same example. This latter seems preferable, on account of the parallelism with the other two clauses) of Korah (the common point being, that they like Korah despised God's ordinances. ἀντιλογία, because Korah and his company ἀντέλεγον τῷ Μωϋσεῖ. See reff., and cf. τὸ ὕδωρ τῆς ἀντιλογίας, Num. xx. 13 (24), xxvii. 14; Deut. xxxii. 53, xxxiii. 8; Ps. lxxx. 7, cv. 32).

12. 13.] Continuation of the description of these ungodly men. 2 Pet. ii. 13, 17. These are the rocks (which are) in your * love-feasts (σπιλάδες, αἱ ὕφαλοι πέτραι, Etymol. M. Cf. Od. ε. 405, ἀλλ' ἀκταὶ προβλήτες ἔσαν, σπιλάδες τε πάγοι τε. See Wetst.'s note. They are the rocks on which the ἀγάπαι stand in danger of being wrecked. Cf. Ec., as quoted under ἀφόβως below. It is unnecessary and unjustifiable to attempt to give σπιλάδες any other meaning, as some have done on account of the σπιλοι in 2 Pet. ii. 13. But each passage must stand on its own ground. See Palm and Rost's Lex., who however give at the end, = ὁ σπιλος, citing for it this passage and Orph. lith. 614. Arnaud endeavours to unite both meanings, resting on the etymology as given by Eustathius (see Wetst.), αἱ παράλιναι πέτραι, παρὰ τὸ σπιλοῦσθαι τῇ ἔχρη: "les rochers continuellement battus par les flots de la mer et souillés par son écume:" but this is too far-fetched. See by all means the illustrations in Wetstein. As regards the construction, we might, as Stier, take αἱ with σπιλάδες: but the above may, supplying ὄντες, seem better, as ἀγγέλους τοὺς μὴ πηρσαντας κ.τ.λ. ver. 6. ἀγάπαις has generally been taken to refer to the love-feasts: the ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις γινόμεναι τράπεζαι, ὡς

ἐαυτοὺς ¹ποιμαίνοντες νεφέλαι st ἄνδροι ὑπὸ ἀνέμων ^r Matt. ii. 6 al. Ezek. xxxiv. (2, 8) 10.
^u παραφερόμεναι, δένδρα ^v φθινοπωρινὰ ^{tw} ἄκαρπα ^x δις ^s Matt. xii. 43
 ἰποθανόντα ^y ἐκριζωθέντα, ¹³ ^{za} κύματα ^{ab} ἄγρια θαλάσσης ^{ll} L. 2 Pet. ii. 17 only. Ps. lxxi. 1.
^t Jer. ii. 6.

^u = Heb. xiii. 9 (Mark xiv. 36 || L.) only. 1 Kings xxi. 13 (Ezra x. 7) only. ^v here only + Polyb. iv. 37 2. ^w Matt. xiii. 22 || Mk. 1 Cor. xiv. 14 Eph. v. 11. Tit iii. 14. 2 Pet. i. 8 only. Jer. ii. 6. Wisd. xv. 4 only. ^x Mark xiv. 30, 72 Luke xvi. 12. Phil. iv. 16. 1 Thess. ii. 18 only. 3 Kings xi. 9. ^y Matt. xii. 29. xv. 13 Luke xvii. 6 only. Jer. i. 10. ^z Matt. viii. 24. xiv. 24 Mark iv. 37 || Acts xxi. 41 only. ^a Wisd. xiv. 1. ^b Matt. iii. 4 || Mk. only.

for ὑπο ανεμων, παντι ανεμω N 25-6 Lucif.
 feruntur vulg.; circumferendae Lucif: φερομεναι k: txt AB(-voi, sic, see table) CKLX
 rel 40 syr(appy) sah æth (arm) Thl.

rec περιφερομεναι, with copt Cc, circum-
 feruntur vulg.; circumferendae Lucif: φερομεναι k: txt AB(-voi, sic, see table) CKLX
 rel 40 syr(appy) sah æth (arm) Thl. φθινοπωρικα N¹.

13. αγρια bef κύματα N: om αγρ. sah.

καὶ Παῦλός φησιν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Κορινθίους, ἅς καὶ ἀγάπας ἐκάλουν: see Winer, Realv. Erasmus would keep the ordinary meaning, "in dilectionibus vestris," or "inter charitates vestras." But the συνευωχούμενοι seems to fix the other. St. Peter has for ἀγάπαις, ἀπάταις, as at present read: see note there), feasting with you (συνευωχούμενοι may mean, feasting together: but the ὑμῶν preceding makes the other more probable) fearlessly (ἀφόβως is joined with ἐαυτ. ποιμ. by Erasm., Beza (and consequently E. V.), Tricæus, and Stier: but thus συνευωχ. would be left standing very badly alone. "Cum timore colenda sunt convivia sacra. Convivari per se nihil vitii habet. Ideo 'sine timore' huic verbo annexi debet," Bengel. Cc. mentions both arrangements: ἀφόβως συνευωχούμενοι, τούτέστιν, μηδένα φόβον τοῖς συνευωχουμένοις προσδοκῶσιν, ἐξαιφνης ὡς περ σπιλάδες ἐπαγόντες αὐτοῖς τὸν ὕλεθρον τῶν ψυχῶν. ἢ, πρὸς τὸ ποιμαίνοντες, τό, ἀφόβως ἐαυτοὺς συνάττοντες), pasturing their own selves (using the ἀγάπα. not for their legitimate purpose, the realization of the unity of Christians by social union, but for their own purposes, the enjoyment of their lusts, and the furtherance of their schemes. See Ezek. xxxiv. 1 ff.; the parallelism of which has however been too far pressed here by Grot. ("se dum sagent, gregem negligunt"), Bengel ("non gregem"); which thought does not seem to be in the context, but merely that they feed and pasture themselves in the ἀγάπα, having no regard to the Shepherd (or shepherds) set over them. Erasmus widens the sense too far—"suo ductu et arbitrio viventes"): clouds without water (see on πηγὰς ἄνδροι in 2 Pet. ii. 17. Water is expected from clouds), carried out of course by winds (here our text is the more concise: St. Peter having, as above, the πηγὰς ἄνδροι separate from the οἰκίαι ὑπὸ λαίλατος ἐλαυνόμεναι. Cf Prov. xxv. 14, Heb. or E. V. παραφερόμεναι, borne by, or as above, borne out of their course,

hither and thither), autumn trees (i.e. as trees are in the late autumn (ἄκαρπα explaining it, see below): as Bengel, "arbor tali specie qualis est autumnno extremo, sine (foliis et ?) pomis:" not "*frugiperdæ*," as Grot.: and so Erasm., Beza (and consequently E. V.), al., and Stier, for which meaning there is no authority in usage: as neither for Schöttgen's, "quæ non nisi autumnno senescenti fructus ferunt immaturos et nulli usui futuros"), without fruit (as trees at the time above mentioned; but there is nothing in this word to indicate whether fruit has been on them or not), twice dead (it is not easy to explain these words in reference to trees. For that we must do so, and not, as Beza, Est., Bengel, Schneckenb., al., desert the similitude, and understand it of spiritual death twice inflicted, or of death here and in eternity (so Grot.: "neque hic bonum habebunt exitum, neque in sæculo altero"), must be evident by ἐκριζωθέντα following. Cc. says, τὰ φθινοπωρινὰ δένδρα δις ἀποθνήσκοντα, ἐν τε τῇ τοῦ καρποῦ αὐτῶν ἀποβολῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ τῶν φύλλων ἀπορροῇ: and then he explains the first particular as above: Beza, Rosenm. explain δις by "plane," "prorsus," which meaning, though denied by Bretschneider, De Wette illustrates by "bis dat qui cito dat:" and Horace's "pro quo bis patior mori." But the most likely reference of the word is to the double death in a tree, which is not only as it seems to the eye in common with other trees, in the apparent death of winter, but really dead. dead to appearance, and dead in reality. Huther comes near this, but does not quite reach it, when he says, "not only without fruit, but dead and dried up:" but this would not be two deaths; whereas the other is), rooted out (the various descriptive clauses form a climax: not only without leaves and fruit, but dead: not only dead, but plucked up and thrown aside. "Tous ces mots sont des métaphores énergiques pour montrer le néant de ces impures, la légèreté de leur conduite, la stérilité de leur

c here only. ^α δὲ θαλά. ^α ἐπαφρίζοντα τὰς ἑαυτῶν ^α αἰσχύνας, ^ε ἀστέρες ^ι πλανήται ABCKL
 κυρτὸν ἐπα- ^α οἷς ὁ ^β ζόφος τοῦ σκότους ^β εἰς ^β αἰῶνα ^ι τετήρηται. f g h k l
 φρίζν. Mosch ldyll. o 13
 v. 5.
 d Luke xiv. 9. ¹⁴ προσεφίητευσεν δὲ καὶ ^ι τούτοις ἑβδομος ἀπὸ Ἀδάμ Ἐνὼχ
 2 Cor. iv. 2. λέγων Ἰδοὺ, ἦλθεν κύριος ^κ ἐν ἀγίαις ^ι μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ,
 Phil. iii. 19. Heb. xii. 2. ¹⁵ ποιῆσαι ^κ κρίσιν κατὰ πάντων, καὶ ^ο ἐλέγξει πάντας τοὺς
 Rev. iii. 18. only Ps. ^ρ ἀσεβεῖς περὶ πάντων τῶν ἔργων ^α ἀσεβείας αὐτῶν ^ι ὧν
 cviii. 29. ^ρ ἡσέβησαν, καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν ^τ σκληρῶν ^ι ὧν ἐλάλησαν P σεβη-
 plur., see ^σ αν...
 1 Pet. iv. 3. e Matt. ii. 2, &c. xxiv. 29
 f here only. = (see note) Hos. ix. 17 (only).
 1 Cor. xv. 41 (3ce). Rev. i. 16 all. Gen. i. 16
 h (without art.) here (2 Pet. ii. 17 rec.) only. 2 Chron. ix. 8 B. i = ver. 6 reff. constr. 2 Pa. ii. 17.
 j dat., Luke xviii. 31. 3 Kings xiii. 18 see Matt. xii. 14. k = Luke xiv. 31. Acts vii. 14. (M it. xxi.
 37. Rom. v. 21 al.) 1 Macc. xi. 15. 1 Heb. xii. 23 reff. m = Luke xiv. 7, 8. Acts vii. 24 Micah
 v. 15. see Mark xv. 1. n = John v. 27 only. Gen. xviii. 25. Ezek. xxviii. 26 Ald. o = John
 ii. 20. viii. 46. xvi. 8 al. 1 Chron. xii. 17. p ver. 4 reff. q Rom. i. 18. xi. 26 2 Tim. ii. 16. Tit.
 ii. 12. ver. 18 only. Jer. v. 6. r attr., 1 John iii. 24 reff. s 2 Pet. ii. 6 only. Dan. ix. 5 LXX &
 Theod.-A. Zeph. iii. 11. t = John vi. 60 (Matt. xxv. 24. Acts xxvi. 14. James iii. 4) only Gen. xlii. 7, 39.

απαφρίζοντα C 5. 13. 180. πλανήτες B. om o and του B. rec ins του
 bef αἰωνα, with K b g l o Ps-Chr: om ABCLN rel 40 Ephr Pallad Cc.

14. επροφητευσεν B¹: προσεπροφητευσεν(sic) N(Tischdf: txt Treg). om δε A.
 ins o bef κυριος N 96. 142. rec μυριασιν bef αγιας, with C syr copt
 aeth: μυριασιν αγιων αγγελων N 26 sah arm: alii aliter: txt ABKL rel vulg Chron Cc
 Thl Did-int.—om αυτων N syr-pk.

15. rec εξελεγει, with c Cc: txt ABCKLN rel 40 Ephr Chron Phot Thl. for
 παντας τους ασεβεις, πασαν ψυχην N. rec aft τους ασεβεις ins αυτων, with KL rel
 Cc Thl: om ABC(N) b¹ d o 13. 36 vss Chron Did-int Ps-Cypv Vig. om ασεβειας
 C 36. 68 demid syr-pk arm Damasc: om ασεβειας αυτων N tol sah. aft σκληρων
 ins λογων CN 13. 36 syr-pk sah Ephr Damasc.

foi et l'absence de leurs bonnes mœurs." Arnaud):

13.] wild waves of the sea, foaming up their own shames (cf. Isa. lvii. 20, in Heb. and E. V.: "The wicked are like the troubled sea, whose waters cast up mire and dirt," which beyond doubt has been in the Writer's mind. αἰσχύνας, plur., either, each his own αἰσχύνη, or all their own αἰσχύνας, disgraces, instances of disgraceful conduct), wandering stars, for whom the blackness of darkness is reserved for ever (cf. 2 Pet. ii. 17, where nearly the same words occur. ἀστέρες πλανῆται would seem most probably to indicate comets, which (as in Oct. 1858) astonish the world for a time, and then pass away into darkness. The similitude would not find any propriety as applied to the planets, properly so called: for there can be no allusion to the astronomical fact of their being naturally opaque bodies, as Bengel imagines. Many Commentators have supposed that the similitude is to be understood of teachers, who would enlighten others, and yet are doomed to darkness themselves: so (Ec., comparing the transformation into an angel of light, 2 Cor. xi. 14. But the context does not justify this. Rather should we say, these professing Christians, by their profession lights in the world, instead of letting that light shine on more and more into the perfect day, are drifting about in strange errors of doctrine and practice till it will be ut-

terly extinguished in eternal darkness).

14, 15.] Prophecy of Enoch respecting them:—see below. Yea, and (δε καὶ are better taken together, applying to the whole sentence, than separated, joining καὶ with τούτοις, "of these as well as of others," for no other prophecies of Enoch are alluded to) of these (προφητεύειν is usually joined with περί: here and in ref. only (γεγραμμένα) with a dat. It is the dat. of reference, answering to πρὸς αὐτούς, Mark xii. 12: see Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 4) prophesied Enoch seventh from Adam ("ut vaticinii antiquitatem commendet," Calv. Possibly also the fact of seven being the sacred number may have been in view, as Bengel: "mysterii non expers, in quo immunitas a morte et numerus sanctus concurrunt." Cf. Wetstein's note, in which several similar designations are quoted: e.g. Philo, Vit. Mos. i. 2, vol. ii. p. 81, alleges Moses to have been the seventh generation from Abraham. R. Berbai, on Num. xxv. 12, says, "Erat autem Phineas septima progenies a Jacobo patre nostro," &c.), saying, Behold, the Lord ("Jam Henochi tempore nomen Jehovah notum erat," Bengel) came (the historic tense of prophecy) among (in, as surrounded by) His holy myriads (of angels: cf. Deut. xxxiii. 2: Zech. xiv. 5, Heb. xii. 23), to execute judgment (reff.) upon all, and to convict all the impious concerning all their works of impiety

κατ' αὐτοῦ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ῥάσεβεις. ¹⁶ οὗτοί εἰσι ἡγογγυσται ^{u here only +}
^v μεμφίμοιροι, ^w κατὰ τὰς ^w ἐπιθυμίας αὐτῶν ^w πορευόμενοι, ^{x 10. -σμός,}
καὶ τὸ στόμα αὐτῶν λαλεῖ ^x ὑπερογκα, ^y θαυμάζοντες ^{1 Pet. iv. 9.}
^z πρόσωπα, ^a ωφελείας ^b χάριν. ¹⁷ ὑμεῖς δέ, ^c ἀγαπητοί,
^d μνήσθητε τῶν ^d ῥημάτων τῶν ^{de} προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν
ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ¹⁸ ὅτι ἔλεγον

xviii. 22 al. y constr. particip., 2 Cor. ix. 11. Col. ii. 2. Winer, edn 6, § 63 i 2. a. u here
only. Gen. xxi. 21. Lev. xix 15. a Rom. iii. 1 only. Job xxii 3. Ps. xxix 9. z here
iii. 12 reff. c ver. 3. 2 Pet. iii. 1 al. d 2 Pet. iii. 2. e = Rom. ix. 29. Gal. i.
9 t. 2 Macc vi. 29 al. b 1 John

16. for 1st αὐτων, εαυτ. CL[P] a c d f g l: txt ABKN rel Ec Thl. for 2nd
αὐτων, αὐτω A.

17. τ. προειρ. ρημ. A Ephr Lucif.

which they impiously did, and concern-
ing all the hard things which impious
sinners spoke against Him. I have dis-
cussed in the prolegomena the question as
to the source of this citation, and its re-
lation to the present apocryphal book of
Enoch. I will only here set down the pas-
sage as it at present stands in De Sacy's
version: "Et venit cum myriadibus sanc-
torum, ut faciat iudicium super eos et per-
dat impios et litiget cum omnibus carna-
libus pro omnibus quæ fecerunt et operati
sunt contra eum peccatores et impii."

16.] *Continuation of the descrip-
tion*, especially with reference to the con-
cluding words of the prophecy. **These are
murmurers (γογγυσται, οἱ ὑπ' ὁδόντα καὶ
ἀπαρρησιάστας τῇ δυσारेστομένῃ ἐπι-
μεμφόμενοι, Ec.** Murmurers against what,
is not said: probably, against the appoint-
ments and ordinances of God. Bengel's
distinction between the two words, "**γογγ.**
adversus homines, **μεμφ.** contra Deum,"
does not appear justified) dissatisfied with
their lot (see on **μεμφιμορία**, Theophrastus,
Char. xvii. Wetst. and Elsner give ex-
amples: e.g. Philo, Vit. Mos. i. 33, vol. ii.
p. 109, of the Israelites, καὶ πάλιν ἤρξαντο
μεμφιμορεῖν: Lucian, Sacrif. 1, τῆς Ἀρτέ-
μιδος μεμφιμοιρούσης, ὅτι μὴ παρελήφθη
πρὸς τὴν θυσίαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Οἰνέως. **μεμφί-
μοιρος** is interpreted by Hesych., **μεμφό-
μενος τὸ ἀγαθόν** ἢ φιλεγκλήμων, ἢ
φιλαιτίας), walking according to their
lusts (this is closely connected with the
preceding: "quia sibi in pravis cupidita-
tibus indulgens, simul difficiles sunt ac
morosi, ut illis nunquam satisfiat. hinc
fit ut semper obmurmurent ac querantur."
Calv.), and their mouth speaking great
swelling things (see 2 Pet. i. 18 note),
admiring (the nom. part. belongs not to
εἰσίν above, but to αὐτῶν immediately pre-
ceding, being joined to it by a loose con-
struction: see reff.) (men's) persons (see
reff.: holding mere outward appearances,

dignities, of men in admiration. In ref.
Gen., it is God who says to Abraham,
ἰδοὺ, ἐθαύμασά σου τὸ πρόσωπον, "Be-
hold, I have regarded (E. V., accepted)
thee." In the ref. Levit., the word im-
ports as here, and is parallel with οὐ λήψῃ
πρόσωπον in the preceding clause. The
Commentators quote Lysias, Orat. 31,
ὅτε γὰρ τοὺς πονηροὺς ὑπερορῶ, ὅτε
τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς θαυμάζει, ἀλλ' Ἰσὺν ἑαυτὸν
παρέχει πᾶσιν, said of death. In 4 Kings
v. 1 Naaman is said to have been a man
τεθαυμασμενος προσώπῳ, of high dignity)
for the sake of advantage ("magnilo-
quentiam taxat, quod se ipsos fastuose jac-
tent: sed interea ostendit illiberali esse in-
genio, quia serviliter se dimittant." Calv.
Compare μισθοῦ, vs. 11).

17, 18.] *Exhortation to remember how the Apostles
forewarned them of these men.* But ye,
beloved (see again below, ver. 20), re-
member the words which were before
spoken (not "prophesied:" see reff.) by
the Apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ
(this can hardly be cited as evidence on
one side or the other on the question
whether St. Jude himself was an Apostle.
He might use the expression, being himself
an Apostle: he is certainly more likely to
have used it, not being one. According
to the critical text, St. Peter uses the
same expression, without the ἡμῶν, 2 Pet.
iii. 2: and whichever view is taken as to
the genuineness or otherwise of 2 Peter,
there could be no intention by such an ex-
pression to exclude either the real or the
pretended St. Peter from the number of
the Apostles), that they told you (whether
by writing, or by word of mouth, does
not appear: so that we cannot say, with
Bengel, "ergo hi, ad quos Judas scribit,
cæteros quoque Apostolos audierant." It
is worthy of remark that he does not say
ἔλεγον ἡμῖν, but ὑμῖν; hereby again not
indeed making it certain that he included
himself among the Apostles, but making it

f see Heb. i. 1
 ref
 g 2 Pet. iii. 3
 only 19a.
 in 4 only.
 (-αἰσέν,
 Matt. xxv.
 29 al.
 -παῖμος,
 Heb. xi. 36.)
 h ver. 15 reff
 const., see
 note.
 i here only + (διόρ., Lev. xx. 24.)
 11 Cor. vii. 40. Rom. viii. 9, m v. 3, 17
 k 1 Cor. iii. 14. xv. 44 (bis), 46 James iii. 15 only f.
 n 1 Cor. iii. 10, &c. Eph. ii. 20. Col. ii. 7 only. Num.
 o = 1 John v. 21 reff.
 p = 1 Cor. i. 13. q Rom.
 xxii. 38 Ald (οἰκ., AB) only.
 ix. 1. xiv. 17. xv. 16. 1 Cor. xii. 3, 9. 2 Cor. vi. 6. 1 Thess. i. 5. Rev. i. 10. 12. Micah iii. 8.

18. ελεγεν ημιν K. om 2nd οτι L-txt N Lucif. rec εν εσχατω χρονω, with
 KL rel vulg Ec: [εν εσχ. τω χρονω P:] επ εσχατων των χρονων g 68. 126-30 syr-pk: επ'
 εσχατων των χρονων 36: txt ABCN 13 Did Thl, but του is omd (*homœotel*?) in BC.
 for εσονται, ελευσονται AC²N³ 13. 36 vulg coptt æth Ephr Did Cyr: txt
 BC¹KL[P]N¹ rel syrr Ps-Hipp Ps-Chr Cyr Ec Thl Lucif.

19. for εαυτων επιθ., επιθυμιας αυτων N¹ 42. (57 f) 163, επιθ. εαυτων N³ f 73-8. 104.
 marks of disapproval have been placed by N³ over απο in αποδιοριζοντες, but
 erased. elz aft αποδιοριζοντες ins εαυτους, with C b d g o vulg(with am demid tol)
 Aug Fulg Bede: om ABKL[P]N rel 40 fuld syrr(sic, Treg) coptt æth arm Ephr Did
 Ec Thl Lucif Cassiod.

20. ημεις C arm. rec τη αγιωτατη υμων πιστει bef εποικοδομουντες εαυτους, with
 KL[P] rel syrr-pk arm Ephr Thl Ec: txt AB(C)N d 13 vss Clem-frag-int Bede.—ημων C.

very uncertain, whether he intends to *ex-clude* himself) that at the last of the time (see notes on 2 Pet. iii. 3: Heb. i. 1: 1 Pet. i. 20: = at the end of the world, in the last age of the Church) there shall be scoffers (men who sport with what is holy and good: the *λοιμοί* of Ps. i. 1. The prophecy is contained in 2 Tim. iii. 1, 1 Tim. iv. 1, Acts xx. 29, and doubtless formed a constant subject of viva voce warning. 2 Pet. iii. 1, 2, can hardly be supposed to be referred to, for that place is, as thus, a reminiscence of things before said by the Apostles, and nearly in the same words), **walking according to their own lusts of impieties** (ἀσεβειῶν, gen. after ἐπιθυμίας, indicating the direction, or perhaps the character, of those desires. Cf. the same words above, ver. 16). 19.] *Last characteristics of these men.* These are they that separate (or "are separating," viz. from the Church, having no real sympathy with the spirit of the Gospel. The act. verb does not seem to require *εαυτούς* to be supplied: that draw lines of distinction, by walking after their own desires, not in the path of the Church's obedience, thus separating both themselves from you, and you from themselves), *sensual* (we have no English word for *ψυχικός*; and our biblical psychology is, by this defect, entirely at fault. The *ψυχή* is the centre of the personal being, the "I" of each individual. It is in each man bound to the spirit, man's higher part, and to the body, man's lower part; drawn upwards by the one, downwards by the other. He who gives himself up to the lower appetites, is *σαρκικός*:

he who by communion of his *πνεῦμα* with God's Spirit is employed in the higher aims of his being, is *πνευματικός*. He who rests midway, thinking only of self and self's interests, whether animal or intellectual, is the *ψυχικός*, the selfish man, the man in whom the spirit is sunk and degraded into subordination to the subordinate *ψυχή*. In the lack of any adequate word, I have retained the "sensual" of the E. V., though the impression which it gives is a wrong one: "selfish" would be as bad, for the *ψυχικός* may be an amiable and generous man: "animal" would be worse: "intellectual," worse still. If the word were not so ill-looking in our language, "psychic" would be a great gain), **not having the spirit** (πνεῦμα, see above, not directly the Holy Spirit of God (the absence of the art. would be no objection to this: see reff. and Rom. viii. 14, 1 Cor. ii. 4, al. fr.), but the higher spiritual life of man's spirit in communion with the Holy Spirit. These men have not indeed ceased to have *πνεῦμα*, as a part of their own tripartite nature: but they have ceased to possess it in any worthy sense: it is degraded beneath and under the power of the *ψυχή*, the personal life, so as to have no real vitality of its own. See Deltzsch, *Biblische Psychologie*, v. Abschn. § 2, "daß neue Geistesleben." and Beck, *Umriss der biblischen Seelenlehre*, p. 35 f.).

20—23.] CONCLUDING EXHORTATION TO THE READERS: and a) vv. 20, 21, *as to their own spiritual life*. But ye, beloved (resumed from ver. 17), building up yourselves (εαυτους, not = ἀλλήλους, but as

προσευχόμενοι, ²¹ ὁ ἑαυτοὺς ἐν ἁγάπῃ ἰθεοῦ ² τηρήσατε, ¹ προσδεχόμενοι τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ ^ν εἰς ^ω ζωὴν ^ω αἰώνιον. ²² καὶ ^α οὓς μὲν ^ν ἐλέγχετε ² διακρινόμενοι, ²³ ^α οὓς δὲ σωζετε ^α ἐκ πυρὸς ^β ἀρπαζόντες,

^α = 2 Tim. i. 18. Heb. v. 18. ^ν = Acts xi. 18. Rom. vi. 22. x. 1. ^ω 1 John iv. 9. ¹ = Matt. xii. 18. Rom. xii. 18. 1 Tim. v. 20 al. ² = Matt. x. 43. Luke ii. 25, 38 al. ² = Matt. ix. 25. Ed-vat. (not A B). ^ν 1 John ii. 25. ^ω = Matt. x. 43. Luke ii. 25, 38 al. ² = Matt. ix. 25. Ed-vat. (not A B). ^α = 2 Tim. i. 18. Heb. v. 18. ^ν = Acts xi. 18. Rom. vi. 22. x. 1. ^ω 1 John iv. 9. ¹ = Matt. xii. 18. Rom. xii. 18. 1 Tim. v. 20 al. ² = Matt. x. 43. Luke ii. 25, 38 al. ² = Matt. ix. 25. Ed-vat. (not A B). ^ν 1 John ii. 25. ^ω = Matt. x. 43. Luke ii. 25, 38 al. ² = Matt. ix. 25. Ed-vat. (not A B).

21. τηρῶμεν B C¹ (perhaps) syrr.

22. rec (for ἡλεγετε) ἡλείετε, with KL[P] rel: ελεατε BC²N: txt AC¹ (13) 40 vulg copt ath arm Ec-comm Cassiod Bede. rec διακρινόμενοι, with KL[P] rel copt(appy): txt ABCN 13 vulg syrr arm Clem Ec-comm lat-fl.

23. om 1st ους δε B. rec ins εν φοβω bef σωζετε, with KL[P] rel: om ABCN d 13. 40 vulg copt ath arm Ec-comm(appy) Cassiod Bede. rec ins του bef πυρος, with b d f g o: om ABCKL[P]N rel 36(sic) 40 arm. ον of αρπαζοντες is written over a previous ε by N¹.

in Phil. ii. 12) upon (as a foundation) your most holy faith (the faith here is the foundation. viz., the *fides quæ creditur*, the object of faith. Bullinger (in Huther), "Vestra fidei superstruentes vos ipsos." Elsewhere in Scripture, CHRIST is this foundation, see 1 Cor. iii. 11; which in fact comes to the same, for He is the Author and Finisher of our Faith, the α and ω), praying in the Holy Spirit (as the means of thus building yourselves up. The expression *προσεύχεσθαι ἐν πν. ἁγίῳ* is not found elsewhere, but is in strict analogy with Scripture usage: cf. *λαλεῖν ἐν πν. ἁγ.*, also Rom. viii. 26, Eph. vi. 18. Some, e.g. Luther, join ἐν πν. ἁγ. with what has gone before, and this is approved by De Wette: but surely *προσευχόμενοι* would not be left thus standing alone. De W. cites Ec. for this arrangement, but it is very doubtful whether he adopts it: *ὁμοῖς δὲ τῇ ἁγιατάτῃ ὑμῶν πίστει ἐποικοδομοῦντες, ἥτοι ἑαυτοὺς ἀνακτῶμενοι ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, τουτέστι, κατὰ τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος διδασκαλίαν τὰς ἐαυτῶν ἀβροίσεις ἐν ταῖς προσευχαῖς ὑμῶν ποιούμενοι*: where it is evident that there should be a period at *ἀνακτῶμενοι*, and that *προσευχόμενοι* has been omitted, or perhaps was never expressed, after *ἁγίῳ*; at any rate the latter sentence is an explanation of ἐν πν. ἁγ. *προσευχόμενοι*), keep yourselves (aor. of the one great life-long act to be accomplished by the *ἐποικοδομεῖν* and *προσέχεσθαι*) in the love of God (within that region of peculiar love where-with God regards all who are built up on the faith and sustained by prayer: θεοῦ being a subjective gen., "God's love," not objective, as Grot., Semler, Bengel, Vorsi-tius, Arnaud, al. The expression is very like *μεύατε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῇ ἐμῇ*, John xv. 9, where *καγὼ ὑμᾶς ἠγάπησα* preceding fixes the meaning to be Christ's love to them), looking for (present part.

as in Tit. ii. 13, where see note. It is to be the habit of the life, as those other pres. participles, *ἐποικ.* and *προσευχόμενοι*) the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ (viz. that which He will shew at His coming, τὸν εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἡμέραν τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς βραβεύόμενον ὑμῖν, Ec.: cf. Tit. ii. 13. Huther remarks that *ἔλεος*, more usually predicated of the Father, is in the addresses of the Pastoral Epistles, and of 2 John, attributed to the Father and Son jointly) unto eternal life (these words may be joined with *ἔλεος*,—that mercy, whose issue shall be eternal life; or with *προσδεχόμενοι*,—as the issue and aim of the expectation; or with *τηρήσατε*,—as the final terminus of that watchful guarding. Perhaps the right choice between the three will be to combine the two last: for *προσδεχόμενοι* is subordinate and conditional to *τηρήσατε*: "keep yourselves . . . in expectation of . . . unto"). The direct and studied reference to the Blessed Trinity will not escape the reader. b) vv. 22, 23.] *Exhortation as to their conduct with reference to the persons* previously stigmatized in the Epistle. And some indeed convict when contending with you (or, "when separating from you." These appear to be the only two meanings which suit the context. Ec. takes the latter, but apparently including in it the idea of hostile disputation: *κακείνους δέ, εἰ μὲν ἀποδίστανται ὑμῶν, τοῦτο γὰρ σημαίνει τὸ διακρίνεσθαι* . . . where the Latin renders, "illos vero si vobis resistant, nam id significat disceptantes . . ." The Vulg. renders it passive: "et hos quidem argue judicatos," which can hardly stand as giving the pres. part. *διακρινόμενους*, and representing rather *διακρίνοντες*. De Wette, following Bengel, understands it "doubting"—"convince," "persuade in the right direction," "those who doubt." But thus the sense of *ἐλέγχετε* is missed,

c of man, Matt.
xviii. 33.
Rom. xii. 8.
Job xix. 21
of God, Matt.
v. 7 al. fr.
pres. -αῖν,
Rom. ix. 15, 16, 18 v. r. only.
e = Matt v 40. John xix. 23.
4. 2 Pet. ii. 5. Ps. cxliv. 20.

οὓς δὲ ἐλεάτε ἐν φόβῳ, μισοῦντες καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς

ἑσπιλωμένον^c χιτῶνα.

24 Τῷ δὲ δυναμένῳ^f φυλάξαι αὐτοὺς^g ἁπταίστους

ABCKL
P a b c
d f g h k
l o 13

Prox xxi 26 A (not F) B1N. d James iii 6 only r. Wisd. xv. 4 only.
f absol, John xvii 12. Acts xii.
g here only t. 3 Macc vi 39. απτ υποσ, Xen. de re eq. 1 G

rec om ους δε ελεατε εν φοβω, with KL[P] rel : om ους δε ελεατε C syr : ins ABN k 13.
40 vulg copt (æth) arm.—ελεῖτε A : ελεγχετε k : txt BN 13. 40.

24. elz (for αὐτους) υμας, with BCLN rel vss Thl; ημας A 42: txt K[P] a b c g h l o

which is never simply to convince, but always carries the punitive idea with it, to *convict*. Grot. gives another meaning, "reprehendite eos qui se cæteris præferunt." Huther goes with Ec. The sense of *contending*, for διακρίνομαι, is found both in classical writers and in the N. T., e.g. Acts xi. 2, and our Epistle, ver. 9 (which is no slight indication of the meaning here): cf. διακρίνεσθαι μάχη Herod. ix. 58, ὅπλοις κ. λόγοις Demosth. p. 163. 15 al. in Palm and Rost's Lex.

This is the first class: th: t of those who oppose themselves, who must be convicted and down-argued. According to the rec. οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, the rendering will be, as E. V., "of some have compassion, making a difference," viz. between them and the others; but others *save* (pres., attempt to save; not σώσατε, which would imply that you had the power, and must do it effectually), *snatching them from the fire* (the same passage in the prophets, Zech. iii. 1—3, which has already been before St. Jude's mind in ver. 9, again furnishes him with the material of this figure. There we read οὐκ ἰδοὺ τοῦτο ὡς δαλὸς ἐξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός; cf. also ref. Amos. Notice too the repetition of διακρίνεσθαι in close connexion, which speaks not a little for the sense above given to it. The πῦρ is most probably not future eternal fire, as Ec. ἐκ τοῦ ἡπειλημένου αὐτοῖς πυρός: but the present hell into which their corrupt doctrines and practices have cast them, not however without reference to its ending in fire eternal. This is the second class; as Ec., εἰ δὲ πρὸς Ἰασιν ἀφορῶσι: or rather perhaps, any over whom your influence extends, as younger members of the Church, &c., whom you can thus rescue by snatching them out of the fire of temptation and peril), and others *compassionate* (the form ἐλεάω for the usual ἐλέω is also found in reff. Rom.; and ἐλλογᾶν, Rom. v. 13 (in A(N)), Philm. 18. See Winer, edn. 6, § 15) in fear (on what account, is shewn by what follows. Ec. rightly, except that (see below) he identifies this class with the last,—προσλαμ-

βάνεσθε δὲ μετὰ τοῦ ἐλεεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ μετὰ φόβου, περισκεπτόμενοι μὴ πως ἢ πρόσληψις τούτων, ἀμελῶς ὑμῶν τὰ πρὸς αὐτοὺς διακειμένων, λύμης ὑμῖν γυνήται αἰτία. This is the third class: consisting of those whom not falling in the way of so as personally to convict, nor having influence over so as to rescue, the believers could only compassionate (and on occasion given, lovingly help) as led away hopelessly to their ruin: but in shewing such compassion, they were to maintain a wholesome fear of their deadly error, for fear they themselves should become defiled by it. It may suffice to repudiate at once Bengel's interpretation of ἐν φόβῳ, "clementer, metu duntaxat incusso." The following clause is expegetical of ἐν φόβῳ, *hating* (not, "seeing that ye hate," as De W., nor "though ye hate," as Jachm.: the pres. part. simply falls under and expands the verbal clause ἐλεάτε-ἐν-φόβῳ, thus forming part of the command) *even the* (or, "their," cf. Ec. below) *garment which has received defilement from the flesh* (τὰ ἐλέω τῷ πρὸς αὐτοὺς συνεπέσθω τὸ μῖσος τὸ πρὸς τὰ μισὰρὰ αὐτῶν ἔργα, μισοῦντων ὑμῶν καὶ βδελυσσομένων, καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν ἐσπιλωμένον, ἦτοι μεμιασμένον αὐτῶν χιτῶνα, ὡς τῇ πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν σάρκα προσψάσει, καὶ αὐτοῦ βδελυροῦ χρηματίζοντος. And so Bengel, understanding χιτῶνα of their garment, which you are to loathe, and to be afraid even to touch: "tunica est totius vitæ habitus exterior, qua ab aliis attingimur." This *may be*, but it is more probable that the χιτῶν is literal, and the saying a proverbial one—hating not merely fleshly pollution itself, but even the traces and outskirts of it; even that, be it what it may, which has its mark and stain upon it. On the sense, see Rev. iii. 4).

24, 25.] CONCLUDING DOXOLOGY, conceived in terms referring to their state of danger and necessity of divine upholding. But (the δέ, as in Rom. xvi. 25, closes off all other considerations and sums up all in this one. It is not at all given by the "now" of the E. V., which conveys a

καὶ ἡ στήσαι ^{ik} κατενώπιον τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ^{il} ἁμώμους ἐν ^h ἡ Matt xxv. 33. Acts vi. 6. i Eph. i. 4. Col. i. 22. k as above (i) only. Josh. i. 5. las above (i). Eph v. 27. Phil. ii. 15. Heb. ix. 14. 1 Pet. i. 19. Rev. xiv. 5 only. Ps. xvi. 23. (-μπος, 2 Pet. iii. 19.)

^m ἀγαλλιάσει ²⁵ ἡ μόνῳ ^{no} θεῷ ^o σωτήρι ἡμῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ ^h χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν, ^p δόξα, ^q μεγαλowsύνη, ^r κράτος καὶ ^s ἐξουσία ^t πρὸ ^t παντὸς τοῦ ^t αἰῶνος καὶ ^u νῦν καὶ ^u εἰς ^u πάντας τοὺς ^u αἰῶνας. ^u ἁμῆν.

ΙΟΥΔΑ.

m Luke i. 14, 44. Acts ii. 46. Heb. i. 9 (from Ps. xlv. 7) only. (-αἰών, Rev. xix. 7.) n John v. 44. (xvii. 3. Rom. xvi. 27.) 1 Tim. i. 17 only. o Luke ii. 47. 1 Tim. i. 1. ii. 3. iv. 10. Tit. i. 3. ii. 10. iii. 4 only. Ps. xciv. 1. p = Luke ii. 14. xvii. 18. John ix. 24. Acts xiii. 33. Rom. xvi. 27 al. Ps. xciv. 7. q Heb. i. 3. viii. 1 only. 2 Kings vii. 21, 23. Ps. lxxviii. 11 al. r 1 Pet. iv. 11 reff. s in doxoll. here only. t here only. see Prov. viii. 23. 1 Cor. ii. 7. u here only. see Luke i. 33 al.

Θεο. aft απαριστους καὶ ins ασπιλους καὶ C k syr (arm Thl). for κατενωπ., ενωπιον C. for αμωμους, αμειπτους A : om k.

25. rec aft μονῳ ins σοφω, with KL[P] rel Θc Thl: om ABCN m (Treg) 13. 40 vss Ephr Fulg Bede. rec om δια ιησου χριστου του κυριου ημων, with K[P] rel Θc: ins ABCLN k 13. 36. 40 vss Ephr Thl Fulg Bede. ins ω bef δοξα N¹ am. rec aft δοξα ins και, with KL[P] rel 40 vulg-ed syr-pk copt Θc Thl Bede: om ABCN k 13 am (with demid fuld tol) syr arm Ephr Fulg. rec om προ παντος του αιωνος, with K[P] rel syr-pk Θc: ins ABCLN d 13 (36) 40 vulg syr copt æth arm Ephr Thl Fulg Cassiod Bede. om παντας K (Sz) N 27. 36. 99 copt. aft αιωνας ins των αιωνων L 13 vulg (demid tol, but not am fuld) syr-mg (copt) Fulg Bede.

SUBSCRIPTION. om rel: τέλος h: τέλος συν θῷ αἰωι των πραξεων και των επιστολων των αγιων αποστολων ων και του ιουδα τετελειωται δια στιχων ξη'. αμην f: ιουδα επιστολη καθολικη C al: του αγιου αποστολου ιουδα επιστολη L al: ετελειωθη συν θεω και η του ιουδα καθολικη επιστολη. δοξα σοι ο θεος (thrice repeated), ο μακροθυμων επ' εμοι τω αναξι δουλω σου K: [π. ιουδα απ. P:] ιουδα επιστολη A: txt BN.

strictly temporal idea to the hearer) to Him that is able (exactly thus, Rom. xvi. 25) to keep them (the occurrence of αὐτοῦς (which is almost beyond doubt the true reading instead of ὑμᾶς or ἡμᾶς) can only be accounted for by the supposition that St. Jude writes here, as of all to whom he has been addressing himself, in the third person, as if he was praying to God for them. His reason for not using ὑμᾶς may have been his desire to include also in the term those who might be convicted, rescued from the fire, and compassionated, as well as his more immediate reader. But it is hardly likely, in the solemn close of his Epistle, that he should mean by αὐτούς, those only) without falling (see reff.: and for παλαίειν, James ii. 10, iii. 2), and to set (them) before-the-presence-of His glory (which will be revealed when the Son of man shall come, ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων, Luke ix. 26, in the ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, Tit. ii. 13) blame-

less (see reff. and 1 Thess. iii. 13) in (element, in which they will be found) great-rejoicing (tripudiatio, the exuberance of triumphant joy: see reff.: and the verb in 1 Pet. i. 6 reff.), to the only God our Saviour through Jesus Christ our Lord (on the union of θεός with σωτήρ, see Prolegg. to Vol. III., ch. vii. § i. 34. Observe the qualification here), be (on account of πρὸ παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος below, De Wette insists as necessary that ἐστιν, as 1 Pet. iv. 11, not ἔστω, is here to be supplied. But ἔστω might be in the Writer's mind, while the precise periods embraced by it might rather be left to the fulness of his devout spirit than marked by strict precision) glory, majesty, might, and power, before all time (before the whole age, scil. of the world. Thus we have eternity "a parte ante"), and now (thus, time present), and to all the ages (thus, eternity "a parte post"). Amen (the ordinary conclusion of a doxology: cf. Rom. i. 25, 1 Pet. iv. 11 (and 2 Pet. iii. 18, where as here it stands at the end of the Epistle)).

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ.

^a gen., = 2 Cor. xii. only. (1 Cor. i. 7. Gal. i. 12. 2 Thess. i. 7. 1 Pet. i. 7, 13. Sir. xlii. 1 [xli. 23.] -ύπτειν, Eph. iii. 5. Dan. x. 1 Theod.) ^b John 2. 4. 6, 9, 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

TITLE. *rec αποκαλυψις ιωαννου του θεολογου*, with f j 9. 17: *αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιω. τ. θ. b c n 1. 25. 33-8. 47 (prefg η). 50. 90: αποκ. ιω. τ. θ. και ευαγγελιστου B 12-8: αποκ. ιω. του αποστολου κ. ευαγ. 41-2: [η αποκ. τ. απ. ιω. κ. ευαγ. P:] του αγιου ιω. τ. θεολ. αποκ. 13: αρχη της αποκαλυψεως του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου 32: ιω. του θεολ. κ. ηγαπημενου αποκ. 4: αποκ. ιω. τ. αποστ. τ. θεολ. 17: ιω. τ. θεολ. αποκ. 19: αποκ. του αγιου αποστ. κ. ευαγ. ιω. τ. θε. 10. 37, simply e h: αποκ. του αγιου ενδοξατου αποστ. κ. ευαγ. παρθενου ηγαπημενου επιστηθιου ιω. θεολ. 30: αποκ. τ. αγ. κ. ενδοξου αποστ. κ. ευαγ. ιω. τ. θε. ην εν πατρω νησω εθεασατο 1: αποκ. τ. αγ. ιω. τ. θε. ην ειδεν εν πατρω m, simply ην εν πατρω τη νησω εθεασατο is added in 16: ιησου χριστου αποκαλυψις δοθεισα τω θεολογω ιωαννη 26: om k 48-9: ιωαννου αποκαλυψις a d g: txt CN. (The title of A has perished, but the subscription confirms txt.)*

CHAP. I. 1. for *αυτω*, *αυτη* B. (So Tischdf [N.T. ed 7] agst Mai.)

CHAP. I. 1-3.] SUPERScription: in which the contents and Writer of the book are declared, and the importance of its subject indicated by a blessing on those who shall read and hear it.

The Revelation (*αποκαλυψις εστιν η των ιερων μυστηριων δηλωσις, καταναγαζομενου του ηγεμονικου της ψυχης, ειτε δια θειων ονειρατων, ειτε καθ' υπαρ εκ θειας ελλαμψεως*. Arethas. Here, the word need not be taken in any but this its general sense, as in 2 Cor. xii. 1, where it is plural; the particular purpose of this revelation follows, with the inf. *δειξαι* below. *αποκαλυψις* is one of those words which have passed, in their later usage, from indicating the *act*, to signify that with which the act is concerned: so *καυχησις*, 2 Cor. i. 12, vii. 14. Jerome on Gal. i. 11, 12, vol. vii. p. 387, says: "Verbum ipsum *αποκαλύψεως*, id est, revelationis, proprie scripturarum est, et a nullo sapientum sæculi apud Græcos usurpatum." But Plutarch, de placit. philos. i. 7, *τις εστιν ο θεός*, says that Euripides was an atheist, but *αποκαλύψασθαι ουκ ηθέλησε, δεδουκως τον βρειον παγον*. Porphyry's use of the word, vit. Plotin. c. 16, is no exception. It is said to

be later Greek for *ἀνακαλ.*) of Jesus Christ (how is this genitive to be understood? Is our Lord the subject or the object? Clearly here the former: for it is not Christ who is here revealed, except in a remote sense: but Christ who reveals, as is plain in what follows: see also ref. Ebrard makes the gen. *possessive*, which comes to the same thing. Heinrichs understands *αποκ. 'Ι. χρ.* of the appearance of our Lord which is related below, after St. Paul's manner (but not in 2 Cor. xii. 1), and St. Peter's (reff.: and 1 Pet. iv. 13, v. 1), see also Luke xvii. 30. But see below. The not very important distinctions between *αποκαλύψις* and its result *προφητεία* are laid down at great length in Hengstenberg, h. l.), which God (the Father) gave to Him (Stern asks, "How are we to understand this? Is not Christ very God, of one essence with the Father from eternity? Did He not, by virtue of the omniscience of His divine nature, know as exactly as the Father, what should be the process of the world's history, what the fate of the Church? What purpose was served by a revelation from God to Jesus?" He proceeds to say that the words cannot refer

ὁ θεός, δεῖξαι τοῖς ^c δούλοις ^c αὐτοῦ ἃ ^{de} δεῖ ^d γενέσθαι ^{df} ἐν ^c ch. ii. 20 of Christ.

e ch. iv. 1. Matt xxiv 6 t. xxvi 54. Dan. ii. 28.
4. Rom. xvi 20. Deut. ix. 3.

f Luke xviii. 8. Acts xii. 7. xxii. 18. xxv.

for δούλοις, ἀγίοις N¹(txt N^{3a}).

merely to the revelation as made to *us*, but are clearly against such an interpretation: and gives, at some length and very well, that which in one form or other all will accept as the true explanation, in accordance with John vii. 16, xiv. 10, xvii. 7, 8. The man Christ Jesus, even in his glorified state, receives from the Father, by his hypostatic union with Him, that revelation which by His Spirit He imparts to His Church. For, Acts i. 7, the times and seasons are kept by the Father in his own power: and of the day and the hour knoweth no man, not the angels in heaven, nor even the Son, but the Father only, Mark xiii. 32. I may observe, that the coincidence in statement of this deep point of doctrine between the Gospel of St. John and the Apocalypse, is at least remarkable), to shew (is this infinitive of the purpose dependent on ἔδωκεν, or on the subst. ἀποκάλυψις? Is it the purpose of God in giving, or the purpose of the revelation in revealing, that is asserted? At all events, Heinrichs is wrong, who takes ἦν ἔδωκεν δεῖξαι together, "*which God gave (empowered) Him to shew.*" But of the others, the construction with ἔδωκεν is the more probable, as being the more usual: "that He might shew," &c. δεῖξαι must not here be confined to its stricter meaning of shewing in vision, as Hengst.; for then, as De W. remarks, we must confine τοῖς δούλοις αὐτ. to the Apocalyptic Seer alone: but must be taken in its wider sense of exhibiting as knowledge, informing of. So in Matt. xvi. 21: where however Hengst. strangely denies this meaning, and upholds that of prove, demonstrate: which our Lord did not do till after His resurrection) to His (Christ's, most probably, as below in this verse, and in ref.: for thus the αὐτός is kept to the same subject throughout) servants (here meaning all Christians, not, as Hengst., prophets only: indeed his sense of δεῖξαι, which necessitates this, brings confusion into the whole sentence. That John himself is one of these δούλοι below, does not affect this general meaning) what things must (by the necessity of the divine decree: see besides reff., Matt. xvii. 10, al.) come to pass shortly (i.e. '*before long*': see reff. especially Luke. The context, the repetition below, ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς ἔγγυς, and the parallel ch. xxii. 6, followed ib. 7 by ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ταχύ, fix

this meaning here, as distinguished from the other of '*swiftly*,' which indeed would be hardly intelligible with the historic aorist γενέσθαι. This expression, as De W. well remarks, must not be urged to signify that the events of apocalyptic prophecy were to be close at hand: for we have a key to its meaning in Luke xviii. 7, 8, where our Lord says, ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βωόντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας κ. νυκτὸς, καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς; λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει: where long delay is evidently implied. Hengstenberg repudiates this, and says it is self-evident that these words can only be adduced here "*nach unrichtigen Misslegung.*" But surely the two cases are exactly parallel: and Hengst.'s strong language, here as elsewhere, proves nothing. His own interpretation of the words, natural as he seems to think it, is forced and unwarrantable. He (in common with many others) takes them to mean that the events spoken of would very soon *begin* to take place. The axe, he says, lay at the root of the Roman Empire when John wrote this, as it did at the root of the Persian Empire when Daniel wrote. But this interpretation is not borne out by the Greek. ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι ἐν τάχει is not "*which must soon begin to come to pass,*" but, in the well-known sense of the aorist, "*which, in their entirety, must soon come to pass:*" γενέσθαι being in fact, a past tense, "*must have come to pass,*" "*be fulfilled:*" so Bengel most truly, "*Totus liber tanquam unum verbum uno momento pronunciatione debet accipi.*" So that we are driven to the very same sense of ἐν τάχει as that in Luke xviii. above, viz. to *God's speedy time*, though He seem to delay: in spite of the scorn which Hengst. pours on this meaning. His maxim, that a Prophet, speaking to men, must speak according to men's ideas, is quite worthless, and may be confuted by any similar prophetic saying, even by the one which he brings in its favour, Hagg. ii. 7: and his complaint, that thus we make the Seer and even the Lord Himself like bad physicians who delude their patients with false hopes (so, in the main, Stern also), is unworthy of a Christian Expositor, after our Lord's own plain use of the same method of speech again and again in His prophecies in the Gospels and in this book. It re-

ἔ = (of proph.), ¹τάχει, καὶ ἐξήμανεν ^{dh} ἀποστείλας ^h διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ
 John xii 33. ¹τάχει, καὶ ἐξήμανεν ^{dh} ἀποστείλας ^h διὰ τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ
 3 viii, 32. xxi.
 19. Acts xi.
 28 (xv. 27
 only) † (Exod. xiii. 20 al) ^h = Esth. iii 13. Prov. xvi 6 see Matt xi 2 2 Kings xii 23.
 1 constr., 1 Tim. vi. 13. ch. xiii. 16, 20. aor. epistol., Philem. 19. 1 John ii. 14. 2 John 13.
 1 = Jer. i. 2. ^k 1 John i 10 reff.

C os...
 ACPN B
 a to p, i.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10 3 16
 to 19 26-
 7. 30. 32
 to 38. 40
 to 42 47
 to 51. 90
 Br.

for τω δουλῷ, του δουλου ("ex alliteration" Beng.) A. ιωανν. N¹.

mains to observe, that these words cannot with any fairness be used as furnishing a guide to the interpretation of the prophecy. They are far rather to be regarded as a prophetic formula (see Beza), common with him to whom a thousand years are as one day, and used in order to teach us how short our time, and the time of this our world, is. See, on the whole, Ebrard's able note, and his remarks on the absurdity of Hengstenberg's pressing the words in favour of his præterist scheme.

τὴν ἐκβασιν δὲ τῶν χρηματιζομένων ἐν τάχει ὑπισχνέται προβῆναι, οὐχ ὥς ἔτυχεν, ἀλλὰ παραμετρῶν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τοῖς θεοῖς, οἷς καὶ τὰ πολυχρονίως καὶ χιλιastῶς ἐκτελούμενα ὥς ἡ χθὲς ἡμέρα, καὶ ἡ ἐν νυκτὶ φυλακὴ κρίνεται. Arethas. There is a profitable and consolatory exegesis of the words in Ambrose Ansbert, B. P. M. ix. pt. 2, p. 310. Dionysius of Alexandria, as cited in Eus. H. E. vii. 25, omits the words *ἂν δεῖ γενέσθαι*, joining *δείξαι* with *ἐν τάχει*; and *He* (*Ἰησοῦς χριστός*, not *ὁ θεός*, see ch. xxii. 16: the subject is changed, and the relative construction abandoned. So almost all Commentators) signified (it) (it is remarkable (see reff.), that with one exception, this prophetic use of *σημαίνω* is confined in the N. T. to the Evangelist St. John) sending by His angel (the aor. part. is contemporary with the aor. verb, not necessarily antecedent to it. *ἀποστ. διὰ*, as in reff. No word, as *τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν*, need be supplied, the verb being used absolutely after the manner of the Heb. *וַיִּשְׁלַח* of Exod. iv. 13 and ref. 2 Kings. Still less must *διὰ* be taken with *ἐξήμανεν*, as Hengst.

The Angel mentioned is perhaps the same who informs the Seer in ch. xvii. 1, 7, 15, xix. 9, xxi. 9, xxii. 1, 6, which latter place takes up this; ib. 8 ff.; and who is spoken of by our Lord ib. 16. It is remarkable that this angel does not appear as the imparter of the visions until ch. xvii. Some indeed, as Ewald, have fancied that they trace his presence in ch. iv. 1 and throughout: but ch. xvii. 1 is too manifestly the introduction to a new appearance for this to be the case; and previously to that the Seer receives his information from different persons. Our Lord Himself opens the Apocalyptic vision. It is another voice which

calls John up to the place of heavenly vision, ch. iv. 1. In vii. 13, one of the four and twenty elders speaks to him; in x. 8, it is the former voice again which addresses him, and in ib. 9, it is the angel who stands on the earth and the sea that gives him the book. Only in the great close of the prophecy, opening with ch. xvii., does one angel stand by him; referred to, as here, under the name *ὁ ἄγγελος*. In the visions of Daniel and Zechariah an angel mediated: Dan. viii. 16, ix. 20, x. 10 ff., Zech. i. 1, 19, al.) to His servant John (on the whole question of the writer of the book, see prolegomena), 2.] who testified of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ, whatsoever things he saw (these words must, in all fairness of construction, be referred to this present book, and not, as by some of the older Expositors, and recently by Ebrard, to the Gospel of St. John. The reasons given by Ebrard for such reference will not hold. He objects to *ἐμαρτύρησεν* being taken of this book, that such a use of the aor. would be peculiar to the Epistolary style, whereas this book, though containing Epistles, is not itself an Epistle. Even were the usage thus confined, it might be answered from verse 4, that the whole *is* in an Epistolary form. But the usage is not thus confined, as every scholar knows. Witness Thucyd. i. 1, *Θουκυδίδης Ἀθηναῖος ξυνέγραψε τὸν πόλεμον κ.τ.λ.* Again, Ebrard objects that the sense thus obtained would be a strange one: "God gave the Revelation to Christ; He signified it by His angel to John, which last hereby makes it known." But I own I am unable to see any strangeness in it. It seems to me the obvious way in which a faithful account of this Revelation would be prefaced by its Writer. On the other side, the objections to Ebrard's reference are to me insuperable. First, as to its *introduction with the simple relative ὅς*. We may safely say that had any previous writing or act been intended, we should have had *ὅς καί*, or in St. John's simple style, even more than this, *ὅς καὶ τὸ πρότερον*, or *ὅς καὶ ἐν ἄλλῃ βιβλίῳ*. The *ὅς* as it stands, I submit, carries on the action, and does not identify John as the same who at a previous time did some other action. Next,

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ^{km} μαρτυρίαν ¹ Ἰησοῦ ^{χριστοῦ}, ⁿ ὅσα ^m ver. 9. ch. xii. 17. xix. 10 bis. xx. 4 only. see John i. 19. 1 John v. 9. (ch. vi. 9. xi. 7. xii. 11). n see ver. 19. o Acts viii. q = Matt. xiii.
ⁿ εἶδεν. ³ μακάριος ὁ ^o ἀναγινώσκων καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες τοὺς
^p λόγους τῆς ^{pq} προφητείας καὶ ^r τηροῦντες τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ
γεγραμμένα· ὁ γὰρ ^s καιρὸς ^s ἐγγύς.

28. xv. 21. 2 Cor. iii. 15. Neh. viii. 3, 8, 18.
14. 2 Pet. i. 20, 21. 2 Chion. xv. 8.
= 1 Tim. vi. 14 only. Prov. iii. 21.

p = ch. xxii. 7, &c.
r Gosp. (not Luke) & Acts pass. but John princ. Paul,
s ch. xxiii. 10 reff. Joel i. 15.

2. rec aft *οσα* ins τε, with 1 Areth: om AC[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Dion Andr Primas. *ιδεν* AN B 16. 33: txt C[P] &c. aft *ειδεν* ins καὶ ατινα εἰσι καὶ α(τινα) *χρη γενεσθαι μετα ταυτα* h l n 10-2-6-8. 37-8. 45-9. 90 B^r; καὶ ατινα εἰσι 13.

3. for *τους λογους, τον λογον* N B: *του λογου* 36. aft λογ. ins *τουτους* C.
aft *της προφητειας* ins *ταυτης* l 16 vulg(with am demid &c agst fuld tol &c) syr-dd copt (Vict) Primas.

as to the *things witnessed*. The words *ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ κ. ἡ μαρτυρία* Ἰ. χρ. cannot with any likelihood be taken to mean "the (personal) Word of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ;" for why, if the former term refer to Christ personally, should He be introduced in the second member under a different name? Besides, the words occur again below, ver. 9, as indicating the reason why John was in the island Patmos; and there surely they cannot refer to his written Gospel, but must be understood of his testimony for Christ in life and words: moreover, *ἡ μαρτυρία* Ἰησοῦ is itself otherwise explained in this very book, ch. xix. 10. But there is yet another objection to the supposed reference to the Gospel, arising from the last words, *ὅσα εἶδεν*. First, the very adjective *ὅσα* refutes it. For the Evangelist distinctly tells us, John xx. 30, that in writing his Gospel, he did not set down *ὅσα εἶδεν*, but only a portion of the things which Jesus did in the presence of His disciples, whereas in the case of this Revelation it was otherwise: he set down all which he saw, as a faithful transmitter of the Apocalyptic vision to the churches. But still more does the verb *εἶδεν* carry this refutation. In no place in the Gospel does St. John use this verb of his eye-witnessing as the foundation of his testimony; indeed he only uses it of himself at all on two occasions, John i. 40, and xx. 8. But in this book, it is the word in regular and constant use, of the seeing of the Apocalyptic visions; being thus used in it no less than 55 times. And some of these usages are such that there can be no doubt this place is connected with them; e. g., ver. 19, *γράψον οὖν & εἶδες*, and the repetition itself so frequently occurring *καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἰδού*. Taken then as representing the present book, *τὸν λόγον* here will be the aggregate of *οἱ λόγοι* ver. 3: *ἡ μαρτυρία* Ἰησ. χρ. will be

the *πνεῦμα τῆς προφητείας*, embodied in writing for the Church in all ages).

3.] Blessed is (or *be*, in the ordinary meaning of *μακάριος*: not necessarily referring on to eternal blessedness, as Hengst.) he that readeth, and they that hear the words of the prophecy and observe the things written in it; for the time is near (it can hardly be reasonably denied that in the *ὁ ἀναγινώσκων* and the *οἱ ἀκούοντες*, the Apostle had in his mind the one public reader and the many hearers. Ebrard attempts to deny this, but it seems to me unsuccessfully. His instance of St. John's passing from a singular to a plural, *πᾶς ὀφθαλμός, καὶ οἵτινες αὐτὸν ἐξεκέντησαν*, ver. 7, would be applicable only if we had here *πᾶς ὁ ἀναγινώσκων*. Considering that no *such* transition is elsewhere found, we can hardly escape the inference that it was intended. And so the great majority of Commentators: so Andreas ("plures uno legente possunt audire," Gloss. ord.), Bede ("doctores et auditores"), Lyra ("qui legit, quantum ad doctores: qui audiunt, quantum ad discipulos"), &c.: Bengel ("unus, ille primum, per quem Johannes librum ex Patmo in Asiam misit, legebat publice in ecclesiis, et multi audiebant"), Ewald, Hengst., De Wette, Stern, Gräber, &c. Others have explained the change of number variously: e. g., Beza, ex Hebraismo; Cotter (in Pool), "quia soli legimus, audimus conjuncti:" Ribera, "quoniam multo plures audiunt, quam legunt:" &c. If the words are to be understood as above, they form at least a solemn rebuke to the practice of the Church of England, which omits with one or two exceptions the whole of this book from her public readings. Not one word of the precious messages of the Spirit to the Churches is ever heard in the public services of a Church never weary of appealing to her *Scriptural* liturgies. Surely it

t = Acts ii. 9
u see 2 John 3
ref., and
note.
v ver. 8. ch. iv.
8. (xi. 17.
xvi. 5.
Exod. iii. 14.) solacc., ver. 5. Winer, edn. 6, § 10. 2.
x = ch. xi. 6 al
4 Ἰωάννης ταῖς ἐπτὰ ἐκκλησίαις ταῖς ἐν τῇ ᾿Ασίᾳ. AC^{PN} B
u χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εὐερίνη ἀπὸ ὧν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ
ἐρχόμενος, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ πνευμάτων ᾧ ἐνώπιον τοῦ
x ch. iv. 5, 6, 10. vi. 9, 15. xiv. 3 al
w ch. iii. 1. iv. 5. v. 6. (Zech. iv. 2, 10.)
a to n, 1
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19 26-
7. 30. 32
to 38. 40
to 41. 47
Br.

4. rec ins του bef ο ων, with 4 (30. 48, e sil): ins θεου B (11²) 33(sic, Del; του θεου, 35-6 e sil) rel arm Andr-coisl Vict Primas: ins κυριου c Cassiod: om AC[P]N h l n 1. 2. 6. 10-2-6-7. 37-8. 49. 51 Br Andr-p. for ἡ, των AN 47 Andr-a: om 80. rec aft ἡ ins εστιν, with [P] n 1. 10-corr¹ 33 (h l 16. 37-8. 49 Br, e sil); εισιν 36: om ACN B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

is high time, that such an omission should be supplied. Notice that not three classes of persons, but two only, are here indicated: he that reads, and they that hear and do. Had there been an article before *τηρουντες*, these latter would have formed a separate class from the *ακουοντες*. The E. V. is right in the sense, in rendering *της προφ.*, '*this prophecy*:' it = *της προφ. του βιβλιου τουτου*, ch. xxii. 7. τα εν αυτη γεγραμμενα are the several exhortations to repentance, faith, patience, obedience, prayer, watchfulness, stedfastness, which are scattered up and down in the prophecy. The *time being near* makes the book of the more importance, and the blessedness of reading and observing it greater. The *nearness* spoken of is to be understood as the *εν ταχει*, ver. 1, which see. We know little now of relative nearness and distance in point of time: when the day of the Lord shall have opened our eyes to the true measure, we shall see, how near it always was).

CH. I. 4—III. 22.] INTRODUCTION TO THE PROPHECY, in the form of a *sevenfold Epistle* to the seven churches of Asia. And herein, vv. 4—6, *address and greeting*, ending with *doxology*. (Ebrard, who seems to love singularity for its own sake, objects to the above arrangement, because the sevenfold epistle has not yet begun, and prefers calling this a dedicatory title to the whole book. But the other view is far simpler and better. The sevenfold Epistle is clearly before St. John's mind, and, full of the images of the vision which he had seen, he only interrupts it by solemn ejaculatory references to the glories of that vision and the sublime announcement of the Lord's coming, and then hastens on to introduce it by a prefatory account of his own circumstances when the Epistles were entrusted to him and of the appearance of the Lord who thus entrusted them.) **John to the seven churches which are in Asia** (the form of address is exactly that in the Epistles of St. Paul: see Rom. i. 1 ff., 1 Cor. i. 1 ff., &c. That St. Paul in Rom.

and elsewhere is careful to designate himself and his office, and St. John introduces himself without any such designation, belongs doubtless in part to the individual character of the two Apostles, but is besides a strong testimony that the John who here writes needed no such designation in the eyes of those to whom he was writing. See this, and other evidence as to the authorship, urged in the prolegomena. See on the seven churches prolegg. § iii. 7 ff. Ἀσία, as always in the N. T., is the proconsular province so called. "Constabat,—ut a Cicerone alicubi dicitur illa proconsularis Asia, quæ inter præcipuas Romani orbis provincias olim habita,—ex Phrygia, Mysia, Caria, Lydia; sub quibus insuper, sub Mysia nempe et Lydia, intelligi debent Ionia et Æolis, ac addi præterea vicinæ maris Ægæi insulæ. Qui amplissimus terrarum tractus, præ aliis Romani orbis provinciis, ingenti imprimis urbium, et multarum ex iis insignium et magnarum, numero gaudebat. Dicebatur Proconsularis, quod eadem a viro consulari sub Proconsulis nomine regebatur." Spanheim de usu numismatum, p. 610 (from Hengstenb.); *grace be to you and peace* (so St. Paul in all his Epistles except the two to Timothy) from **Him who is and who was and who is to come** (a paraphrase of the unspeakable name יהוה, resembling the paraphrase יהוה אלהינו יהוה in Exod. iii. 14, for which the Jerusalem Targum has, as here, *qui fuit, est, et erit*: as has the Targum of Jonathan in Deut. xxxii. 39, Schemoth R. iii. f. 105. 2: "Dixit Deus S. B. ad Mosen: Ego fui et adhuc sum, et ero in posterum." Schöttg., Wetst., De Wette. "ὁ ἐρχόμενος, *instans*, i. e., *futurus*: ut Marc. x. 30. Caret lingua Hebræa participio quale est *ἐσόμενος*." Ewald. Each of the appellations by itself is to be regarded as a proper name—ὁ ὢν, —ὁ ἦν (not δ ἦν: the imperf.—or aor.—being used in the lack of a past participle of εἶμι), and ὁ ἐρχόμενος: and it follows from what is remarked above that the meaning of ἐρχόμενος is not here to be pressed as referring to any future coming,

c pres., John
iii 35.
d (λουεῖν)
constr. with
ἀπό, Acts.
xvi 33
- here (John
xiii. 10. Acts
ix 37 Heb.
x. 22. 2 Pet.
ii. 22) only. (ἀπολουῖν, Acts xxii 16 1 Cor vi 11.) see Ps. i. 12. λυεῖν ἐκ, ch. xx. 7. e Heb ix. 22, 25 reff
f change of constr., Matt xi. 9. al. Winer, edn. 6, § 50 11 g ch v 10 (xx. 6 1 Pet ii. 9. Εξοδ. αλκ.
6.) approx., see Winer, edn. 6, § 63. ii. 2 fin h Rom. xv. 6 2 Cor. i. 3. xi 31. Eph. i. 3. Col.
i. 3. 1 Pet. ii. 3. 1 Jude 25 (teill.).

Andr Areth Primas Bede. βασιλειων (but corrd) N¹. rec τω αγαπησαντι, with [P] h n 1. 10. 36 (37 Br, e sil) Andr-a-p Areth: τον αγαπησαντος 12²: os ηγαπησεν m 34-5² Andr-coisl: txt AC(N) B rel syr-dd.—om τω N¹. λυσαντι ACN n 1. 6. 12¹. 36-8. 69. 79 syr-dd arm Andr-a-txt Primas Cassiod: λουσαντι [P] B rel vulg copt æth Andr-p Areth, λουσαντας 12² (sic, Birch), ελουσεν m 34-5² Andr-coisl.— λυσαντι και των της αμαρτίας κηλιδων λουσαντι τη εκχυσει του ζωοποιου αιματος και υδατος και ποιησαντι ημας βασιλειον ιερατευμα και λουσαντι (from Andreas) 17. 16. 45. 69. om 2nd ημας N¹ 36. rec for εκ, απο, with [P] B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth Primas: txt ACN n¹ 1. 12. 36-8 Andr. rec ins ημων, with C[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth Bede: om A 1. 12-6 Andr-p Primas.

6. for ποιησεν, ποιησαντι B f 9. 13-6. 27. 36. ημων A c 13. 27. 38. 55. 76: ημων C, nostrum regnum am (with fuld harl tol): txt [P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth. rec (for βασιλειαν ιερεις) βασιλεις και ιερεις, with [P] u 1. 36 79 Andr-a-p: βασιλεις ιερεις 30-8: βασιλειον ιερεις B: βασιλειον ιερατευμα f 13. 27. 55 Andr-comm: βασιλειον και ιερατευμα 9: βασιλειαν και ιερεις N^{3a}: txt ACN¹ rel am syr-dd copt æth Andr-coisl Areth Vict. for tous αιωνας, τον αιωνα N¹. rec aft αιωνας ins των αιωνων ("ex formula usitata" Beng), with CN B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-p-coisl Areth: om A[P] j n 9 copt Andr-a. om αμην 33 tol: ins AC[P]N B rel.

See also Isa. lv. 4, ἰδοὺ μαρτύριον ἐν ἔθνεσιν ἔδωκα αὐτόν, ἄρχοντα καὶ προστάσσοντα ἔθνεσιν. "That which the Tempter held forth to Jesus, Matt. iv. 8, on condition of worshipping him, He has now attained by the way of his humiliation unto death: viz. victory over the world, John xvi. 33." De Wette). Now follows, consequent upon the glorious titles of Christ which have been enumerated, an ascription of praise to Him for His inestimable love to us. Unto Him that loveth us (ἀγαπᾶντι,—present part., not imperf. as Bengel,—includes in itself ἀγαπήσαντι, which is the feeblar, as it is the more obvious reading. It is His ever-abiding character, that He loveth His own, John xiii. 1: out of that love sprang the mighty act of love which follows: but it did not exhaust its infinite depth: it endures now, as then. The waiting till He become, in the unfolding of the Father's purposes, the acknowledged Head over his Church, is in reality as great a proof of that love now, as the Cross was then) and washed (or, loosed) us from our sins in His blood (the aor. points to a definite event, viz. his sacrifice of Himself. In such an image as this, which occurs again ch. vii. 14, we have enwrapped together the double virtue of the atoning blood of Christ in justification, the deliverance from the guilt of sin, and sanctification, the deliverance from the

power of sin: the forensic and the inherent purity, of both which it is the efficient medium: of the former by its application in faith, of the latter by such faith, in its power, uniting us to Him who is filled with the Spirit of holiness. See 1 John i. 7 and note), 6.] and He made (the breaking up of the participial into the direct construction is Hebraistic: so De W., al. "It belongs to the delicacy of the Hebrew diction, to follow up the participle which gives the tone to the sentence by finite verbs, which, through the influence of the relative notion embodied in the participle, are themselves to be taken as conditioning clauses." Delitzsch on Habak. (in Hengst.)) us a kingdom (viz. the kingdom of God or of heaven, so much spoken of by our Lord Himself and his Apostles: consisting of those who are His, and consummated at His glorious coming. This kingdom is one in which his saints will themselves reign, see the parallel place ch. v. 10, where καὶ βασιλεύσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς is added: and Dan. vii. 27: but above all the place which is here referred to, Exod. xix. 6, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔρεσθέ μοι βασιλειον ἱεράτευμα καὶ ἔθνος ἅγιον (1 Pet. ii. 9)), priests (the βασιλείαν was the collective description: ἱερεῖς is the individual designation. See on the union of the two characters in the individual Christian, the note on 1 Pet. ii. 9) to (as belonging to;

7 Ἰδοὺ ^k ἔρχεται ¹ μετὰ τῶν ^{lm} νεφελῶν, καὶ ^{no} ὄψεται ^k — Matt. xvi. 27. Mal. iii. 1.
 αὐτὸν πᾶς ὀφθαλμὸς καὶ ^p οὔτινες αὐτὸν ^{nq} ἐξέκέντησαν, ¹ Mark xiv. 62. Dan. vii. 13. Theod.
 καὶ ¹ κόψονται ἐπ' αὐτὸν πᾶσαι αἱ ^s φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς. ^t ναί, ^m Matt. xxiv. 30. John. 1.
 30 || xxiv. 64. 1 Thess. iv. 17. n John xix. 37, from Zech. xii. 10 (Ald. & some mss.).
 o = Matt. xxiv. 30 || xxiv. 64 ||. p = ch. ii. 24. ix. 4. xx. 4. Act. x. 41, 47 al. q John.
 as above (n) only. Judg. ix. 54. r mid w. ἐπί, ch. xviii. 9 (but dat.). 2 Kings xi. 26 A (om
 ἐπί, B). Zech. xii. 10 w. acc., Luke viii. 52. xxiii. 27 absol., Matt. xi. 17. xxiv. 30 only. act., Matt. xxi.
 8 || Mk. only. s Matt. xxiv. 30. Zech. xii. 12. t see 2 Cor. i. 20. ch. xxii. 20.

7. for μετα, ἐπι C Ephr.
 αὐτον, αὐτω 37: om 1.

οψονται N 1. 12.
 om 2nd αυτον N.

for πας, παρ(sic) N. for 1st
 om επ αυτον 1: om επ N1.

the Father being the ultimate object of reference, as His will is the origin, and His glory the result, of all that is brought about by the mediatorial work of Christ) **God and His Father** (to Him who is God and His Father: or, to His God and Father. The former is the more probable here, Ebr. remarks, on account of St. John's habit of repeating the possessive genitive after words of possession: e. g. ch. vi. 11, οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν κ. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν: ix. 21, ἐκ τῶν φόνων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τ. φαρμάκων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ, &c.: John ii. 12, which is more to the point here,—*ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ κ. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] κ. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ*. See notes on the places where the expression occurs in St. Paul (reff. Rom. Eph.), where I have taken the other rendering), **to Him** be (or, *is, belongs*: the like ambiguity is found in all doxological sentences) **the glory and the might unto the ages** (i. e. for ever. See note on Gal. i. 5): **Amen**.

7, 8.] *A solemn announcement of the coming of Christ, and declaration, by way of ratification, of the majesty and omnipotence of God* (see below). **Behold He** (the Person last spoken of: the subject being continued from the preceding verses) **cometh with the clouds** (τῶν, viz. of heaven: so expressed in reff. Dan., and Mark: cf. ἐν τῇ νεφελῇ, ch. xi. 12), **and every eye shall see Him** (by a well-known figure, not merely Hebraistic but common to all tongues, the acting member is said to do that which the man does by its means. This is to be understood of the whole human race, risen and summoned before Him), **and** (among them: the καὶ does not couple a separate class, but selects a prominent one) **they which** (οὔτινες, of the whole class: almost = "whoever:" "all they who") **pierced Him** (see John xix. 36 f. and note. As there St. John evidently shews what a deep impression the whole circumstance here referred to produced on his own mind, so it is remarkable here that he should again take up the prophecy of Zechariah (reff.) which he there cites, and speak of it as fulfilled. That this should be so, and that it should

be done with the same word ἐξέκέντησαν, not found in the LXX of the passage, is a strong presumption that the Gospel and the Apocalypse were written by the same person. It is true, that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have used the verb ἐκκεντεῖν; but this hardly comes into consideration as affecting this presumption. The persons intended in this expression are beyond doubt those to whom our Lord prophesied in like terms, Matt. xxvi. 64; viz. those who were His murderers, whether the Jews who delivered Him to be crucified, or the Romans, who actually inflicted His death. That the meaning must not here be generalized to signify all who have by their sins crucified the Son of God afresh, is plain from the consideration that this class, οὔτινες, are taken out from among the πᾶς ὀφθαλμός which precedes, whereas on that supposition they would be identical with it; for we all have pierced Him in this sense), **and all the tribes of the earth shall mourn at Him** (i. e. their mourning shall be directed towards Him as its object: in fear for themselves in regard to the consequences of his coming: similarly πρὸς τι, John xiii. 28. The account to be given of the meaning in ref. 2 Kings, ἐκόψατο ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτοῦ, is in fact the same, the circumstances only making the difference. In Zech. xii. 10, both meanings are united.

The prophecy is in allusion to Matt. xxiv. 30; and its sense, that all, even the holiest of men, shall mourn at the visible approach of that day. But as Bengel well remarks, there will be then two kinds of mourning: "præ terrore hostili," and "præ terrore poenitentiali." The former will prevail in the impenitent and careless world; the latter even in the comforted and rejoicing church. The holiest saint when that Presence is manifested, in the midst of his "Lo, this is our God; we have waited for Him, and He will save us," will personally feel with St. Peter, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." The whole is an adaptation and amplification of the words of Zechariah, i. c. See Vitringa's note. But we must

n ch. xxi 6
 xxi 13.
 Luke i 32
 ch. xxi. 8.
 xxi 6.
 w ch. xxi. 14.
 xix 15.
 x ver 4.
 y as above (w).
 w θεός,
 ch. i. 8 xi.
 17, xy 3.
 xvi. 7. xix. 6.
 xxi. 23 only
 ch. xxi. 4) constr., see Matt. xxi. 30
 19 b see Rom xiv 17. 1 Cor. iv 20.
 z Rom xi 17. 1 Cor ix 23. Phil i 7 only + (-εύ,
 a Phil iv. 14 John xvi 33 Acts xiv. 22 Ps. xxi. 11.
 c w. gen. as in rec, ch iii 10 al

8. το α και το ω 1. 10 (9. 51, e sil) : το αλφα και το ω AC[P](N) B a b c d f g h j k m n 2. 4. 6. 13-7-8-9. 25. 30-2-3-4-5-6-7. 42-6-8. 50 B^c.—aft αλφα ins και εγω N¹(N^{8a} dis- approving). rec adds αρχη και τελος, with N¹(N^{8a} has marked the words for erasure, but the marks have been removed apparently by the same hand) m 1. 34-5 (37. 41, e sil) vulg some-lat-ff; γ αρχη και το τελος n 36 copt: om AC[P] B rel syr-dd aeth arm Areth Ambr. Primas. rec (for κυριος ο θεος) ο κυριος, with 30(e sil) 34: txt AC[P]N B rel vss Hipp Andr Areth Orig-int Ambr Primas. (d def.)

9. rec aft δ ins και (with 2, e sil) : om AC[P]N B rel. for συγκ., κοινωνος rel Areth: txt AC[P]N B f m n 18. 34-5-6. 49 (1. 13. 38. 51, e sil). rec ius εν τη bef βασιλεια, with [P] l (1, e sil) 16. 49 Andr-p; εν 36: om ACN B rel vulg copt Orig Dion Andr Areth Primas.—for και, τη 50: om και βασ. syr-dd aeth. (d def.) rec (for εν ιω) ιησου χριστου, with n (1, e sil) Andr: εν χρ. ιησ. B rel harl syr-dd arm Andr-coisl Areth Primas: εν κυ ιω aeth: εν χω A 25: εν ιω χω N^{8a}: txt C[P]N¹ 38 am(with

not adopt his notion, taken up also by Hengst., "Venire dicitur Christus in nubibus caeli, quoties gloriam maiestatemque suam in singularibus gratiae, severitatis et potentiae suae effectis demonstrat, et se ecclesiae quasi praesentem exhibet:" for thus we confuse and indeed stultify the whole of this solemn announcement. The certainty of Christ's revealing Himself to his Church in mercies and judgments needed no such asseveration as is here used: but the certainty of His great personal second coming did and still does; being the one fact which the world and the church alike are disposed to lose sight of). **Yea, Amen** (both these words are used in ref. 2 Cor. as forms of ratification. The former is Greek, the latter Hebrew: and both together answer to the "Thus saith the Lord" of the prophets: τούτοις δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις τὸ βέβαιον ἐπιμαρτυρῶν, ἐπεσφράγισε διὰ τοῦ εἰπεῖν ναὶ καὶ ἀμήν. τοῦ νὰ μὲν ἐξ Ἑλληνικῆς συνθηκῆς τὸ ἀμετάστατον τῶν εἰρημένων ἐξακριβοῦντος, τοῦ δὲ ἀμήν παρ' Ἑβραίων, εἰς τὸ μηδὲν ἀνγενέσθαι ἐμποδῶν μὴ ἐκβῆναι τὰ ἡπειλημένα ἐπαγομένου. Andr. in Catena). **I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord God, He that is and that was and that is to come, the Almighty** (by whom are these words spoken? Certainly as they here stand, with κύριος ὁ θεός, and ὁ παντοκράτωρ, they must be understood as uttered by the Eternal Father. And similarly we find Him that sitteth on the throne speaking in ch. xxi. 5 ff. In our ver. 17, and in ch. xxii. 13, it is our Lord who speaks. Nor need we be sur-

prised, that He who is of one essence with the Father should assert of Himself the same eternal being as the Father. This need not lead us to force the reference of any passage, but each must be ruled by considerations of its own context. Schöttgen gives examples of the Rabbinical usage of "ab Aleph usque ad Tau," to signify "completely," "entirely:" and of the word נא being a name of the Shechinah, because it comprehends all the letters. The ἀρχὴ κ. τέλος was a correct gloss, from ch. xxi. 6, xxii. 13). ὁ παντοκράτωρ answers in the LXX to the Hebr. הוֹרָא also to יָצָא. See note on Rom. ix. 29.

9—20.] *Introduction to the Epistles. Appearance of our Lord to St. John, and command to write what he saw, and to send it to the seven churches.* 9.] *Description of the Writer, and of the place where the Revelation was seen.* **I** John (so again ch. xxii. 8: so Daniel, viii. 1, ix. 2, x. 2) **your brother** (no inference can be drawn against the apostleship of the Writer from this his designation of himself. Indeed from his entire silence respecting himself in his Gospel, we may well believe that here, where mention of his name was absolutely required, it would be introduced thus humbly and unobtrusively), **and fellow-partaker in the tribulation and kingdom and endurance in Jesus** (the construction and arrangement are peculiar. The conjunction of these terms seems to be made to express, a partaker, as in the kingdom, so in the tribulation and endurance which are in

μην ἐν τῇ νήσῳ τῇ καλουμένη Πάτμῳ ^d διὰ τὸν ^e λόγον ^d (1) ch. vi. 9. xx 4. (2) Rom. iv. 25. Phil. ii. 30. e ver. 2 (reff.). f = ch. iv. 2. see Luke xxii 44. Acts xxi. 11. xxi. 17 (γυν. ἐν ποιεῖν, Herod. ii. 82) g Matt xxii. 43. ch. xvi. 3. xxi. 10. see Jude 20 reff. h 1 Cor. xi. 20 only † (see note). i see Ezek. iii. 12.

demid tol lipss) copt Orig. om τη καλουμένη 1. for δια (bef τ. λογ.), και C. rec ins δια bef την μαρτυριαν, with [P]N B rel syr-dd Andr-p: om AC c m n 1. 4. 9. 34-5-7-8. 48 vulg copt Dion Andr Areth Primas Bede. rec aft ησου ins χριστου, with N^{3c} B rel lips-4 syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas: om AC[P]N¹ n 12. 36-7-8 vulg copt Dion Andr-a. 10. 6 omits vv 10-16. ins εγω bef εγενομην (εγ written twice?) A.

and by Christ: but the insertion of βασιλεία between θλίψει and ὑπομονῇ is startling, and the effect of it must be to make the construction zeugmatic, ἐν χρ. 'I. not properly belonging to βασιλεία. It can hardly be that the words are, as De W., "ordnungslos neben einander gestellt." More probably, the tribulation brings in the kingdom (Acts xiv. 22), and then as a corrective to the idea that the kingdom in its blessed fulness was yet present, the ὑπομονῇ is subjoined. "Tres hæreditatum uncias introducti Johannes, quibus se participem ostendit. Sed media harum, i. e. regnum, possideri non potest, nisi et hic tribulatio exercuerit, et illic patientia defenderit." Ambr. Ausbert), was ("befand mich:" not = ἦ, which announces the simple fact. When an *event* is notified with ἐγένετο, we express the meaning by "came to pass:" when a *person*, we have no word which will do it) in the island which is called Patmos (see Prolegomena, § ii. par. 4) on account of the word of God and the testimony of Jesus (the substantives form the same expression as occurred before ver. 2, where see note. There they indicated *this* portion of the divine word and testimony, of which John was a faithful reporter. Whether their meaning is the same here, will depend partly on what sense we assign to the prep. διὰ. In St. Paul's usage, as in reff., it would here signify *for the sake of*, i. e. for the purpose of receiving: so that the Apostle would thus have gone to Patmos by special revelation in order to receive this ἀποκάλυψις. Again, keeping to this meaning of διὰ, these words may mean, that he had visited Patmos in pursuance of, for the purposes of, his ordinary apostolic employment, which might well be designated by these substantives. And such perhaps would have been our acceptation of the words, but that three objections intervene. 1) From what has preceded in this verse, a strong impression remains on the mind that St. John wrote this in a season of tribulation and persecution. Why should he throw over his address this

tinge of suffering given by the θλίψις and ὑπομονῇ, if this were not the case? De W. will not allow this: but to my mind Hofmann is quite right in pressing it (Weiss. u. Erfüll. ii. 308). 2) The usage of our Writer himself in two passages where he speaks of death by persecution (reff.) shews that with him διὰ in this connexion is "*because of*," "*in consequence of*." De W. naively says that had it not been for these parallel places, such a meaning would never have been thought of here. We may as simply reply, that owing to those parallel places, it must be accepted here. St. John's own usage is a better guide in St. John's writings than that of St. Paul. And Origen's ear found no offence in this usage, for he incorporated it into his own sentence, . . . κατεδίκασε τὸν Ἰωάννην μαρτυροῦντα διὰ τὸν τῆς ἀληθείας λόγον εἰς Πάτμον τὴν νῆσον. See the passage, Prolegg. § i. par. 12. 3) An early patristic tradition relates that St. John was banished to Patmos. See the authorities in the Prolegg. ut supra, and the question discussed, whether we are justified in ascribing this tradition solely to our present passage. These considerations, mainly those arising from the passage itself, compel us, I believe, to understand the words of an (exile in Patmos).

10, 11.] I was (on ἐγενόμην, see above. Not merely "*I was*," but "*I became*") in the Spirit (i. e. in a state of spiritual ecstasy or trance, becoming thereby receptive of the vision or revelation to follow. That this is the meaning is distinctly shewn by the same phrase occurring in ch. iv. 2: where after seeing the door open in heaven, and hearing the ἀνάβα ὧδε, he adds, εὐθέως ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι. See also ch. xxi. 10. Ebrard well says, "Der Rapport mit der Umgebung durch die Sinne ist unterbrochen, und ein Rapport mit der unsichtbaren Welt tritt ein:" "connexion with surrounding objects through the senses is suspended, and a connexion with the invisible world established." On the attempt made by some to give the words a different meaning, see

k ch it 1. μου ⁱ φωνήν μεγάλην ^k ὡς ^k σάλπιγγος ^{l 1} λεγούσης Ὁ AC^{PN} B
 Isa xlviii 3. ^{a lo n, 1,}
 i iii 1. see ^{2, 4, 6, 9,}
 Matt xxiv, 31 1 Cor. xv. 52. 1 Thess. iv. 16. ^{10-3, 16}
 1 so ch. iv. 1. ^{so 19,}

φωνην bef οπισω μου B rel (Andr-coisl) Areth: μεγαλην bef σπ. μου A 16. 38 Andr-a:
 txt C[P]N (n 36) (1. 41-9, e sil) vulg Primas.—φωνης . . . μεγαλης 34.—σαλπιγγος
 bef μεγαλην, omg ως, n.—οπισω μου ως φωνην μεγαλην ως φωνην σαλπιγγος 36.—
 οπισθεν A. ^{40-1-2,}
^{47 to 51,}
^{90 B.}

11. λεγουσαν N³²: -σις(sic) 1. rec aft λεγουσης ins εγω εμι το Α και το Ω δ
 πρωτος και δ εσχατος και, with [P] 1 1. 16. 36-8. 49(of these however [P] 1 16 om εμι;
 [P has αλφα for το α;] 16. 38 om 1st δ; 38 om 2nd δ; 1 16. 38 om last και; 49
 places a cross before εγω and aft εσχ.) Andr-a-p: om AC^N B rel vss Andr-coisl Areth

below) on the Lord's day (i. e. on the first day of the week, kept by the Christian church as the weekly festival of the Lord's resurrection. On any probable hypothesis of the date of this book, this is the earliest mention of the day by this name. This circumstance, coupled with an exegetical bias, has led certain modern interpreters, of whom as far as I know, Wetstein was the first, to interpret the words of the day of the Lord's coming, ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου. So Züllig, and in our own country, Drs. S. R. Maitland and Todd. But 1) the difficulty, of the thus early occurrence of this term, is no real one. Dr. Maitland says (see Todd's Lectures on the Apoc., Note B, p. 295), "I know of nothing in the Scripture or in the works of the ante-Nicene Fathers on which to ground such an assumption." To this we may answer, that the extent of Dr. Maitland's knowledge of the ante-Nicene Fathers does not, happily for us, decide the question. For, while he repudiates passages "professedly (?) brought forward from Ignatius, Irenæus, &c.," those of Tertullian ("die dominico jejuniū nefas ducimus," de coron. c. 3, vol. ii. p. 70: "quomodo dominica solennia celebrabimus," de fug. pers. c. 14, p. 119), Dionysius of Corinth (τὴν σήμερον οὖν κυριακὴν ἁγίαν ἡμέραν διηγάζομεν, ἐν ᾗ ἀνέγνωμεν ὑμῶν τὴν ἐπιστολήν, Eus. iv. 23), Julius Africanus (τάχα τε σημαίνει τὸ πολυχρόνιον αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν ὑπερκόσμων ὁδοδὰδα, κυριακὴν ἡμέραν, de temp. 5), Epiphanius (πῶς τε ἀπολλεῖν εἰς ἐπιφώσκουσαν κυριακὴν, φανερόν ἐστι; Hæc. lxxv. 7, p. 910), Clem.-Alex. (οὗτος ἐντολὴν τὴν κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον διαπραξάμενος κυριακὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν ποιεῖ, Strom. vii. 12 (76), p. 877 P.), are apparently unknown to him. Indeed he confesses (Todd, ut supra p. 301) to have found the word in Origen against Celsus viii. 22, vol. i. p. 758 (ἐὰν δέ τις πρὸς ταῦτα ἀνθυποφέρει τὰ περὶ τῶν παρ' ἡμῶν κυριακῶν, ἢ τοῦ πάσχα, ἢ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς . . .), and concedes that there may be many more places, but this does not modify his opinion, nor its adoption by his successor Dr. Todd. It may be well to cite the testimonies from

Ignatius (ad Magnes. 9, p. 669, *μηκέτι σαββατίζοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ κυριακὴν ζῶην (ζώντες)*) and Irenæus (in the Quæst. ad Orthod. in the works of Justin Martyr, 115, ed. Otto, vol. iii., p. 180 f., τὸ ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ μὴ κλίνειν γόνυ, σύμβολόν ἐστι τῆς ἀναστάσεως . . . ἐκ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν δὲ χρόνων ἡ τοιαύτη συνήθεια ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν, καθὼς φησιν δ μακάριος Εἰρηναῖος . . ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ πάσχα λόγῳ, ἐν ᾧ μέμνηται καὶ περὶ τῆς πεντηκοστῆς, ἐν ᾗ οὐ κλινόμεν γόνυ, ἐπειδὴ ἰσοδυναμεῖ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κυριακῆς κατὰ τὴν ῥηθείαν περὶ αὐτῆς αἰτίαν): whence it is hardly possible but that the word should have occurred in Irenæus. Mr. Elliott, Hor. Apoc. iv. 367 note, has pointed out that the Peschito renders οὐκ ἐστὶν κυριακὴν δείπνον φαγεῖν, 1 Cor. xi. 20, "not as becometh the day of the Lord ye eat and drink" (Etheridge), which is an interesting proof of the early usage. This chronological objection being disposed of, and the matter 2) taken on its own merits, it really is astonishing how any even moderate Greek scholars can persuade themselves that the words can mean that which these Commentators maintain. They must be bold indeed who can render *ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι ἐν*, "I was transported by the Spirit (or, in spirit) into,"—in the face of ch. iv. 2: and κυριακὴ ἡμέρα, "the day of the Lord's coming," in the face of the absence of a single precedent, and of the universal usage of the early Church. No such rendering would ever have been thought of, nor would it now be worth even a passing mention, were it not that an apocalyptic system has been built upon it.

What Drs. M. and T. say of the art. τῇ as making for their sense, is really past comprehension: as it is, that Dr. T. should call it the *emphatic* article. I need hardly remind students that it is in this connexion any thing but emphatic, being merely designative, as in ἐν τῇ σήμερον ἡμέρᾳ, Acts xx. 26; τῇ ἐχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, ib. xxi. 26; (ἐν) τῇ ἐρχομένῃ ἡμέρᾳ, so often used by St. John in his Gospel. One day being known by the name κυριακὴ, any thing happening on it would be de-

βλέπεις ἡ γράψον ἡ εἰς ἡ βιβλίον καὶ πέμψον ταῖς ἐπτά ἡ ἐκκλησίαις, εἰς ἡ Ἐφεσον καὶ εἰς Σμύρναν καὶ εἰς Πέργαμον καὶ εἰς Θυάτειραν καὶ εἰς Σάρδεις καὶ εἰς Φιλαδέλφειαν καὶ εἰς Λαοδίκειαν. ¹² καὶ ὁ ἐπέστρεψα ἡ βλέπειν τὴν ἡ φωνὴν ἡ ἦτις ἡ ἐλάλει ἡ μετ' ἡ ἐμοῦ καὶ ὁ ἐπιστρέψας εἶδον ἐπτά ἡ st λυχνίας ^{su} χρυσαῖς, ¹³ καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν [ἐπτά] ἡ λυχνίων

m Isa. xxx. 8. see ch. xvi. 8. xx. 12, 15. o act. Matt. xii. 41. Mark xiii. 16. Acts xvi. 18 al. Num. xxi. 33. see Ezek. xlv. 6. 1 John 1. 2. reff. r = John (iv 27 bis. ix. 37. xiv. 30 ch. 2 Zech. iv. 2. 11. t Matt. v. 15. Luke viii. 16. Mk. xi. 33. Heb. ix. 2 only, exc. Rev. here &c. 4 times, & ch. u. 1, 5. xi. 4. u Rev. passim. elsewhere 2 Tim. u. 20. Heb. ix. 4 (bis) only.

Primas. om o βλέπεις and 1st καὶ Ν¹ (ins Ν^{3a}). ins το bef βιβλίον Ν. rec om ἐπτα (with 1. 26, e sil): ins AC[P]Ν B rel vss Andr Areth Primas. rec aft ἐκκλησίαις ins ταις εν ασια, with copt Bede: om AC[P]Ν B rel am (with demid fuld harl lipss tol) syr-dd Andr Areth Primas. σμυρνην e: ζμυρναν Ν: μυρναν (1st letter of σμυρν. absorbed by last of εἰς) A g² 1. 32-5. 50. 69 Andr-b: μυραν g¹. rec θυατειρα, with Ν rel: θυατειρας 1: θυατηρας 12: txt AC B d f m 11. 34 5.—for εἰς θυατειραν, εν θυατειροις [P] 36. Ν has the names in the following order, εἰς εφ. κ. ε. περγ. κ. ε. θυ. κ. ε. ζμυ. κ. ε. φιλ. κ. ε. λα., Ν^{3a} adding κ. ε. σαρδῖς. 12. aft 1st καὶ ins ἐκεῖ B rel: om AC[P]Ν f m n 1. 34-5-6 (38. 40, e sil). rec (for ἐλαλεῖ) ἐλάλησε, with [P] l 1. 16. 33: λαλεῖ A: txt CN B rel vulg Iren-int Andr Areth, ἐλάλη d g. (Tischdf [ed 7] follows CN^{3a} B al in editing ἰδον here, ver 17, &c; but, from the constant confusion between εἰ and ι, it need hardly be considered a various reading at all.) 13. ἐμμεσω AC: μεσον Ν: txt [P] B rel. rec aft των ins ἐπτα, with Ν B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth Bede: om AC[P] n 1. 12. 38 (Beh). 46 am¹ syr-dd copt æth arm Iren-int Andr Cypri Ors. (The word may have been either repeated mechanically or omitted for elegance.) aft λυχνίων ins των χρυσων m 34-5 vulg(not tol) æth Andr-

signated ordinarily as happening ἐν τῇ κυριακῇ ἡμέρᾳ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ κυριακῇ, or, as ἡμέρα is one of those nouns which frequently lose the article, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κυριακῇ. In either case, the meaning, as far as the sense of κυριακή is concerned, is precisely the same. Nor does either the art., or the use of the word κυριακή by Chrys. in that sense (? I have not been able to find it), make it probable that *Easter Sunday* is meant): and I heard behind me (cf. Isa. xxx. 21) a voice (ref. Ezek.), great as of a trumpet, saying (the trumpet is the instrument of festal proclamation, Num. x. 10; Joel ii. 15, &c.: accompanies divine manifestations, Exod. xix. 19 f.; Joel ii. 1; Matt. xxiv. 31; 1 Thess. iv. 16. The similarity to the sound of the trumpet here was in the loudness and clearness of the voice: see also ch. iv. 1. From this latter it appears that this voice was not that of our Lord, but of one who there also spoke to the Apostle. Düsterd. remarks that the ὀπίσω μου leaves an indefiniteness as to the speaker), What thou seest (the present carries on the action through the vision now opening,—“*what thou art seeing*”) write (forthwith: aor.) into a book (the prep. of motion gives the transference from the writer to the document), and send to the seven churches, to Ephesus, and to Smyrna, and to Pergamum, and to Thyatira, and to Sardis, and to Philadelphia, and to Laodicea (for

all particulars respecting these churches see the Prolegomena, § iii.).

12—20.] THE VISION, in which our Lord appears to St. John, and the command is repeated. This vision is the introduction, not only to the messages to the churches, but to the whole book: see further on ver. 19. 12.] And I turned about to see the voice which was speaking with me (the voice, the acting energy, being used for the person whose voice it was. ἦτις, giving the force of *qualis*; of what sort it was which was speaking, &c.): and when I had turned about I saw seven golden candlesticks (λυχνία is a word repudiated by the Atticist writers. So Phrynichus, App. p. 50, λυχνίων: οἱ ἀμαθεῖς αὐτὸ λυχνίαν καλοῦσι: and Eustathius, p. 1842. 26, λαμπτήρες λέγει ὅς νῦν οἱ ἀργυροῖκοι λυχνίας φασίν, ἐφ' ὧν δᾶδες κείμεναι ἀνάπτονται. It is found in Philo, Josephus, and Lucian. See Lobeck's Phrynichus, p. 313 note. It is the vessel containing the λύχνος: better therefore rendered *candlesticks* than *lamps*, which gives more the idea of the light itself. The seven golden candlesticks are (united in one λυχνία) part of the furniture of the tabernacle, Exod. xxv. 31 ff. Again, in ref. Zech., we have the λυχνία χρυσῇ ὅλῃ with its seven λύχνοι. Here there are seven separate candlesticks, typifying, as that one, the entire church, but now no longer bound together in one out-

¹ πεπυρωμένοι, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς ^m φωνὴ ^m ὑδάτων ¹ Cor. vii. 9.
πολλῶν, ¹⁶ καὶ ⁿ ἔχων ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ^{op} ἀστέρας ² Cor. xi. 29.
only. Prov. x. 20. m ch. xiv. 2 xix 6. Ps. xcii. 4. see Jer xxviii. (li.) 16
ch. xix. 12. o Jude 13 reff. p ver. 20. ch ii. i. iii. 1. Eph. vi. 16.
2 Pet. iii. 12.
ch. ii. 18
n so particip.

15. πεπυρωμένης (erratum?) AC: πεπυρωμένων N 16. 46. 69 vulg Iren-int: txt [P] B rel.
16. om εχων, reading αστερες below, A 41 æth: ειχεν N¹ m 34-5-6. rec αυτων
bef χειρι, with rel: om (as in ch. ii. 1) χειρι g n 10 vulg arm Andr-p: txt AC[P] N B
c f h m 1. 4. 12-6-7. 32-4-5-6-7. 48-9 B^r Andr Areth.—χ. a. bef τη δεξ. B: manu

Art. poet. 202), the Syriac and Arethas, "brass from Lebanon" (1st altern. in catena, —εἴτε τὸν ἐν τῷ Λιβάνῳ τῷ ὕρει μεταλλευόμενον), the Arabic "Greek brass,"—Andreas, and most of the German editions of the Bible, a kind of incense so called (2nd altern. in catena, —εἴτε καὶ τὸν χαλκοειδῆ λιβάνωτον νοητέον, ὃν ἱατρῶν παῖδες ἄρβρεα καλοῦσιν, εὐώδεις καὶ αὐτὸν πυρὶ δμιλοῦντα ἄρμους ἀποπέμποντα: Germ., Erzweibrauch), on the authority of Antonius of Nebrissa (in Salmasius (Wetst.), δ λίβανος ἔχει τρία εἶδη δένδρων, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἄρβρεν ὀνομάζεται χαλκολίβανος, ἡλιοειδὴς καὶ πυρρός, ἡγουν ξανθός), who understands by the word some superior species of frankincense, the so-called 'thus masculum': for in Greek frankincense is called λίβανος, after the Heb. לְבָנָן or לְבָנִי, from the root לָבַן, *albus fuit*. This writer refers to hymns of Orpheus in honour of Apollo and of Artemis, in which χαλκολίβ. occurs in the sense of a costly kind of incense (but all we find in the titles of hymns 7, 19, 21, 65, is λιβανόμαννα, possibly a mixture of frankincense and manna), and to Virg. Ecl. viii. 65.—'Verbenasque adole pingues et mascula thura.' Still it appears somewhat strained to refer χαλκολίβανος or -ον to 'thus masculum': for, granted that 'masculum' may betoken its purity and clearness, how is χάλκος accounted for, which looks more like a hint at *hardness*? Besides, incense is not burnt ἐν καμίνῳ, in a smelting furnace, but in a censer or shallow vessel, and its colour while burning is no way observable. The interpretation, "brass from Lebanon," does not appear to be tenable, as there is no notice of Lebanon ever having produced brass of superior quality, such as this from the context must be. Suidas interprets it thus: χαλκολίβανον, εἶδος ἡλέκτρον τιμιώτερον χρυσοῦ. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἡλεκτρον ἀλλόττυον χρυσιον μεμιγμένον δελφὶ καὶ λιθείᾳ. And this, considering that in the similar and model passage, Dan. x. 6 LXX, we have χάλκος ἐξαστράπτων (as also in Ezek. i. 7), ib. Theod. χάλκος στίλβων (as also in Ezek. xl. 3), and in Ezek. i. 4, 27, and viii. 2, ἡλεκτρον,—seems the most likely direction in which to find the meaning. Still, as almost all Com-

mentators confess, it must remain enigmatical, of what the word is compounded, and to what it precisely applies. According to usual analogy, not χάλκος but λίβανος is the central idea, and χάλκος the qualifying one, as in χαλκάνθη, χαλκόλιθος, χαλκοθήκη, &c. But this makes the difficulty greater; for we can assign no meaning to λίβανος which would fit this requirement. If conjecture were admissible (which it is not), I should, in despair of any way out of the difficulty, suggest whether the word might not have been χαλκολιβιδίω, a stream of melted brass: ΔΙ having been read ΙΙ or Ν. At all events this may rank with Hitzig's conjecture, χαλχοκλιβάνω), as if they had been burnt in a furnace (and so red-hot and glowing): and his voice as the voice of many waters (Ebrard sees an allusion to the quiet and majestic sound of the sea, appealing to ch. xvii. 1 and xiii. 1; but, as Dusterdieck remarks, there seems to be no such allusion here, but only to the *power* of the voice as resembling the rushing of many waters. So Dan. x. 6 Theod., ἡ φωνὴ αὐτοῦ ὡς φωνὴ ὕχλου: Ezek. xliii. 2, where the same expression is found (in the Heb., with which agree Vulg., Syr., &c., but not LXX), i. 24, where the sound of the wings of the creatures is ὡς φωνὴ ὕδατος πολλοῦ).

16.] And having (ἔχων, not = καὶ εἶχεν, but as in ref. St. John takes up the description from time to time irrespective of the construction, as if (De W.) with separate strokes of the pencil) in his right hand seven stars (not, as Heinr., *on* his right hand, as a number of jewelled rings, but *in* his right hand, as a wreath or garland held in it. De W. well remarks that *this*, which is the more natural rendering, is also required by the symbolism. If the seven churches which the seven stars symbolize, were *on* the Lord's hand as rings, they would seem to be serving (adorning?) Him, and not to be the objects of his action: but now that He *holds them* in his hand, He appears as their Guardian, their Provider, their Nourisher: and, we may add, their Possessor, who brings them out and puts them forth to be seen when He pleases. His universal Church would hardly be thus repre-

q Matt xv. 11. p ἑπτὰ, καὶ ἑκ τοῦ ἑρ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἰστ ῥομφαία ἡ δίστομος AC P B
 Job xli. 11. r ch. xix. 15 rtv ὄξεα ἡ ἐκπορευομένη, καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος a lo n, 1.
 (21). ὄξεα ἡ ἐκπορευομένη, καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἥλιος 2 4. 6. 9.
 s Rev. (ii. 12, z φαίνει ἂν τῇ ἁ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ. 17 καὶ ὅτε εἶδον αὐτόν, 10-3. 16
 16 vi 8. xix. z φαίνει ἂν τῇ ἁ δυνάμει αὐτοῦ. 17 καὶ ὅτε εἶδον αὐτόν, 26-7. 30.
 15, 21) only, exo. Luke ii. 36. bc ἔπεσα ἑπρὸς τοὺς ἑ πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡς νεκρός· καὶ ἔθηκεν 32 to 38.
 t ch. ii 12 u Heb iv. 12. ch ii. 12 only, w. ῥομφ., Ps. cxxix 6. Sir. xxi. 3. w μάχαιρα Judg iii. 16 Prov. v 4 only v = ch. ii. 12 xiv. 14, &c xix 15 (Rom iii 15)
 y Matt xiii. 43 xvi 2. Ps lxxxviii 36 w = ch iv 5 al. x = John xi 44 (vii. 24) only Cant ii 14.
 23 only Gen i. 17 a see Mark ix 1 Rom. i 4 i Cor. xi. 43 al. Jude. v. 31 B. 1 John ii. 8. ch xii. 17
 viii. 12 Theod. x 8, 9 LXX c Mark v. 22 John xi 32. Acts v. 10 only d Dan. 9. 26
 16. Ps. cxxxviii. 5. e Dan x 12 Luke i 13, 30. f ch. ii. 8. xxiii. 13. Is. xlii. 4
 6 xlviii. 12. g John vi. 57. Luke xxiv. 5. Num. xiv. 21

dextera sua Iren-int.

φαίνει bef ως ο ἥλιος N.

17. for *pros, eis N.* wsei N 36. rec επεθηκε, with N n 1. 10-7 (g h 12. 37. 41-9 B, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec aft δεξian αυτου ins χειρα, with N³⁰ h n 1. 10. 36 (37. 41-9 B, e sil) Andr: om AC[P]N¹ B rel Andr-coisl Areth, and vulg Cypr Primas. rec aft λεγων ins μοι, with (i. 41, e sil) aeth: om AC[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth. om μη φοβου N¹ (ins N^{3a}). for πρωτος, πρωτοτοκος A (and in ch. ii. 8 also) (Areth-comin).

sented, but only a portion of it which it pleases Him to take in his hand and hold forth as representing the rest); and out of his mouth a two-edged sharp sword going forth (cf. Isa. xi. 4, xlix. 2 (ἐθηκε τὸ στόμα μου ὡς μάχαιραν ὀξεϊαν): also our ch. ii. 16, and Wisd. xviii. 15, 16. The same figure occurs with reference to *men* in Ps. lv. 21, lvii. 4, lix. 7: and Wetst. and Schöttg. give examples of it from the Rabbinical writings. The thing signified may perhaps be as in 2 Thess. ii. 8, ὁ ἄνομος ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ . . . : and in ch. xix. 21; but clearly we must not exclude (as Düsterd.) the attributes of the *word of God*, Heb. iv. 12, Eph. vi. 17. And this all the more, inasmuch as 1) here the Lord is represented not as taking vengeance on his enemies, but as speaking with his own, both in the way of comforting and of threatening: and 2) in ch. xix. 21, where this very sword is again alluded to as slaying the Lord's enemies, His title as καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου is ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ): and his countenance (not, as Düsterd., who wrongly quotes De W. as supporting him, *general appearance*: so also Ewald, al. Had this been so, how should the Apostle have noted the details just mentioned? for the whole figure of our Lord would have been too dazzling for him to contemplate. It is natural that after describing the eyes, and that which proceeded from the mouth, he should give the general effect of the countenance. And as matter of usage, John xi. 44 is decided, being spoken of a person, which ib. vii. 24 is not) as the sun shineth in his strength (see ref. Judges:—that is,

when unclouded and in full power: not necessarily at midday, but at any time. The construction is again broken: ὡς ὁ ἥλ. φαίνων would be the regular connexion). 17, 18.] And when I saw Him, I fell at his feet as dead (the effect of the divine appearance: see Exod. xxxiii. 20; Job xlii. 6; Isa. vi. 5; Ezek. i. 28; Dan. viii. 17 ff., x. 7 ff. There is no discrepancy in this bodily action with the spiritual nature of the vision, as De W. thinks, either here or in the places where similar physical effects are described, ch. v. 4, xix. 10, xxii. 8 (Dan. vii. 15). Düsterd. well remarks in reply, that the ἐν πν. of ver. 10 does not supersede existence in the body. Just as dreamers express their bodily feelings by physical acts, e. g. by starting or weeping, so might St. John while in this ecstasy: cf. Acts ix. 3). And he placed his right hand upon me, saying, Fear not (see, besides ref., Luke ii. 10, Matt. xvii. 7, Mark xvi. 6. These places, and the whole character of our Lord's words, shew that the Apostle's falling down as dead was purely from fear, not, as Ebrard imagines, as an expression of ecstatic love); I am the first and the last (reff.: = α and ω above: not as the semi-Socinian Commentators, Grot., Wetst., "summus dignitate . . . contentissimus": it is the eternity of God which is expressed—of Him who is before all and after all, from and to everlasting), and the living One (not = ὁ ζωοποιῶν, however true the fact may be; nor here signifying *alive from the dead*: but is the well-known attribute of God, the Eternal, not in bare duration, but in personal Life! The ζωοποιεῖν is included, but the word *strength*

νεκρὸς καὶ ἰδοὺ ^{gh} ζῶν ^h εἰμὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων,
καὶ ἔχω τὰς ⁱ κλείς τοῦ θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ^k ᾄδου. ¹⁹ γράψον
οὖν ἂ ¹ εἶδες καὶ ^m ἂ ^{mn} εἰσὶν καὶ ἂ ^o μέλλει ^o γενέσθαι μετὰ
ταῦτα, ²⁰ τὸ ^p μυστήριον τῶν ^q ἐπτὰ ^q ἀστέρων οὓς εἶδες
^r ἐπὶ τῆς δεξιᾶς μου, καὶ τὰς ἐπτὰ ^s λυχνίας τὰς ^s χρυσᾶς.

h constr., Gen. 1. 6. Matt xvi 19. Luke xi 52. ch iii. 7. ix. 1. x. 1 only. Jude iii. 25. 1 Chron. ix. 27. Isa. xxii. 22 only. ch vi. 8. xx. 13, 14. Acts 1. 27, from Ps. xv 10. I see ver 2. m plur., 1 Cor. x. 6. ch. ii 2. Matt vi 28. Luke xxiv 11. John xix 31. Ps. cxlv. 10. Winer, edn 6, § 38. 3 a. n = (see note) Matt. xxv. 26 xiii 37. John xv 1. 1 Cor. x 4. Gen. xli. 26, 27. Ezek xxxvii. 11. o Acts xxi 22. Isa. xlviii. 6. p = Eph. v. 32. ch. xvii. 5, 7. q ver. 16. r so John xx. 7. s ver 12 (reff.).

18. om 1st καὶ **Ν**¹. om των αιωνων j 38. rec aft αιωνων ins αμην, with **Ν**^{3a} b rel syr-dd Andr Areth: om AC[P]¹ j 1. 36-8 vulg copt æth arm Orig. Iren-int Ath-int Andr-p. for κλείς, κλειδας B rel: txt AC[P]¹ **Ν** h l m n 1. 34-5-6. 47-9 Br (13. 27. 37-8. 41, e sil). rec του αδου και τ. θανατου, with n 1. 36 (12. 27, e sil) Andr. a: txt AC[P]¹ **Ν** b rel vss Iren-int Andr Areth Ors.

19. rec om ουν, with (d ?) j 1. 16. 38 Areth: ins AC[P]¹ **Ν** b rel vss Andr Primas. ins δει bef μελλει **Ν**¹: μελλειν **Ν**¹. rec γινεσθαι, with **Α**^{3a} rel Andr-coisl Areth: om k: txt C[P]¹ **Ν**¹ b b f h 6. 10-1-6. 49 Br (c ? n ?—so Scriv) Andr.

20. rec (for ους) ων, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]¹ **Ν** 1. 12. 46. 80². for επι της δεξ., εν τη δεξια A; in dextera vulg Primas.

far more. The E. V. is wrong in connecting these words with those that follow); and I was (not ἦν, but ἐγενόμην,—I became: it was a state which I passed into) dead, and behold I am alive for evermore (see Rom. vi. 9, Acts xiii. 34. ζῶν εἰμὶ expresses, more emphatically than would the simple verb, the residence and effluence of life. By this mention of His own death and revival, the Lord reassures his Apostle. He is not only the living One in His majesty, but He has passed through death as one of us, and is come to confer life even in and through death), and I have the keys of death and of Hades (I can bring up from death, yea even from the mysterious place of the spirits of the departed. The figure of the keys is often used in this book; see reff. Wetst. quotes from the Targum of Jonathan on Deut. xxviii. 12, "Quatuor sunt claves in manu Domini, clavis vitæ et sepulchrorum et ciborum et pluviae;" and other testimonies of the same kind. We have the *gates* of death as opposed to the gates of the daughter of Zion, Ps. ix. 14; cf. also Job xxxviii. 17; and the gates of Hades, Matt. xvi. 18. Isa. xxxviii. 10).

19.] Write therefore ('because I have vouchsafed thee this vision,—I whose majesty is such, and whose manifested loving-kindness to thee.' The connexion is better thus than with ver. 11, as some: "Now that thy fear is over, write what I bade thee," Hengst. So Aret., who remarks, "ἐκστασις memoriam lædit." But it is very doubtful whether ver. 11 is spoken by our Lord at all: see there) the things which thou sawest (just now: the vision which was but now vouchsafed thee), and what things they signify (two

meanings of **ἂ εἰσιν** are possible. 1) 'the things which are,' viz. which exist at the present time. This has been taken by Arethas, Lyra, Corn-a-lap., Grot., Calov., Vittr., Beng., Wolf, Zull., Hengst., Ebrard, Lücke, Dusterd., al. 2) as above, 'what things they (the **ἂ εἶδες**) signify:' so Alcas., Aretius, Eichhorn, Heinr., Ewald, De W. In deciding between these, we have the following considerations: a) the use of the plural **εἰσιν**, as marking off this clause in meaning from the next, which has **ἂ μέλλει γενέσθαι**. If this latter is sing., why not this? Is it not because the **μέλλει γενέσθαι** merely signifies the future time, in which this latter class, *en masse*, were to happen, whereas this **ἂ εἰσιν** imports, what these things, each of them, severally, mean? And b) this seems to be borne out by the double repetition of **εἰσιν** in the next verse, both times unquestionably in this meaning. So that I have no hesitation in taking the meaning given above), and the things which are about to happen after these (viz. after **ἂ εἶδες**: the next vision, beginning with ch. iv., which itself opens with μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον. I would take γενέσθαι in the sense of happening, not in the wide ages of history, but in apocalyptic vision: seeing that, ταῦτα meaning **ἂ εἶδες**, a present vision, **ἂ μέλλει γενέσθαι** will by analogy mean the things which shall succeed these, i.e. a future vision. Notice, it is not **ἂ δεῖ γενέσθαι** as in ver. 1: not the necessity of prophecy, but only the sequence of things seen); 20.] the mystery of the seven stars which thou sawest upon (held in, and so standing over, as a wreath) my right hand (τὸ μυστ. is in apposition with **ἂ εἶδες** κ.τ.λ., and governed by

t (see note.)

οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄστέρες ἄγγελοι τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησιῶν εἰσιν.
καὶ αἱ λυχναὶ αἱ ἑπτὰ ἑπτὰ ἐκκλησίαι εἰσιν.

ACPN B
a to n, 1.
2 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19.
26-7. 30.
32 to 38.
40-1-2.
47 to 51.
90 B.

om εἰσιν N¹.rec as επτα λυχναι, with N^{3a} m n 17. 49 (d f h l 12. 37 B^r, e sil) copt

Andr: επτα λυχναι (omg ai N¹ 1) : ai λυχναι επτα 30-3-5 : txt AC[P] B rel vulg syr-dd
Areth.—ai επτα λυχναι ai επτα (λυχναι) εκκλησαι εισιν 38, the 2nd λυχν is erased.

rec adds as ειδες, with [P] n 1. 10-7. 49 (a d f h 12. 37. 41 B^r, e sil) copt Andr :
om ACN B rel Andr-coisl Areth Cypri Primas.

γράφον. Lyra interprets the word well, "sacramentum stellarum," i.e. "sacrum secretum per ipsas significatum:" see reff.), and the seven candlesticks of gold (elliptic construction for 'and the mystery of the seven candlesticks,' &c.). The seven stars are (the) (the prefixed predicate ἄγγελοι, though on that account wanting the article, is rendered definite by the definite gen., τῶν ἑπτ. ἐκκ., which follows) angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks are seven churches (the import of the ἄγγελοι has been much disputed. Very many Commentators take them for the *presiding presbyters*, or *bishops*, of the churches. So Primas., Bede, Joach., Lyra, Alcas., Corn.-a-lap., Ribera, Bossuet, Beza, Grot., Calov., al. m. So also Vitruv., Whitby, and with some modification, Hengst. This view is variously supported. It derives probability from the analogy of the vision itself, in which, seeing that the candelabra represent the churches themselves, existing vessels containing much light, the stars, concentrated sparks of light, should represent some actually existing persons in or connected with the churches. Again it is supported by our finding that throughout the seven Epistles the angel is treated as representing and responsible for the particular church. But before we pass on to the other great section of interpretation, we may at once dismiss those forms of this one which make ἄγγελος the *ideal representative* of the governing body (as Hengst.), or an *ideal messenger* from the church (as Ebrard), or a proleptic idea of the office of Bishop, not yet instituted, as Rothe, or, in short, any idealism at all. As the ἐκκλησία is an objective reality, so must the ἄγγελος be, of whatever kind. This consideration will also affect the current of interpretation which takes the angels to be *the churches themselves*. So Andreas and Arethas (in Cat.—ἄγγελον τῆς Ἐφέσου, τὴν ἐν αὐτῇ ἐκκλησίαν λέγει. οὐ γὰρ ὁ προστατὼν ἄγγελος ἡμαρτῆκει, ὥστε δεῖν ἀκοῦσαι μετανοήσου, ὁ δὲ ἀγιότητα ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ κυρίου ὑπάρχων ἀστὴρ ὢν . . . τίς δὲ καὶ χρεῖα γράφειν τῷ ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ διαλεγόμενου παρόντι; κ.τ.λ.). The second line of interpretation is that which regards the ἄγγελοι

as *angels*, in some way representing the churches. In favour of this is 1) the constant usage of this book, in which the word ἄγγελος occurs only in this sense: 2) the further usage of this book, in which we have, ch. xvi. 5, the ἄγγελος τῶν ὁδῶν introduced without any explanation, who can be none other than the angel presiding over the waters: 3) the expression of our Lord Himself Matt. xviii. 10, οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ διὰ παντὸς βλέπουσιν τὸ πρόσωπον τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς, coupled with the saying of the church in the house of Mary the mother of John Mark, Acts xii. 15, with regard to their disbelief of Peter standing at the door, ὁ ἄγγελός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ: both asserting the doctrine that angels are allotted to persons, and are regarded as representing them: a subject full of mystery, and requiring circumspect treatment, but by no means to be put aside, as is commonly done. 4) The extension of this from individuals to nations in the book of Daniel, which is so often the key to apocalyptic interpretation. See Dan. x. 21, xii. 1: an analogy according to which there might well be angels not only of individuals, but of churches. 5) The fact that throughout these Epistles, nothing is ever addressed individually as to a teacher, but as to some one person reflecting as it were the complexion and fortunes of the church in a way in which no mere human teacher or ruler could. That there is no exception to this in ch. ii. 20, see maintained in note there. 6) To the objection advanced in the comment of Arethas above, οὐ γὰρ ὁ προστατὼν ἄγγελος ἡμαρτῆκει κ.τ.λ., the reply may be made, with advantage to this interpretation, that there evidently is revealed to us a mysterious connexion between ministering angels and those to whom they minister, by which the former in some way are tinged by the fates and fortunes of the latter. E.g., in our Lord's saying cited above, the place of dignity there asserted of the angels of the little children is unquestionably connected with the character of those whose angels they are: and it cannot be following out such a revelation too far to say that, if some of the holy angels are thus and for this

II. ¹ Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Ἑφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον

CHAP. II. 1. for *της*, *τω* (so also A in vv. 8, 18: *mechanical repetition of terminations preceding*) AC: *τω της* 36: txt [P]N B rel Andr Areth. rec (for *εν εφεσω*) *εφεσινης*: *εφεσι* 1: *εφεσιων* 38: *εφεσου* 16, *εφεσω* 36: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg spec syr-dd copt Andr Areth.

reason advanced to honour, others may be similarly, and for the opposite reason, placed in less honour and relatively disgraced. That this idea is found expressed in the Rabbinical writings (see in Wetst.) is a mark of the further development of the truth which seems to have been first revealed to Daniel. 7) It will be perceived that this interpretation does not lie under any of the objections stated above as idealizing that which ought to be an objective reality. For it contemplates the angels of the churches as really existent, not as ideal beings. It is only when this latter is the case, that those objections can apply. 8) It will also be perceived, that both the circumstances, which were cited as making for the former interpretation, tell equally for this: viz. a) that just noticed, the actual existence of these persons in or belonging to the churches, and b) the fact that in the Epistles the angel is treated as representing and responsible for the particular church.

So that I cannot but regard this second view as far the more likely one. It has been taken by Origen, Greg.-Naz., Jerome, Andr., Areth. (in Catena: holding as above, the churches themselves to be virtually meant, inasmuch as the angel himself could not need repentance, &c.: but never doubting that by *ἄγγελοι* the angels are meant), Wetst., Züllig, Wahl, Bretschneider, Bleek, De Wette (see above), al. The attempt to defend the interpretation of *ἄγγελοι* as bishops by the analogy of the *נָזִירִים*, *legatus Ecclesiae*, in the synagogue, appears to be futile, inasmuch as that officer held quite an inferior place, in no way corresponding to a bishop, or any kind of president of the church. I may also notice, that the weight laid by Brightmann, al., and recently by Ebrard, on the omission of the art. before *ἄγγελοι* is worth nothing (see the rendering above). Such a sentence as Ebr. suggests in case *ἄγγελοι* had been definite, *οἱ ἐπ. ἀστ. οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν ἐκκ. εἰσιν*, could hardly be written in Greek: it would have stood *εἰσιν οἱ ἄγγ. τῶν ἐκκλ.* The fact, that each succeeding epistle is addressed *τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν . . . ἐκκλησίας*, should have guided Commentators aright in this matter.

As regards the symbolism, *stars* are the symbols of the angels of the churches, inasmuch as angels are beings of light, Heb. i. 7 (from Ps. civ. 4), where see note;

Job xxxviii. 7, where they are called the morning stars. The same symbolism is used in the prophets of Lucifer, the day-star, the son of the morning, Isa. xiv. 12 ff., who would exalt his throne above the stars of God, ib. ver. 13; Rev. xii. 4, 9. See also Luke x. 18. That stars are also used to symbolize earthly authorities, is what might be expected from the very nature of the symbol, and should never have been alleged here as a reason against the literal interpretation of *ἄγγελοι*. The churches themselves are represented by candlesticks, agreeably with the universal symbolism both of the prophetic and evangelic Scriptures. Cf. Prov. iv. 18; Isa. lx. 1, 3; Matt. v. 14, 16; Luke xii. 35; Phil. ii. 15).

CH. II. 1—III. 22.] THE EPISTLES TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES. Views have considerably differed respecting the character of these Epistles, whether they are to be regarded as simply historical, or historico-prophetic, or simply prophetic. The point on which all, I presume, will be agreed is, that the words contained in these Epistles are applicable to and intended for the guidance, warning, and encouragement of the whole Church Catholic, and its several parts, throughout all time. The differing interpretations will here be only briefly alluded to. An account of them will be found in Vitringa, Apocalypsis Johannis, &c. pp. 27—58: and (but scantily, as most interpreters pass over them but slightly) in the introductions to the principal Commentaries.

Before commenting on each individual Epistle, I would notice the similar construction of all. This may be thus described. Each Epistle contains, 1. A command to write to the angel of the particular church. 2. A sublime title of our Lord taken for the most part from the imagery of the preceding vision. 3. An address to the angel of the church, always commencing with *οἶδα*, introducing a statement of its present circumstances: continuing with an exhortation either to repentance or to constancy: and ending with a prophetic announcement, mostly respecting what shall be at the Lord's coming. 4. A promise made to *δικῶν*, generally accompanied with a solemn call to earnest attention, *ὁ ἔχων οὖς κ.τ.λ.*

1—7.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT EPHESUS. See Prolegg. § iii. 7. To

u Isa. iii. 16. Jer. ii. 1. Ezek. iii. 11 al
 1- ch. vii. 1. w 1 Cor. iii. 8. xv. 58. 2 Cor. vi. 5 ch. xiv. 13 Gen. xxxi. 42. x = Luke xxi. 19. ver. 19. ch. xiii. 10 al. f (P. ix. 18) see Sir. ii. 14.
 y Matk. ix. 23. Luke xvi. 2. Deut. xiv. 24. z = Matt. xiii. 17. John xxi. 12 Acts xv. 10. Rom. xv. 1. Gal. ii. 2 4 Kings xviii. 14. a = 2 Cor. xiii. 5. ch. iii. 10 3 Kings x. 1. b see 2 Cor. xi. 13 ch. xxi. 8 only. Prov. xxx. 9. d see above (z). absol., f = Matt. xi. 28. John iv. 6. 2 Kings xvii. 2. Jer. here only. g vi. 14, 20. h Matt. v. 23. Mark xi. 25, but w. τλ. Job xxxi. 35. i h gen. subj., 1 Cor. xvi. 24. Phil. i. 9. Col. i. 8. Philem. 5, 7. ver. 19.

u Τάδε u λέγει ὁ v κρατῶν τοὺς q ἐπτά q ἀστέρας ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ ACPN B a 10 n, 1. 2. 4 6 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30 32 to 33. 40-1-2 47 to 51. 90 B^r.
 αὐτοῦ, ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἐπτά s λυχνιῶν τῶν s χρυσέων, 2 Οἶδα τὰ ἔργα σου καὶ τὸν w κόπον καὶ τὴν x ὑπομονὴν σου, καὶ ὅτι οὐ y δύνῃ z βαστάσαι κακοὺς, καὶ a ἐπειράσας τοὺς λέγοντας ἑαυτοὺς b ἀποστόλους καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν, καὶ εὗρες αὐτοὺς c ψευδεῖς, 3 καὶ x ὑπομονὴν ἔχεις καὶ d ἐβάσταςας e διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου καὶ οὐ f κεκοπίακες. 4 ἀλλ' e ἔχω e κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι τὴν h ἀγάπην σου τὴν πρώ-

aft αὐτου ins χειρὶ N¹(N^{3a} disapproving): bef αὐτου m 35. for εν μεσω, επι 1.
 rec χρυσων, with [P]N B rel: txt AC.

2. rec aft κοπον ins σου, with N B rel lips-6 copt Andr Areth: om ACP h n 10-2-7-8-9. 36-7. 46-9 vulg syr-dd arm Andr-a.—om και τον κοπον e k 30. βασταζει [P] 1. Andr-b. homœotel in 1, 4th to 5th και. και επειρ.] om και A copt æth-rom Cassiod: ins C[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff. rec επειρασω: επειλασας B^r: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth. rec (for λεγ. εαυ. απ.) φασκοντας ειναι αποστολους: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg Andr Areth.—aft απ. ins ειναι N^{3c} B rel: om ACPN¹ 18. 25.—om εαντ. 12.

3. rec και εβασταςας και υπομονην εχεις, with ([P] 1) 10-6-7. 38. 49 (B^r, e sil) Andr: om κ. υπομ. εχεις 33 (34-5, e sil): om και εβασταςας 37: txt AC(N) B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Aug Primas.—εβαπτισας 1.—aft εχεις ins και θλψεισας N¹ (N^{3a} disapproving).—aft εβασταςας ins με [P] 16. 45-6. rec ins και bef δια (with 92 ?): om AC[P]N B rel. rec (for και ου κεκοπιακες) κεκοπιακας και ου κεκηκας: κεκοπιακας και ουκ εκοπιασας g: και κεκοπιακας 16. 37-8. 69 arm Andr-p: και κοπιακας (i. e. κεκοπ.) 1: και ουκ εκοπιασας [P]N B rel: txt AC 51 vulg syr-dd copt, -κας 51.
 4. αλλα N B a b c d f g h j l m 10. 30. 46 B^r. for τ. αγ. σ. τ. πρ., πρωτην σου

the angel of the church in Ephesus write: These things saith he that holdeth fast (cf. ver. 25, ch. iii. 11) the seven stars in his right hand (cf. John x. 28), He that walketh in the midst of the seven candlesticks of gold (assertions of Christ's being the Lord, the Governor and the Upholder of His Church, agreeably to the vision of ch. i.: coming in suitably in this first Epistle, as beginning the complete number): I know (am aware of: not as Lyræ, "id est, approbo.") The context determines this to be the fact here, but not this word. The ἔργα might be *bad* ones, see John iii. 19) thy works (so in all the Epistles, except those to Smyrna and Pergamum) and thy labour (reff.) and endurance (κόπος and ὑπομονή form the active and the passive sides of the energizing Christian life. The omission of the σου after τὸν κόπον serves to bind the two together in one. They are expegetical, in fact, of ἔργα; cf. 1 Cor. xv. 58: these being the resulting fruits of κόπος and ὑπομονή, see ch. xiv. 13), and that thou canst not bear (reff.) evil men (on κακός and πονηρός, see note, ch. xvi. 2. These are here regarded as a burden, an incubus, which the Ephesian

church had thrown off. The assertion is as yet general: it is particularized in the next clause) and didst try (make experiment of, rather than put to the test, which is δοκιμάζειν, 1 John iv. 1) those who call themselves apostles and are not, and didst find them false (this is deeply interesting in connexion with St. Paul's prophetic caution, Acts xx. 28—30. That which he foretold had come to pass, but they had profited by his apostolic warning): and hast endurance, and didst bear (them, while trying them: or perhaps the verb is used absolutely) for my Name, and hast not been weary (there is a seeming inconsistency in οἶδα τὸν κόπον σου . . . καὶ οὐ κεκοπίακες, which caused those who were not aware of St. John's use of the last word (reff.) to alter the sentence as in var. readd. "Novi laborem tuum, nec tamen laboras, i. e. labore non frangeris." Beng. ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ἀπεκαρτέρησας, οἶονε, οὐκ ἀπηγόρευσας, οὐ προδεδωκας, οὐκ ἐλπιτοκράτησας διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, Areth. in Catena). Howbeit I have (nothing need be supplied: the following clause is the object to ἔχω) against thee (reff.) that thou hast left (deserted; or let go: see reff.) thy love which was at

την ἰάφηκας. ⁵ κ μνημόνευε οὖν πόθεν ¹ πέπτωκας, καὶ ^{i = Matt xxiii.}
^m μετανόησον καὶ τὰ πρῶτα ἔργα ποιήσον· εἰ δὲ μή, ἔρ- ^{23. Rom. i.}
^{χομαί} ⁿ σοι καὶ ^ο κινήσω τὴν ^p λυχνίαν σου ἐκ τοῦ ^ο τόπου ^{27. Judg. ix.}
^{αὐτῆς}, ^q εἰ μὴ ^m μετανόησης. ⁶ ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἔχεις, ὅτι ^{k = Acts xx.}
^{μισεῖς} τὰ ἔργα τῶν Νικολαϊτῶν, ἃ ἀγῶν μισῶ. ⁷ Ὁ ^{31. Eph. ii.}
^{11. ch. iii. 3.}
^{Exod. xiii. 3.}
^{1 = Rom. xi. 1,}
^{22. 1 Cor. x.}
^{12. Prov.}
^{xxiv. 16.}

3. Matt. iii. 2. iv. 17 al. Wisd. v. 3.

ix. 9.] Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 5.

q pleonasm, Matt. v. 18. [2 Cor. xii. 7.] Winer, edn. 6, § 63. 6.

n dat., = ver. 16 only.

o = ch. vi. 14 (reff.).

m absol., ch. iii.
 Matt. xxi. 5, from Zech.
 p ch. i. 12, &c. reff.

αγαπῇν Α. αφηκες CN¹: txt A[P]N^{3a} B rel.

5. ^{5.} ^{rec} ^{επεπτακας}, with [P] h l n 1. 10-7 (12-6. 37. 49 Br, e sil) Andr, ^{excederis} vulg some-lat-ff: txt ACN B rel Andr-coisl Areth Cyp^r Pac Primas, -kes N. elz aft^r ^{ερχομαι} σοι ins ταχυ, with B rel harl¹ syr-dd Andr Areth Primas; Steph ταχει, with 1 (ταχει): om AC[P]N vulg copt aeth Aug Jer Vict-tun.

6. om & A copt.

first (towards whom? Arethas, in Cat., understands τὴν πρὸς τοὺς πλησίον χορηγίαν: Grot. similarly, "multum remisisti de prima illa cura circa pauperes:" Calov., "sedula cura et vigilantia cum fervore ac zelo pro verbi divini puritate adversus pseudoprophetas:" Eichhorn, strangely enough, "quod nimis morose et severe coerces improbos doctores:" Heinrichs, De Wette, and Ebrard think it is *brotherly love* which is meant. But there can I think be little question that the language is conjugal, and the love, as Aretius, Ansbert ("casti sponsi dilectionem abjecisti"), Vitringa, Züllig, Hengstenb., Düsterd., Stern (but applying it all to the bishop personally), al., the first fervent chaste and pure love of the newly-wedded bride: cf. Jer. ii. 2. τὴν πρῶτην

must not be taken as if it were comparative (*priorem*), but literally. In what particular the Ephesian church had left her first love, is not stated. Perhaps, as Ansbert, "dilectione sæculi æstuabat:" or, seeing that it is negative, rather than positive delinquency which is blamed, the love of first conversion had waxed cold, and given place to a lifeless and formal orthodoxy). Remember therefore whence thou hast fallen (the first fervour of love is regarded as a height, from which the church had declined. The Commentators cite Cic. ad Att. iv. 16, "non recordor unde ceciderim, sed unde resurrexerim"), and repent (quickly and effectually, aor.) and do the first works (the works which sprung from that thy first love: those resume); but if not, I (will) come to thee (a strong 'dativus incommodi:' = ἐπὶ σε, ch. iii. 3. Not Christ's final coming, but his coming in special judgment is here indicated), and will move thy candlestick out of its place (i.e. as Aretius, "efficiam ut ecclesia esse desinas:" see the fulfilment noticed in Prolegg. § iii. par. 7. Some take it too vaguely, as Ewald, "gra-

tiam et benevolentiam meam tibi detraham:" others, as Grot., misled by their acceptance of the *first love* (see above), "efficiam ut plebs tua alio diffugiat, nempe ad ea loca ubi major habetur cura pauperum:" others again, going quite wrong, owing to a fancy that the Epistle is addressed to the *bishop*, "tollam a te ecclesiam, ne illi ultra præsideas;" so Zeger, al. Koppe and Heinrichs give a modification of the true meaning which is hardly justified: "primarium episcopatus sedem Epheso aliorum transferam"), if thou do not repent (shalt not have repented; i.e. by the speedy time indicated in the previous aorist).

6.] Notwithstanding, this thou hast (this one thing: there is no need to supply ἀγαθόν or the like: of what sort the τοῦτο is, is explained by what follows. We may notice the tender compassion of our blessed Lord, who, in his blame of a falling church, yet selects for praise one particular in which His mind is yet retained. This is for our comfort: but let us not forget that it is for our imitation also. μεταξὺ τῶν λυπηρῶν τίθησι καὶ τὰ πρὸς εὐθυμίαν ἄγοντα, ἵνα μὴ τῇ περισσοτέρᾳ λύτῃ καταποθῇ τὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας. Areth. in Cat.) that thou hatest the works ("non dixit Nicolaitas, sed facta: quia personæ sunt ex charitate diligendæ, sed eorum vitia odio sunt habenda." Lyra. It would have been well with the church, had this always been remembered. τὰ ἔργα, see below, must be referred to the moral delinquencies of this sect) of the Nicolaitans (there has been much dispute who these were. The prevailing opinion among the fathers was, that they were a sect founded by Nicolaus the proselyte of Antioch, one of the seven deacons. So Irenæus (Hær. i. 26. 3 (27), p. 105, "Nicolaitæ autem magistrum quidem habent Nicolaum, unum ex vii., qui primi ad diaconum ab apostolis ordinati sunt: qui indiscrete vivunt"), Tertullian

here &c. (4 times) ch. iii. ἔχων οὗτος ἰ ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησιαῖς. ACPR B a 10 n, 1. 2. 4 6 h. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26 7. 30. 32 to 33. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 Br.

7. ins επτα bef εκκλησιας A: add ταις επτα C: om [P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

(Præser. Hær. 46, vol. ii. p. 63, "alter hæreticus Nicolaus emeruit. Hic de septem diaconis qui in Actis App. allecti sunt, fuit." He then describes his execrable impurities), Clem.-Alex. (in two passages, which are worth citing, as I shall presently have to comment on them: 1) Strom. ii. 20 (118), p. 490 P., —τοιοῦτοι δὲ καὶ οἱ φάσκοντες ἑαυτοὺς Νικολάω ἔπεςθαι ἀπομνημόνευμά τι τάνδρὸς φέροντες ἐκ παρατροπῆς τὸ δεῖν παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκί. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν γενναῖος κολοῦσιν δεῖν ἐδόλουν τὰς τε ἡδονὰς τὰς τε ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ τῇ ἀσκήσει ταύτῃ καταμαραίνειν τὰς τῆς σαρκὸς ὁρμάς τε καὶ ἐπιθέσεις. οἱ δὲ εἰς ἡδονὴν τράγων δίκην ἐκχυθέντες οἶον ἐφουβρίζοντες τῷ σώματι καθηनुπαθοῦσιν: 2) ib. iii. 4 (25), p. 522 P.: περὶ τῆς Νικολαδουρήσεως διαλεχθέντες ἐκεῖνο παρελείπομεν ὁραίαν, φησί, γυναικὰ ἔχων οὗτος μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν τὴν τοῦ σωτήρος πρὸς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὀνειδισθεὶς ζηλοτυπίαν εἰς μέσον ἀγαγὼν τὴν γυναικὰ γῆμαι τῷ βουλομένῳ ἐπέτρεψεν ἀκόλουθον γὰρ εἶναι φασὶ τὴν πράξιν ταύτην ἐκείνῃ τῇ φωνῇ τῇ ὅτι παραχρήσασθαι τῇ σαρκί δεῖ), Euseb. (H. E. iii. 29, citing Clem.-Alex., as above), Epiphanius (Hær. xxv. pp. 76 ff., where he gives a long account of Nicolaus and his depravation and his followers): so also Jerome (dial. adv. Lucif. 23, vol. ii. p. 197) and Aug. (de hæres. 5, vol. viii. p. 26), and many other fathers, citations from whom may be seen in Stern's notes, h. l.: also Areth. in Catena, referring to Epiph.

We have already seen, in Clem.-Alex., symptoms of a desire to vindicate Nicolaus the deacon from the opprobrium of having been the founder of such a sect; and we find accordingly in the apostolical constitutions, οἱ νῦν ψευδοάνωμοι Νικολαῖται are spoken of: and Victorinus of Pettau, in our earliest extant commentary on the Apocalypse, says, "Nicolaïtæ autem erant illo tempore ficti homines et pestiferi, qui sub nomine Nicolai ministri fecerunt sibi hæresin," &c. Thence we advance a step farther, and find another Nicolaus substituted for the deacon of that name. So in Dorotheus (cited in Stern) we find him described as a bishop of Samaria (ὅς ἐπίσκοπος Σαμαρείας γενόμενος ἐτεροδόξησεν ἅμα τῷ Σίμωνι). And an apocryphal Acts of the Apostles in Fabricius, Cod. Apoc. N. T. i. p. 498 (Stern), speaks of a Corinthian of this name, infamous for licentious practices. We come

now to the second principal view with regard to this sect, which supposes their name to be symbolic, and Nicolaus to be the Greek rendering of Balaam, בַּלְאָם, or, Chald., בַּרְבַּל, 'perdidit vel absorpsit populum.' Consequently the name Nicolaitans = Balaamites, as is also inferred from ver. 14. This view seems first to have been broached by Chr. A. Heumann in the Acta Eruditorum for 1712, and since then has been the prevailing one. (There is a trace in ancient times of a mystical interpretation, e.g. in Haymo, gloss. ord., who says, "Nicolaus, *stultus populus*, id est, Gentiles Deum ignorantes;" and Ambrose Ansberr, "si a proprietate ad figuram, ut solet, sermo recurrit, omnes hæretici Nicolaitæ esse probantur: Nicolaus enim interpretatur *stultus populus*." What this means, I am as unable to say as was Vitringa: it perhaps arises from thus understanding בַּרְבַּל 'non-populus:' cf. Deut. xxxii. 21.) But this is very forced, and is properly repudiated by some of the best modern Commentators: e.g. by De Wette, Ebrard, and Stern. (See also Winer, Realw. sub voce: Neander, Kirchengesch. i. 2. 774 ff.: Gieseler, Kirchengesch. i. 1. 113 note.) In the first place, the names are by no means parallel, even were we to make Balaam, as some have done, into בַּרְבַּל, lord of the people (Ἀρχέλαος): and next, the view derives no support from ver. 14 f., where the followers of Balaam are distinct from the Nicolaitans: see note there. And besides, there is no sort of reason for interpreting the name otherwise than historically. It occurs in a passage indicating simple matters of historical fact, just as the name Antipas does in ver. 13. If we do not gain trustworthy accounts of the sect from elsewhere, why not allow for the gulf which separates the history of the apostolic from that of the post-apostolic period, and be content with what we know of them from these two passages? There is nothing repugnant to verisimilitude in what Clem.-Alex. relates of the error of Nicolaus; nor need all of those, who were chosen to aid the Apostles in distributing alms, have been, even to the end of their lives, spotless and infallible. At least it may be enough for us to believe that possible of one of them, which the post-apostolic Fathers did not hesitate to receive), which I also hate (this strong ex-

τῷ * νικῶντι [†] δώσω [‡] αὐτῷ [§] φαγεῖν [¶] ἐκ τοῦ [⌘] ξύλου τῆς [⌘] ζωῆς, ὃ [⌘] ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ [⌘] παραδείσῳ τοῦ [⌘] θεοῦ [[⌘] μου].

⁸ Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίας γράψον
Τάδε λέγει ὁ ^α πρῶτος καὶ ὁ ^α ἔσχατος, ὃς ἐγένετο ^α νεκρὸς

al. Gen. xxxi. 7. u so ch. vi. 4 reff. v John vi. 26, 50, 51. Heb. xii. 10.
w ch. xii. 2 (bis), 14, 19. GEN. ii. 9. x = as above (w). Luke xxiii. 31 only. Exod. ix. 25. Xen.
Anab. vi. 4, 5. y Luke xxiii. 43. 2 Cor. xii. 4 only. Gen. ii. 8 & fr. z ch. iii. 2 reff.
a ch. i. 17, 18 (reff.).

νικῶντι A. (so also ver 17.) om αυτω N h 49 (10-7. 46. 88?) Areth. rec for
τω παραδείσῳ μεσω του παραδειτου (see note), with h m n 1. 10-7. 34-5-6 (16. 37. 49
Br e sil) copt Andr Areth-comm: μεσω τω παραδισω [P]N^{3a}: txt ACN¹ B rel vulg
syr-dd æth Orig-int Cyp^r rec om μου, with AC[P]N¹ n 1. 13 (Mid expr) 36
(26, e sil) Andr: ins B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Orig-int Cyp^r.

⁸. for της, τω A (so also vv 1, 18): ὁ g. rec (for εν σμυρνη εκκλ.) εκκλ. σμυρ-
ραιων: εκκλησίας μυρραιων (sic) 1: σμυρραιων εκκλ. n: txt AC[P]N¹ B rel vss Andr-p-
coisl Areth Primas Bede.—σμυρνης A: ζμυρνη N. for πρωτος, πρωτοτοκος A. (So
ch i. 17.)

pression in the mouth of our Lord unquestionably points at deeds of abomination and impurity: cf. Isa. lxi. 8; Jer. xlv. 4; Amos v. 21; Zech. viii. 17).

7.] *Solemn conclusion of the Epistle.* He that hath an ear (no fanciful distinction must be imagined between the singular, and the plural which is found in the Gospels (reff.): nor must we imagine with Hengst. that οὗς denotes the spiritual hearing or apprehension. We have precisely the same use of the κη in Matt. x. 27, ὃ εἰς τὸ οὗς ἀκούετε κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων: where the distinction will hardly be maintained), let him hear what the Spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα, speaking in its fullness, through Him to whom it is given without measure, to John who was ἐν πνεύματι, in a state of spiritual ecstasy and receptivity: cf. John xvi. 13) saith to the churches (Ebrard well notices that not a colon, but a full stop must be put here, as indeed might be shewn from the way in which the proclamation is repeated in ver. 29 and in ch. iii. 6, 13, 22. It directs attention, not to that which follows only, but to the whole contents of the seven Epistles). To him that conquereth (the verb is absolute, without any object expressed as in reff. John and 1 John. So of Christ Himself in ch. iii. 21), I will give to him (the personal pronoun is repeated both idiomatically and for emphasis) to eat (i. e. I will permit him to eat: not in the ordinary sense of giving to eat: see ch. iii. 21, δώσω αὐτῷ . . . καθίσαι) of (the fruit of) the tree (see ref. Gen., from which the words come: and to suit which apparently the words μέσω τοῦ have been substituted for τῷ) of life, which is in the paradise of (my) God (the way to which tree was closed up after man's sin, Gen. iii. 24. The promise, and its expression, are in the closest connexion with

our Lord's discourse in John vi., as will be seen by comparing Gen. iii. 22, μή ποτε ἐκτείλῃ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ, καὶ λάβῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, καὶ φάγῃ, καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,—with John vi. 51, ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου, ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. But we need not therefore say (as Ebrard: so also Calov.) that Christ is the tree of life here, nor confuse the figure by introducing one which in its character is distinct from it. Still less, as Grot., is the tree to be interpreted as being the Holy Spirit. See, for the imagery, ch. xxii. 2, 14, 19. There is meaning in τοῦ θεοῦ (μου). The two former words as following παραδείσῳ, come from Ezek. xxviii. 13, and set forth the holiness and glory of that paradise as consisting in God's dwelling and delighting in it: and the adjunct μου (John xx. 17), if read, connects this holiness and glory with Him who is ours, and who has every right to make the promise in virtue of his own peculiar part in God. On the whole image and expression, see Schöttgen, h. l., who adduces many parallels from the rabbinical writings).

8—11.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT SMYRNA. See Prolegg., § iii. 8. And to the angel of the church in Smyrna (in accordance with the idea of the angel representing the bishop, many of the ancient Commentators have inferred that Polycarp must have been here addressed. Whether this were chronologically possible, must depend on the date which we assign to the writing of the Apocalypse. He was martyred in A.D. 168, 86 years after his conversion, Eus. H. E. iv. 15) write: These things saith the first and the last, who was (became) dead and revived (see ch. i. 17, 18, and for this sense of ζῆν, reff. The words here seem to point on to the promise in vv.

b = ch xiii. καὶ ab ἔζησεν, 9 Οἰδὰ σου τὴν ἑθλίψιν καὶ τὴν ἰπτω-
 14. Matt ix. χείαν, ἀλλὰ ἑπλοῦσιος εἶ, καὶ τὴν ἰβλασφημίαν ἑκ τῶν
 18. John v. λεγόντων ἡ Ἰουδαίους εἶναι ἑαυτοὺς καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ
 25. Ezek. συναγωγὴ τοῦ ἰσαταναῦ. 10 μὴ φοβοῦ ἃ μέλλεις πᾶσχειν.
 xxxv. 3. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 c ch. i. 9 reff. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 Ps. xlii. 24. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 d 2 Cor. viii. 2. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 9 only. Job ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 xxx. 27. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 e = James ii. 5. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 (see ch. iii. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 18. 2 Cor. vi. 10) ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 n = Rom ii. 28, 29. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 xiii. 2. xv. 36. 1 Cor. vi. 20. 2 Cor. xii. 1 (Heb. ii. 10) only. ἰδου [ἰδὴ] μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἑξ ὑμῶν εἰς 1 φυλα-
 1 Matt. xvi. 30. Acts xvi. 28. Jer. xlv. (xxxvii.) 21.

9. rec ins τα εργα και bef τ. θλιψιν (see ver 2 and ch. iii. 1, 8, 15), with N B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Tich: om ACP 19. 47 vulg copt aeth Andr-comm Primas Bede.

rec (for αλλα πλ.) πλ. δε, with 1 Andr-coisl-comm: txt AC[P]N B rel Areth. rec om εκ, with [P] h n 1. 10-7. 33 (26. 34-6-7. 49 B^r e sil) Andr: ins AC(N) B rel syr-dd copt arm Andr-coisl Areth Primas: την εκ. N. ιουδαιων (mechanical repetition of termination of preceding word) CN¹: txt A[P]N^{3a} B rel. at end add εισιν N^{3c}.

10. rec μηδεν, with [P]N rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Cyp Primas: txt AC B g 38. 49 copt Andr-p. παθεν B 38(Bch) rel Andr-a Areth: txt AC[P]N h l m n 10-8. 34-5-6 (1. 4. 16. 37. 40-2-9. 51 B^r, e sil) Andr. aft ιδου ins δη B rel syr-dd Andr-p Areth: om AC[P]N f k l m n 1. 30¹-3 (16. 34-5-6-8. 51. 90, e sil) Andr. rec (for βαλλειν) βαλειν, with B rel Andr Areth: βαλλειν 32: txt AC[P]N^{3a} a e m 12-7-8. 30¹-4-5-6-8(Alf). 90. 92 Andr-coisl.—(om 30¹: βαλλειν βαλιν(sic) N¹: ο διαβ. bef βαλλ. g 38.) rec εξ υμων bef ο διαβολος, with N (g) k(e sil) 1 Andr: txt AC[P]

10, 11): I know thy tribulation and thy poverty (in outward wealth, arising probably from the θλῖψις, by the despoiling of the goods of the Christians); nevertheless thou art rich (spiritually; see reff. To suppose an allusion to the name πολυκαρπος (Hengst.), is in the highest degree fanciful and improbable): and (I know) thy calumny from (arising from) those who profess themselves to be Jews, and they are not, but (are) Satan's synagogue (these slanderers were in all probability actually Jews by birth, but not (see Rom. ii. 28; Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 4 ff.) in spiritual reality; the same who ever where, in St. Paul's time and afterwards, were the most active enemies of the Christians. When Polycarp was martyred, we read ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος ἐθνῶν τε καὶ Ἰουδαίων τῶν τὴν Σμύρναν κατοικοῦντων ἀκατασχέτω θυμῷ καὶ μεγάλῃ φωνῇ ἐπεβόα: and afterwards when faggots were collecting for the pile, μάλιστα Ἰουδαίων προθύμως, ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς, εἰς τοῦτο ὑπουργοῦντων, Mart. Polyc. c. 12, 13, pp. 1037, 1042. This view is strengthened by the context. Had they been, as some have supposed, e. g. Vitringa, Christians, called Ἰουδαῖοι in a mystical sense, they would hardly have been spoken of as the principal source of calumny against the Church, nor would the collective epithet of *Satan's synagogue* be given to them. Respecting the latter appellation, see some interesting remarks by Trench, N. T. Synonyms, § i. He brings out there, how ἐκκλησία, the nobler word,

was chosen by our Lord and His Apostles for the assembly of the called in Christ, while συναγωγὴ, which is only once found (James ii. 2) of a Christian assembly (and there, as Düsterd. notes, not with τοῦ θεοῦ, but with ὑμῶν), was gradually abandoned entirely to the Jews, so that in this, the last book of the canon, such an expression as this can be used. See also his Comm. on the Epistles to the Seven Churches, p. 95. See the opposite in Num. xvi. 3, xx. 4, xxxi. 16, —συναγωγὴ κυρίου). 10.] Fear not the things which thou art about to suffer (in the ways mentioned below. α indicates manifold tribulation, as there): behold [for certain (δὴ gives the tone of present certainty and actuality: see reff. It is in fact originally no more than a shortened form of ἦδη: see Hartung, Partikellehre, i. 245 ff.)], the devil (Hengstb. after Züllig, would lay stress here on the import of the name of the great adversary, as connected with the βλασφημία above. But this again would be forced and unnatural, especially after the recent mention of σατανᾶ. Of course it is understood from the context, that the devil would act through the hostility of human agents, and among them eminently these Jewish enemies. Trench, in loc., remarks on the reference to the devil, as the primary author of all assaults on the Church, found in the Acts of the ancient martyrs: e. g. the Ep. from the Churches of Lyons and Vienne: the Martyrdom of Polycarp, 3, 17, pp. 1032, 1041: Martyr. Ignat.) is about to cast (some) of you into prison (literally: the constant

κὴν ἴνα ^m πειρασθῆτε, καὶ ⁿ ἔξετε ⁿ θλίψιν ^o ἡμερῶν ^o δέκα. ^m see 1 Pet. iv. 12.
^p γίνου πιστὸς ^q ἄχρι ^r θανάτου, ^s καὶ δώσω σοι τὸν ⁿ John xvi. 33
^t στέφανον τῆς ^t ζωῆς. ^l ὁ ^u ἔχων ^u οὖς ^u ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ ¹ Cor. vii. 28.
^p πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ^o ^v νικῶν οὐ μὴ ^v ἀδικηθῇ ^p Matt x. 16.
^εκ τοῦ ^w θανάτου τοῦ ^w δευτέρου. ^q Heb. iv. 12.
^q Heb. iv. 12.
^r Acts xxi. 4. ch. xii. 11 (2 Mac. xiii. 14).
^s = John ii. 19. Eph. v. 14. James iv. 7, 8.
^t James i. 12 only. see 2 Tim. iv. 8. Prov. iv. 9 bis.
^u ver. 7 (reff.).
^v = ch. vi. 8 reff. Isa.

...ΤΟΥ
 δευτέρου
 κ.

r Acts xxi. 4. ch. xii. 11 (2 Mac. xiii. 14).
 t James i. 12 only. see 2 Tim. iv. 8. Prov. iv. 9 bis.
 x. 20. w ch. xx. 6, 14. xxi. 8.

s = John ii. 19. Eph. v. 14. James iv. 7, 8.
 u ver. 7 (reff.).
 v = ch. vi. 8 reff. Isa.

ACPN B
 a to j, l m
 n. 1. 2. 4.
 6. 9. 10-
 3. 16 to
 19. 26-7.
 30. 32 to
 38. 40 to
 42. 47 to
 51. 90 B^r.

B rel. πειραθῆτε 1. for ἐξετε, ἐχετε C 1. 11: ἐχῃτε A[P] 12 (Mill). 86 copt
 Primas: ἐξητε d: txt N B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich Bede. ἡμερας B rel
 Areth: txt AC[P] N h l m n 10-7. 84-6 (1. 16. 37. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr Primas. om
 γινου N¹ (ins N^{2a}).

accompaniment of persecution, Acts xii. 4; xvi. 23: not, as Heinr., put for all kinds of misery), that ye may be tried (by temptations to fall away: not, that ye may be *proved*,—"ut fidem suam inter maxima pericula probare eoque consummatam virtutem consummare possint," as Ewald. This might be the end which Christ had in view in permitting the persecution: but ἴνα here rather gives the purpose of the agent in the previous clause, ὁ διάβολος): and ye shall have tribulation ten days (the expression is probably used to signify a short and limited time: so in Gen. xxiv. 55; Num. xi. 19; Dan. i. 12: see also Num. xiv. 22; 1 Sam. i. 8; Job xix. 3; Acts xxv. 6. Wetst. quotes Ter. Adelph. v. 1. 36, "decem dierum vix mihi est familia." So Arethas in Catena, εἰς ὀλίγον χρόνον τούτων ἡ θλίψις, καὶ οὐδ' ὅσον δέκα ἡμέρας παραμετρεῖσθαι ἄξια. And so, recently, Trench. All kinds of fanciful interpretations have been given: so in Gloss. ord.,—"Deus suos ad bella mitens Decalogo armat" (another variety of which is, "tribulatio ecclesiae durabit quamdiu observatio praeceptorum Decalogi, quod est usque ad finem mundi:" so Lyra, altern.):—"x. diebus, i. e. toto hoc tempore in quo per septem dies contra tria principalia vitia pugnatur, avaritiam, cupiditatem, vanam gloriam." Similarly Ansb. And again, "significatur totum tempus usque ad finem saeculi, eo quod omnes numeri sequentes denarium sunt replicationes ipsius et partium suarum." Lyra introduces "the year-day principle:"—"posset etiam aliter salvo meliori iudicio exponi, ut per decem dies intelligantur decem anni, secundum illud, Ezech. iv. 6, 'Diem pro anno dedi;' forte tantum duravit persecutio Smyrnensis ecclesiae." This has been taken up by Cluver. in Calov., Brightmann, al. Bede, Haymo, and Joachim understand it of the ten persecutions from Nero to Diocletian: Perer., Ribera, and Corn.-a-lap., "decem, id est,

multis, diebus:" Ambr., "quia, licet ista tribulatio pluribus diebus et mensibus duret, decem tamen diebus erit atrocissima:" and recently Ebrard understands the ten days of ten divisions, or periods, in the persecution). Be (γίνου, not ἴσθι, see reff.: new circumstances of trial requiring new kinds and degrees of fidelity; which does not remain as it is, but takes accession) θου (it is quite futile to attempt to distinguish in these Epistles between what is said to the Angel in the singular, and what is said to the Church in the plural. This is shewn by the former part of this verse,—ὁ μέλλεις πάσχειν . . . followed by ἐξ ἡμῶν. Only where there is occasion to discriminate, is the plural used: cf. ver. 24 f.: but wherever the whole church is spoken of it is in the singular, under the person of its representative angel) faithful unto (reff. not, "until": but "even unto," i. e. up to the point or measure of: Let not thy faithfulness stop short of enduring death itself. Cf. Phil. ii. 8) death, and (reff.) I will give thee the crown (τὸν στέφανον, as being the well-known prize promised to the faithful: as in reff. Trench. in loc., has an interesting note on the question whether this is a *diadem* of royalty, or a *garland* of victory: and decides for the former, seeing that the στέφανοι of ch. v. can only be royal crowns,—that the word is employed by all the Evangelists of the "Crown of thorns,"—and that the imagery of this book is not any where drawn from Gentile antiquity, but is Jewish throughout) of life (gen. of apposition: the life itself being the crown: see note, and distinction, on 2 Tim. iv. 8). 11.] Conclusion: see above, ver. 7. He that conquereth shall not be injured (οὐ μὴ gives great precision and certainty to the promise: there is no chance (οὐ) that he should be (μὴ) . . . See Winer, edn. 6, § 56. 3 note) by (ἐκ as proceeding out of as the source or origin) the second death (defined to be, in ch. xx. 14, ἡ λίμνη τοῦ πυρός. In this he shall

^x ch. i. 16
^y = here, &c.
⁴ times. ch.
¹¹. 11. Mark
⁷. 11. 4, 8.
^{Col.} 1. 19.
² Thess. ii.
¹⁵. (Heb. iv.
¹⁴. vi. 18 w.
^{gen.})
² = 1 John ii.
²², 23 reff.
^{(Gen. xviii.}
¹⁶⁾
^a 1 Tim. v. 8.
^{ver. 20 reff.}

¹² Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Περγάμῳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον
 Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὴν ^x ῥομφαίαν τὴν ^x δίστομον τὴν
^x ὀξεῖαν, ¹³ Οἶδα ποῦ κατοικεῖς, ὅπου ὁ θρόνος τοῦ
 σατανᾶ, καὶ ^y κρατεῖς τὸ ὄνομά μου, καὶ οὐκ ^{za} ἡρνήσω τὴν
^{ab} πίστιν ^b μου [καὶ] ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις [αἱς] Ἀντίπας ὁ ^c μάρ-
 τυς μου ὁ πιστός [μου], ὃς ἀπεκτάνθη ^d παρ' ὑμῖν, ὅπου

^a Arts i. 8. iii 15. xxi 20. ch. xi. 3. see Ps. lxxxviii. 37. constr.,
^d = Col. iv. 16 2 Tim. iv. 13 al.

¹³. rec (aft οἶδα) ins τα εργα σου και, with B rel syr-dd Andr Areth (σου bef τα εργα
²⁷): om ACPN 38 vulg copt æth Jer Primas Quæst. for 1st μου, σου N¹ (txt
^{N^{3a}}). rec ins και bef εν ταις ημεραις, with AC 51 vulg copt Bede: om [P]N
 B rel demid syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth Primas Quæst. rec aft ημεραις ins εν,
 with PN (d P) 1. 10-7. 34-6 B^r (16. 37. 49, e sil) Andr Areth: μου g: om AC B rel vulg
 syr-dd copt æth Primas Quæst. om ais (homæotel?) AC: ins PN^{3a} (ταις N¹) B
 rel demid syr-dd æth Quæst. rec δ μαρτυς μου ὁ πιστος, with [P]N B rel vss:
 [δ] μαρτυς ὁ πιστος, omg μου both times, 12. 36 (om 1st δ 36): δ μαρτυς μου ὁ πιστος
 μου ("ex alliteratione ad πιστιν μου." Beng.) AC f syr-dd.

have no part, nor it any power over him).

12—17.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT PERGAMUM (see Prolegg. § iii. 9; Trench, p. 106). And to the angel of the church in Pergamum write: These things saith He that hath the sharp two-edged sword (this is the logical order in English of the epithet-predicates, τὴν δίστομον τὴν ὀξεῖαν. ἡ ῥ. ἡ δίστομος is the sword with two edges: and to the whole of this is added ἡ ὀξεῖα. The designation of our Lord is made with reference to ver. 16 below): I know where thou dwellest; (viz.) where is the throne of Satan (it is not easy to say, what these words import. Andr. and Areth. say in the Catena, θρόνον τοῦ σ. τὸν Περρ. καλεῖ, ὡς κατείδωλον οὐσαν ὑπὲρ τὴν Ἀσίαν πᾶσαν. And so Vitringa and Bengel. But Vitr. himself asks, "an Satanas in illa superstitione (Æsculapii cultu) se magis prodidit Pergami, quam in Dianæ cultu Ephesi?" Grot. Wetst. al. fancy that σατανᾶς was the serpent form under which the god Æsculapius was worshipped at Pergamum. But even the fact itself is doubtful; and the interpretation halts, in that the text is not ὁ θρόνος τοῦ δράκοντος, instead of τ. σατανᾶ. Zornius, mentioned in Wolf, h. l., explains it of the famous Pergamene library, and the writings of the Sophists therein contained. A more likely direction in which to find the solution is that taken by Lyra, "id est, ejus potestas, infideles inclinando ad persecutionem ecclesiæ:" for above, ver. 10, the act of persecution is ascribed to the devil: and here we learn by what follows, that he had carried it at Pergamum to the extent of putting Antipas to death; which seems not to have been

reached elsewhere at this time. Whether this may have been owing to the fact of the residence of the supreme magistracy at Pergamum, or to some fanatical zeal of the inhabitants for the worship of Æsculapius, or to some particular person or persons dwelling there especially hostile to the followers of Christ (Hengst., Ewald), must remain uncertain. The above view, with unimportant modifications, is adopted by De Wette, Ebrard, Stern (who combines the others with it), Gräber, Düsterd., al.—I may remark, that it is plainly out of the question to attempt, as has been done by some, to connect such an expression as this with the prophecies of the latter portion of the book, and to anticipate for the insignificant Pergamum a leading place in their fulfilment. The expression is relevant, as the context shews, merely to the then existing state of the city (ὅπου κατοικεῖ below), and not to any future part which it should take in the fulfilment of prophecy), and thou holdest fast (reff.) my name (the profession of thy faith in Me) and didst not deny the faith of me in the days of Antipas (or, taking the other form of the text, 'in which Antipas': see var. readd. As the shorter text runs, and probably also if we read the ταῖς of the Codex Sinaiticus, Ἀντίπας is regarded as indeclinable, which circumstance has apparently led to all the perplexing varieties of reading) my witness, my faithful one (or, if we omit the second μου, my faithful witness: the appositional nominative, see above, ch. i. 5. A motive for its use here may have been the nominative form of the gen. Ἀντίπας. This consideration of itself would obviate the untenable objection which Düsterd. brings against the above account of the con-

ὁ σατανᾶς κατοικεῖ. ¹⁴ ἀλλ' ὁ ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὀλίγα· ὅτι ^{e ver. 4.} ἔχεις ἐκεῖ ^{f = John vii. 16, 17. 2 John 9, 10 al. fr.} κρατοῦντας τὴν ^f διδασχὴν Βαλαάμ, ὃς ἐδίδασκεν

rec κατοικεῖ bef ο σατανας, with syr-dd æth: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg copt arm Andr Areth.—om σπου ο σ. κ. 38.

14. ἀλλα B a b c d f g j 13. 30-3. om κατα σου N¹(ins N^{2a}). om σι C am(with fuld harl¹ tol lips-4, agst demid lipss) syr-dd copt Primas: ins A[P]N B rel Andr Areth. εχει A. εδιδασξε B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]N d m n 18. 34 (1. 37. 40-2, e sil).

struction, viz. that there is no reason to suppose it to have been used except in the case of the Sacred Name, as in ch. i. 5: but see Düsterd.'s own text in ver. 20: and ref. there, who was slain among you, where Satan dwelleth (of Antipas = Antipater (Jos. Antt. xiv. l. 3),—after the analogy of Hermas for Hermodorus, Lucas and Silas for Lucanus and Silvanus, —nothing is known to us with certainty, except from this passage. Andreas says that he had read the account of his martyrdom: Ἀντίπας δέ τις τοῦνομα μάρτυς ἐν Περγᾶμῳ γέγονεν ἀνδρείοτάτος, ὡς περ ἀνέγνω τὸ μαρτύριον: and Areth. in Cat. says, οὗ καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον εἰς ἔτι σώζεται. Ribera gives the following account from Simeon Metaphrastes: “Pergami episcopum hunc fuisse tradunt, et ejus martyrium Metaphrastes Simeon scripsit, qui ad extremam eum senectutem pervenisse dicit, et cum res Christianorum propter Domitiani persecutionem magno in discrimine versarentur, nullo timore captum sæpius in publicum prodiisse et inter crudelissimorum tortorum minas intrepide sinceram fidei doctrinam ac Christi laudes prædicasse. Ita Christianis præsidio, dæmonibus terrori erat, qui ab ipso se fugari et sacrificiis suis privari fatebantur. Quare a præfecto urbis captus et in Christi confessione generose persistens ad Dianæ templum tractus et in bovem æneum, quem multo ante igne inflammaverant, conjectus, vitam in gratiarum actione precibusque finivit. Et tanta (inquit Simeon) præstitit virtute, ut locus hic ubi martyrium pertulit, in hodiernum usque diem miraculis excellat, et magnæ in eo fiant curationes.” The Greek and Roman menologies contain similar accounts at his day, April 11th. It is hardly possible to withhold indignation at the many childish symbolic meanings which have been imagined for the name, in defiance of philology and of sobriety alike. First is that of Aretius, ἀντὶ-πᾶς, the enemy of all, i. e. the child of God and enemy of the world; which has been taken up by Hengstenberg, who ought to have known better, and Antipas identified with the historic Timotheus. Such folly would hardly be

credited, were it not before our eyes:—

“Ist man bis hieher gefolgt, so wird man es nicht zu finden finden, wenn wir die Beramtung aufstellen, das durch Antipas Timotheus bezeichnet werde. Die beiden Namen ‘Jurdtegoti’ und ‘Gegenall’ stehen in inniger Correspondenz mit einander,” &c., Hengst. p. 190. This Commentator also finds remarkable meaning in the way in which the name is written in A, Ἀντίπας. Then that of E. Schmidt and others, who hold Ἀντίπας to be = Ἀντίπαπα: that of Cocceius, who makes Antipas represent the Athanasians, seeing that ἀντίπατρος = ἰσοπατρος = δημοσιος. I mention such interpretations, to shew how far men may go wrong when once they surrender their judgment to their fancy in search of a mystic sense for plain history. On δ σπου δ σατ. κατοικ., see above).

14. 15.] Nevertheless I have against thee a few things (not “a little matter,” as Luth., Hengstb.; nor does ὀλίγα imply that more than one matter is blamed, as Beng.: nor is it used by *littotes*, to mean “graviter de te conqueror,” as Heinr. and Ebdard; nor is any reference to be thought of to the sins of Christ’s people having been removed by His atonement, and thus spoken of lightly by Him, as Aretius: but is used as a word of comparison with the far greater number of approved things which remained, and is plural, inasmuch as ὀλίγον would refer, not to the objective fewness, but to the subjective unimportance, of the grounds of complaint; which latter was not so. This use of the plural comes under the case treated by Winer (§ 27. 2), where only one thing is really meant, but the writer speaks of that one generically; e. g. τεθνήκασι οἱ ζητοῦντες τὴν ψυχ. τοῦ παιδίου, Matt. ii. 20, where Herod only is meant, And so De Wette and Düsterd.): thou hast there (in Pergamum: the locality is specified probably on account of the description which has been just given of it as the place where a faithful martyr had suffered unto death) men holding (cf. κρατεῖς τὸ ὄν. μου above) the teaching of Balaam (διδασχὴν: not simply as De W., “doctrine corresponding to the

g = Matt. xvi. 23. Rom. xiv. 13. 1 Cor. i. 23. Josh. xxiii. 13. h ch i. 4. 1 ver. 20. Acts xv. 29. xxi. 25. 1 Cor. viii. 1, &c. x. 19 only +. *τῷ Βαλὰκ βαλεῖν ἑσκανδαλον ἑνώπιον τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ, φαγεῖν ἰεῖδωλόθута καὶ ἰπορνεῦσαι. 15 οὕτως ἔχεις καὶ σὺ ὑκρατοῦντας τὴν διδασχὴν Νικολαϊτῶν ὁμοίως. 16 κ μετανόησον [οὖν]. εἰ δὲ μή, κ ἔρχομαί κ σοι ταχὺ καὶ* ACPN B a to j, lm n, 1. 2 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B.

j 1 Cor. vi. 18. x. 8 (bis). ver. 20. ch. xvii. 2. xviii. 3, 9 only. Ps. lxxiii. 27.

k ver. 5.

elz (for τω) τον, with N^{3a} rel Andr-coisl Areth: om B: Steph εν τω, with 1. 18. 92²: txt AC 11.—βαλαακ C B c g² 2. 6. 32. 92 fuld Andr-a.—[τω βαλααμ τον βαλακ P:] δ βαλααμ τον βαλακ 12(om (δ?) βαλααμ 12²).—om τω βαλακ N¹. for βαλειν, βασιλει A: βαλλειν N^{3a}. ins και bef φαγειν B rel Andr Areth; τον 9. 13-6. 23. 69: om AC[P]N h n 1. 10-7-8. 36 (27. 37-8. 41-2-7-9. 51, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a.

15. rec ins των bef νικολαιτων, with [P]N l n 1. 10-7 (g h j 4. 16-7. 37-8. 41-7-9. 51 B; e sil) Andr Areth: om AC B rel. rec (for ομοιως) ο μισω, with 1 (lips-4 Andr-a): om 38(leaving a slight gap) æth: ομοιως ο μισω [P] 12-3-7 Andr-b: txt ACN B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth.

16. rec om ουν, with [P]N f n 1. 10-7. 36 (h 37. 49 B; e sil) vulg syr-dd: ins AC B rel copt æth arm Andr Areth. συ(itacism) N¹. πορνα (sic) 1.

character of the advice of Balaam," but used in strict correspondence with ὅς ἐδίδασκεν following: that which a man teaches being his doctrine. And κρατεῖν this διδασχὴν, is to follow the teaching), who taught Balak (the dat. seems to be a Hebraism, לַבָּלָק, Job xxi. 22: so Ewald, De W., Ebrard, Düsterd.: not a dat. commodi, "for Balak" to serve his purpose, understanding "men" as an object after ἐδίδασκεν, as Hengstb. Certainly it is not expressly asserted in Num. xxxi. 16 that it was *Balak* whom Balaam advised to use this agency against Israel: but the narrative almost implies it: Balak was in power, and was the most likely person to authorize and put in force the scheme. And so Josephus, Antt. iv. 6. 6, makes Balaam on departing call to him τὸν τε Βάλακον καὶ τοὺς ἔρχοντας τῶν Μαδιανιτῶν, and give them the advice) to put a stumbling-block (properly σκανδάλῃθρον: see reff., and a minute investigation of the word by Trench in loc.: an occasion of sin) before (in the way, or before the face of) the sons of Israel, to eat (i.e. inducing them to eat. See var. readd.) things offered to idols (from Num. xxv. 1, 2, it was not only participation in things offered to idols, but the actual offering sacrifices to them, of which the children of Israel were guilty. But seeing that the participation was that which was common to both, our Lord takes that as the point to be brought forward: "satis hic habuit Christus id dicere, quod illi Israelitæ cum Nicolaitis habebant commune." Grot.) and to commit fornication. 15.] Thus thou also

hast (as well as those of old: not, as the Church at Ephesus, ver. 6 (De W.). "Sicut Balac tenuit doctrinam pestiferam Balaam, sic apud te sunt aliqui tenentes doctrinam Nicolai erroneam." Lyra) men

holding (see above) the teaching of the Nicolaitans (the art. though not expressed, is in fact, in this later usage, contained in the proper name) in like manner (viz. in eating things offered to idols, and fornication. We may remark, 1) that it is most according to the sense of the passage to understand these sins in the case of the Nicolaitans, as in that of those whom Balaam tempted, literally, and not mystically. So Victorin., Andr., Areth., Ribera, Calov., Beng., Heinr. (doubtfully), Ewald, De W., Hengst., Ebrard, Düsterd., Trench, al.: 2) that the whole sense of the passage is against the idea of the identity of the Balaamites and the Nicolaitans; and would be in fact destroyed by it. The mere existence of the etymological relation is extremely doubtful (see above on ver. 6): and even granting it,—to suppose the two identical, would be to destroy the historical illustration by which the present existing sect is described).

16.] Repent [therefore] (Lyra, a-Lapide, Tirinus, Bengel, al., join the preceding ὁμοίως to this clause, understanding it, as well as the church at Ephesus, ver. 5.

The command is addressed not only to the Nicolaitans, but to the church, which did not, like that of Ephesus, hate them, but apparently tolerated them): but if not, I (will) come to thee (dat. incommodi, see above on ver. 5) quickly (here again, though in the common eschatological phrase, not of the Lord's final coming; as indeed the language shews, for then He no longer πολεμήσει), and will make war with them (the Nicolaitans. This making war must not be understood as Grotius, "Prophetas excitabo in Ecclesia, qui id faciunt quod Episcopus negligit, et fortiter se opponant Nicolaitis" (similarly Calov.) with (ἐν, in, as armed

¹πολεμήσω μετ' αὐτῶν ^mἐν τῇ ⁿῥομφαίᾳ τοῦ στόματός μου. ¹Rev. (ch. xii. 7 bis. xiii. 4. xvii. 14. xix. 11) only, exc. James iv. 2. 4. Kings xvi. 32. ^m= Luke xxii. 49 al. fr. Jer. xxi. 5. ⁿch. i. 16. ^over. 7 (reff.). ^pch. vi. 4 reff. ^qgen. as Acts xxvii. 36.

17 ὁ ὅ ἔχων ὁ οὖς ὁ ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. τῷ ὁ νικῶντι δώσω ^pαὐτῷ ^aτοῦ ^rμάννα τοῦ ^sκεκρυμμένου, καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ ^tψῆφον λευκὴν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ^tψῆφον ^uὄνομα καινὸν γεγραμμένον ὃ οὐδεὶς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ ὁ λαμβάνων.

^r John vi. 49. Hec ix. 4 on γ. Deut. viii. 3.
^t = here bis (Acts xxv. 19) only. Exod. iv. 25.

^s = Col. iii. 3. Ps. (xvi. 14.) xxx. 19.
^u ch. iii. 12. Isa. lxiii. 2. Ixv. 15.

17. νικῶντι AC. (so A in ver 7.) om 1st αυτω N. rec ins φαγειν απο bef του μαννα, with [P] h l n 1. 10-6-7. 49 (37 Br, e sil); φαγειν εκ 36; εκ (alone) N: φαγειν (alone) 11-9: aft του ins φαγειν f 13: aft μαννα ins φαγειν 34-5: om AC B rel vulg copt æth Andr-coisl Primas. [for μαννα, ξυλου P.] om 2nd δωση αυτω N 38. om o N (ins N^{3a}) n: om o ουδεις το λαμβανων 1. rec (for οιδεν) εγνω (with 51, e sil): txt AC[P]N B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth.

with or arrayed in: but sometimes in the Rev. it is difficult to trace the proper meaning of ἐν, and it seems almost purely instrumental: cf. Winer, edn. 6, § 48, d) the sword of my mouth (many expositors (e. g., Grot., Wetst., Vittr., Beng., Stern, Hengst., Trench, al.) suppose an allusion to the sword of the angel, armed with which he withstood Balaam in the way (Num. xxii. 23, 31), or to that and the sword by which those who sinned in the matter of Baal-peor (Num. xxv. 5), and eventually Balaam himself (Num. xxxi. 8), were slain: but seeing that the connexion with ch. i. 16 is so plainly asserted by our ver. 12, it seems better to confine the allusion to that sword, and not to stretch it to what after all is a very doubtful analogy).

17.] *Conclusion.* For the former clause see on ver. 7. We may notice that in these three first Epistles, the proclamation precedes the promise to him that conquereth: in the four last, it follows the promise. To him that conquereth I will give to him (see above on ver. 7) of the manna which is hidden (on the partitive gen. see ref., and Winer, edn. 6, § 30. 7, b. In this manna, there is unmistakably an allusion to the proper and heavenly food of the children of Israel, as contrasted with the unhallowed idol-offerings; but beyond that, there is an allusion again (see above on ver. 7) to our Lord's discourse in John vi., where He describes Himself as the true bread from heaven: not that we need here, any more than in ver. 7 (see note there), confuse the present figure by literally pressing the symbolism of that chapter. Christ's gifts may all be summed up in the gift of Himself: on the other hand, He may describe any of the manifold proprieties of his own Person and office as His gift. This manna is κεκρυμμένον, in allusion partly perhaps to the fact of the pot of manna laid up in

the ark in the holy of holies (Exod. xvi. 33: cf. our ch. xi. 19: not to the Jewish fable, "Hæc est arca quam . . . Josias abscondit ante vastationem templi nostri, et hæc arca futuro tempore, adveniente Messia nostro . . . manifestabitur." Abarbanel on 1 Sam. iv. 4, cited by Dürst.,) but principally to the fact that our spiritual life, with its springs and nourishments, κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ, Col. iii. 3. See also Ps. lxxviii. 24; cv. 40. The distinction between κεκρυμμένον, reconditum, and κρυπτόν, occultum, pressed here by Trench after Cocceius, does not appear to be warranted, further than that the participle represents more the objective fact, while the verbal adjective sets forth the subjective quality), and I will give to him a white stone (see below), and on the stone (the prep. of motion betokens the act of inscribing) a new name written, which none knoweth except he that receiveth it (the views concerning this stone have been very various. Bede interprets it "corpus nunc baptismis candidatum, tunc incorruptionis gloria refulgens." And similarly Lyra, "corpus dote charitatis decoratum, quod dicitur calculus sive lapillus, quia est extractum de terra, sicut et lapis," adding, "nomen novum, quia tunc quilibet beatus manifeste et corporaliter per dotes corporis gloriosi erit ascriptus civitati cœlestium." But both these are surely out of the question. Some have connected this with the mention of the manna, and cited (as Wetst., who gives it merely among others and expresses no opinion) the Rabbinical tradition, Joma 8, "cadebant Israelitis una cum manna lapides pretiosi et margaritæ." Others again think of the precious stones bearing the names of the twelve tribes on the breastplate of the High-priest, the order for which was contemporary with the giving of the manna, Exod.

18 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Θυατείροις ἐκκλησίας γράψον

ACPN B
a 10 j, 1 m
n, 1 2. 4.
6. 9 10-
3. 16 to
3. 19. 26-7.
30. 32 to
38. 40 to
42. 47 to
51. 90 B.

18. for της, τω A (as also in vv 1, 8): om C: τοις c n. θυατειρη B d j l 2. 9.
16. 23-6-7. 33-5. 41-2-5. 50: θυατειρα f: θυατειρης(sic) 34: txt AC [P (-τηρ-, so ver
24)] N rel. om εκκλησιας A.

xxviii. 17; xxxix. 10, and regard this as indicating the priestly dignity of the victorious Christian. So Ewald, Züllig, Eberard: the last remarks, that as the hidden manna was the reward for abstaining from idol-meat, so this for abstinence from fornication. But, as Düsterd. observes, these are never called ψῆφοι. Again some, as Arethas, Grot., Hamm., Eichhorn, Heinr., have reminded us of the Gentile custom of presenting the victors at the games with a ψῆφος or ticket which entitled them to nourishment at the public expense, and to admission to royal festivals. Titus, they quote from Xiphilinus, Epit. Dion. p. 228, used to cast small pieces of wood (σφαίρια ξύλινα μικρά) down into the arena, σύμβολον ἔχοντα, τὰ μὲν ἔδωδον τινός, κ.τ.λ., which whoever got was to bring καὶ λαβεῖν τὸ ἐπιγεγραμμένον. Hence they regard the white stone as the ticket of admission to the heavenly feast. But it may be replied, 1) the feast is mentioned separately under the name of the hidden manna: and 2) the description of the writing on the stone, which follows, will not suit this view. Again, others, regarding the connexion of the white stone with the manna, refer to the use of the lot cast among the priests, which should offer the sacrifice (so Schöttg., quoting the Rabbis): or to the writing a name, at election by ballot, on a stone or a bean (so Elsner, and perhaps Victorinus, who says, "gemma alba, adoptio in filium Dei"): or to the "mos erat antiquis niveis atrisque lapillis, His dammare reos, illis absolvere culpa," Ov. Met. xv. 41. So Erasm., Zeger, a-Lap., Aretius, Calov., Vitr., Wolf, al. Some expositors combine two or more of these expositions: as De Wette, understanding it as typical of justification and election; Bengel; Stern, who also notices the white stone as the mark of felicity, "Hunc, Macrine, diem numera meliore lapillo, Qui tibi lantes apponit candidus annos," Pers. Sat. ii., and "O diem lætum notandumque mihi candidissimo calculo," Plin. Ep. vi. 11. 3. But, as Düsterd. well observes, it is against all these interpretations, that no one of them fits the conditions of this description. Each one halts in the explanation either of the stone itself, or of that which is written on it. Least of all, perhaps, does the last apply: the verdict of acquittal would be a strange reward indeed to one who has fought and overcome

in the strength of an acquittal long ago obtained, δ κύριος ἐχαρίσατο ὑμῖν, Col. iii. 13. The most probable view is that which Bengel gives a hint of ("scribebant veteres multa in lapillis"), and which Hengst. ("Das hier in Betracht kommende Moment ist allein das, daß man im Alterthume manches auf kleine Steine schrieb") and Düsterd. hold, that the figure is derived from the practice of using small stones, inscribed with writing, for various purposes, and that, further than this, the imagery belongs to the occasion itself only. Taking it thus, the colour is that of victory, see ch. iii. 4; vi. 2; iv. 4; xix. 14. The name inscribed yet remains for consideration. It is in this, as it would be in every case, the inscription which gives the stone its real value, being, as it is, a token of reward and approval from the Son of God. But *what name* is this? not what name *in each case*, for an answer to this question is precluded by the very terms, οὐδὲς οἶδεν, κ.τ.λ.: but of *what kind*? Is it the name of Christ Himself, or of God in Christ? This supposition is precluded also by the same terms: for any mysterious name of God or of Christ would either be hidden from all (so ch. xix. 12, ἔχων . . . ὄνομα γεγραμμένον δ οὐδὲς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός), or known to all who were similarly victorious through grace. These very terms seem to require that it should be the recipient's *own name*, a *new* name however; a revelation of his everlasting title, as a son of God, to glory in Christ, but consisting of, and revealed in, those personal marks and signs of God's peculiar adoption of *himself*, which he and none else is acquainted with. "If the heart knoweth its own bitterness, and a stranger intermeddleth not with its joy" (Prov. xiv. 10), then the deep secret dealings of God with each of us during those times, by which our sonship is assured and our spiritual strife carried onward to victory, can, when revealed to us in the other blessed state, be known thoroughly to ourselves only. Bengel beautifully says, "Möchtest Du wissen, was Du für einen neuen Namen bekommen wirst? Überwinde! Worher fragst Du vergeblich: und hernach wirst Du ihn bald auf dem weissen Stein geschrieben lesen." Trench, in loc., after Züllig, suggests that the white, or glistening stone, may be the Urim, in which the most precious stone of

Τάδε λέγει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἔχων τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ ὡς φλόγα πυρός, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὅμοιοι χαλκολιβάνῳ, ¹⁹ Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν πίστιν καὶ τὴν διακονίαν καὶ τὴν ὑπομονήν σου, καὶ τὰ ἔργα σου τὰ ἔσχατα ^a πλείονα τῶν ^z πρώτων. ²⁰ ἀλλὰ ἔχω κατὰ σοῦ ὅτι ^c ἀφείς τὴν γυναικὰ [σου] Ἰεζαβὲλ ^d ἣ

⁵⁸). y ver 2. z see Matt. xii 45. 2 Pet ii 20. (Job xlii. 12) a see Heb. xi. 4 reff. b ver 4. c = John xi 44, 48 xii. 7. Acts xiv. 17 Ps. civ. 14. (form, Ex. xxxii. 32.) d constr. (see note), ver. 13. ch. ii. 12. ix. 14. xiv. 12 Ezek. xxxii. 7, 12.

om 1st αυτου A 36-8 vulg Andr Epiph: ins C[P] B rel vss Andr Areth.

19. om 2nd την c 38. rec transp πιστιν and διακονιαν, with 1 (41-2, e sil): transp αγαπην and πιστιν g 51. 90: txt AC[P]N^{3c} B rel vss gr-lat.-ff.—(om την διακ. και N¹: om την N^{3a} 38.) om την (bef υπομονην) A 36. om 2nd σου N. rec ins και bef τα εσχατα, with 1. 33 (34. 47-8-9. 50. 90, e sil): om AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat.-ff.

20. (αλλα, so A B a b d g j m 13-8-9. 30-3 (34, e sil). 35 Andr-coisl.) rec aft κατα σου ins ολιγα, with 33 (41, e sil): πολλα n Andr-a Cypr Primas Vict-tun; πολυ N 12. 17¹. 36. 43 Andr-b Cypr: om AC[P] B rel vss Epiph Andr Tert. om οτι αφεις 1: om οτι αφεις την γυναικα [σου] 33. rec (for αφεις) eas: αφις 34-5. 47 Andr-coisl Areth: αφικας N^{3a} 26. 36 Andr-p: ποθεις 38; tenes Tert: txt AC[P]N¹ B rel Epiph Andr-a. rec om 2nd σου, with C[P]N 1. 16. 35-6-8 (32. 41 B¹, e sil) vss Epiph Tert: ins A B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr Primas. rec ιεζαβηλ, with 33 (16-8. 27. 32-7. 40-1-2, e sil): ιαζαβελ N¹: txt AC[P]N^{3a} B rel. rec την

all was covered by the twelve on which the names of the tribes were engraved; the writing on which no one knew. The suggestion is one well worth consideration).

18—29.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT THYATIRA. See Prolegg. § iii. 9. And to the angel of the church in Thyatira write: These things saith the Son of God (our Lord thus names himself here, in accordance with the spirit of that which is to follow; ver. 27 being from Ps. ii., in which it is written, κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με Τίός μου εἰ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε), who hath his eyes as a flame of fire (connected with ver. 23, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ἔρευνών νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας) and his feet are like to chalcobalanus (for χαλκολ., see on ch. i. 15. There is here probably a connexion with ver. 27, ὡς τὰ σκεύη τὰ κεραμικὰ συντριβεται, the work of the strongly shod feet): I know thy works, and (the four which follow are subordinated to the ἔργα preceding, as is shewn by σου placed after the four, not after each one. The καὶ then is the subordinating or epexegetic copula, as in καὶ χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος, John i. 16. See Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 3, c) the love (ἀγάπη, standing first, is probably quite general, to God and man) and the faith (general again: not = faithfulness, but in its ordinary sense) and the ministration (viz., to the sick and poor, and all that need it: the natural proof of ἀγάπη and πίστις—πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη, Gal. v. 6) and the

endurance (in tribulation: or perhaps the ὑπομονὴ ἔργου ἀγαθοῦ of Rom. ii. 7) of thee, and (that) thy last works (are) more (in number, or importance, or both) than the first (this praise is the opposite of the blame conveyed by ver. 5 to the Ephesian church). 20.] Notwithstanding I have against thee that thou sufferest (ἀφείς from ἀφέω, see ref. Ex. and Winer, edn. 6, § 14. 3) thy wife (or, the woman) Jezebel (on the whole, the evidence for σου being inserted in the text seems to me to preponderate. It could not well have been inserted: and was sure to have been erased, from its difficulty, and possibly from other reasons, considering what was the common interpretation of the ἄγγελος. It does not create any real difficulty: finding its meaning not in the matter of fact at Thyatira, but in the history from which the appellation Ἰεζαβὲλ is taken. In 3 Kings xx. 25 (1 Kings xxi. 25) we read Ἀχαάβ, ὃς ἐπράθη ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρὸν ἐνώπιον κυρίου, ὡς μετέθηκεν αὐτὸν Ἰεζαβὲλ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ: from which text the phrase is transferred entire, importing that this Jezebel was to the church at Thyatira what that other was to Ahab. It is not so easy to determine who is, or who are, imported by the term. The very fact of the name Jezebel being chosen (for it is impossible, even were this the actual name of a woman, that it should be used here with any other than the symbolic meaning), coupled with τὴν γυναικὰ σου above explained, takes us out of the realms of simple fact into those of symbolism.

e Luke ii. 36 only. 4 Kings xxii. 14.
f = John vii. 12, 47. 1 John i. 5, ii. 26. iii. 7 al.
Deut. xiii. 5. k ch. i. 1.
h ver. 14 (reff.). i = (& sing.) John v. 6. vii. 33. xii. 35. xiv. 9. Isa. liv. 7. k here bis ch. ix. 20, 21. xvi. 11 only. l = Matt. v. 32. 1 Cor. vi. 13, 18 al. Ezek. xliii. 9. m Matt. ix. 2. Mark vii. 30.

λέγουσα ἑαυτὴν ὁ προφήτιν, καὶ διδάσκει καὶ ἡ πλανᾷ τοὺς ἑμίους ὁ δούλους ἡ πορνεῦσαι καὶ φαγεῖν ἡ εἰδωλόθυτα. 21 καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῇ ἡ χρόνον ἵνα μετανοήσῃ, καὶ οὐ θέλει μετανοήσαι ἡ ἐκ τῆς ἡ πορνείας αὐτῆς. 22 ἰδοὺ ἡ βάλλω

λεγουσαν, with [P]N^{3c} 1. 36-8: την λεγουσα(sic) N^{3a}: η λεγει B rel Andr Areth: και λεγει 42: txt ACN¹. for εαυτην, αυτην N B 1 16. 40. 69. προφητην P B h¹ l m 36 (38?): προφητειαν N¹: txt ACN^{3ac} rel.—add ειναι N 36. rec διδασκειν και πλανασθαι, omg 1st και and τους, with vulg: διδασκει και πλαναται, omg τους, 1: txt AC[P]N B rel syr-dd copt æth Andr.—for 1st και, ἡ B. rec ειδωλοθυτα bef φαγειν, with 1 (6. 41, e sil): txt AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

21. rec om και ου θελει μετανοησαι, with N¹ 1. 12-7 (arm): κ. ει μεν θελει μετανοησαι 38: κ. ουκ ηθελησεν μετανοησαι A Primas Vict-tun: txt C[P]N^{3a} B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—rec aft εκ τ. πορν. αυτ. ins και ου μετενοησεν, with 1 arm (-σαν): om AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—ταυτης N.

22. rec aft ιδου ins εγω, with (d ?) 1 (above the line). 33 (34, e sil): om AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff. for βαλλω, βαλω [P]N^{3a} B 9. 27. 32-8 vulg-ed copt some-lat-ff: καλω N¹: txt AC rel.

The figure of "Jezebel thy wife" being once recognized in its historical import, it would not be needful that an individual woman should be found to answer to it: the conscience of the Thyatiran church could not fail to apply the severe reproof to whatever influence was being exerted in the direction here indicated. So that I should rate at very little the speculations of many Commentators on the supposed woman here pointed out. Düsterd, recently, remarks that ἡ λέγουσα has something individual about it. So it has: but may not this individuality belong just as well to the figure, as to the thing signified by it? The sect or individuals being once concentrated as Jezebel, ἡ λέγουσα would follow of course, in the propriety of the figure. On the whole, however, I should feel it more probable that some individual *teacher*, high in repute and influence at the time, is pointed at. The denunciation of such a teacher under such a title would be at once startling and decisive. Nor would probability be violated by the other supposition, that a favoured and influential party in the Thyatiran church is designated. The church herself is represented by a woman: why may not a party (compare the Jews, who are the συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ of ver. 9) within the church be similarly symbolized? However this may be, the real solution must lie hidden until all that is hidden shall be known. See more below, who calleth herself a prophetess (the appositional nom. again: see reff.: and again with an indeclinable proper name, as in ver. 13. This clause perhaps points at an individual: but there is on the other hand no reason why a sect claiming prophetic gifts should not be in-

dicated: the feminine belonging as before to the historical symbol), and she teacheth and deceiveth my servants, to commit fornication and eat things sacrificed to idols (hence the propriety of the name Jezebel: for both these were the abominations of the historic Jezebel: 2 Kings ix. 22, 30 (cf. Jer. iv. 30; Nahum iii. 4): the latter indeed in its more aggravated form of actual idolatry, 1 Kings xviii. 19. This specification of the mischief done shews us that this influence at Thyatira was in the same direction as the evil works of the Nicolaitans at Pergamum, ver. 14. The fact that this was the prevalent direction of the false teaching of the day, is important in a chronological point of view: see Prolegg., § iii. par. 6). And I gave her time (not, "in my pre-ordination of what is to be," as the aor. in Mark xiii. 20, but denoting historically that which the Lord had actually done, in vain. Notice that the ἀφείναι, on which depended the time given her for repentance, is yet blamed in the church of Thyatira as a sin) that she should repent, and she willeth not to repent of (lit. "out of," constr. prægna, so as to come out of: or the μεταν. itself is regarded as an escape. The construction (reff.) is confined to this book: we have the verb once with ἀπό, Acts viii. 22; and the subst. μετάνοια, Heb. vi. 1) her fornication (πορνεία is here to be taken, as in all these passages, in its literal sense. Otherwise, if taken figuratively, it would be only a repetition of the other particular, idolatry). 22.] Behold (arrests attention, and prepares the way for something unexpected and terrible), I cast her (evidently against her will: but there is not necessarily violence in the word: it is the ordinary

αὐτὴν εἰς ^m κλίνην, καὶ τοὺς ⁿ μοιχεύοντας μετ' αὐτῆς εἰς ⁿ constr. absol.
 θλίψιν μεγάλην, ^o ἂν μὴ ^k μετανοήσουσιν ^k ἐκ τῶν ἔργων (see note),
 αὐτῆς, ²³ καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς ^p ἀποκτενῶ ἐν ^p θανάτῳ, καὶ James ii. 11
 ἡνέκονται ^p πᾶσαι αἱ ἐκκλησίαι ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ^q ἔρουνῶν ^p = Ezk. xlii. 2.
 νεφροὺς καὶ ^r καρδίας, καὶ ^t δώσω ὑμῖν ἐκάστῳ ^{tu} κατὰ τὰ ^p = Ezk. xxxiii. 27 (but
 without ἐν).
 q John v. 39 ii. 52 Rom viii. 27. 1 Cor ii. 10 1 Pet. i. 11 only Gen. xlv. 12. r Rom. viii. 27.
 s here only Psa. vii. 9 xxx. 2. t Ps. xxvii. 4. see Rom. ii. 6 Psa. lxi. 12. Prov. xxiv. 12.
 u ch. xx. 12 al.

k και
 γινω
 α το 11, 1.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10-3. 16
 to 19. 26-
 7. 30 32
 to 38. 40
 to 42. 47
 to 51. 90
 Br.

for κλινην, φυλακην (see ver 10) A.

rec(for 2nd αυτης αυτων (repetition of preceding termination), with A j n 1. 17¹ (appy). 36. 49¹ arm Andr Cyp Primas: txt C[P]N B rel am (with fuld harl¹ lips-5 tol, against demid harl² lipss) syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Tert.

23. om 1st και A copt.

εραυνων AC: txt [P]N B rel.

om 2nd τα C.

verb for being "cast" on a bed of sickness: see reff. and Matt. viii. 6, 14) into a bed (ἀντὶ τοῦ, εἰς ἀρρώστιαν, Areth.: will change her bed of whoredom into a bed of anguish: see Ps. xli. 3. So most Commentators. Perhaps the threat has reference to a future pestilence. Bede, Lyra, al., understand the bed to be "infernalis pœna," the latter referring to Isa. xiv. 11. Ansbert, curiously enough, "severitatis vel audaciæ lectum," into which God casts his enemies before their destruction), and those who commit adultery (not now πορνεύοντας, but a more general term, embracing in its wide meaning both the πορνεύσαι and εἰδωλόθута φαγεῖν, and well known as the word used of rebellious and idolatrous Israel, cf. Jer. iii. 8, v. 7; Ez. xvi. 32 al.) together with her (μετ' αὐτῆς is not = αὐτῇ, so that she should be the 'conjux adulterii,' but implies merely participation—those who share with her in her adulteries. These μοιχεύοντες μετ' αὐτῆς, as interpreted by the tone with which the rebuke began, will mean, those who by suffering and encouraging her, make themselves partakers of her sin. And this rather favours the idea that not one individual, but a dominant party, is intended. See below) into great tribulation (this clause forms a kind of parallelism with the former, so that εἰς θλίψιν μεγ. is parallel with εἰς κλίνην. But it is not to be regarded as interpreting κλίνην. Her punishment and that of her children (see below) is one thing; that of the partakers in her adulteries, those in the church who tolerated and encouraged her, another, viz. great tribulation. This is forcibly shewn by the ἔργων αὐτῆς following), if they do not (aor.: speedily and effectually, shall not have done so by the time which I have in my thoughts) repent of her (not their: they are Christ's servants who are tampering with her temptations and allowing themselves in her works, which are alien from their own spiritual life) works. And her

children (emphatically put forward as distinguished from the last mentioned: q. d., "And as to her children, &c.") These are her proper adherents: not those who suffer her, but those who are begotten of her, and go to constitute her. Some Commentators have vainly dreamt of the slaughter of Ahab's 70 sons, 2 Kings x.: but they were not Jezebel's children. The historical figure is obviously dropped here) I will slay with (in, but perhaps merely instrumental: see above, on ver. 16) death (the expression is probably a rendering of the Heb. מוֹתֵנָהּ, as in Lev. xx. 10, which the LXX render by θανάτῳ θανατούσθωσαν, and which there occurs in reference to adultery. But we need not, as Hengst., suppose a direct reference to that passage: for there is nothing of adultery here: we have done with τοὺς μοιχεύοντας μετ' αὐτῆς, and are come to the judgment on τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς): and all the churches (this remarkable expression, meaning not, all the Asiatic churches, but all the churches in the world till the end of time, lifts the whole of this threatening and its accompanying encouragements out of proconsular Asia, and gives us a glimpse into the oecumenical character of these messages) shall know (the fanciful Hengst. imagines a reference in γνώσκονται to the false γνώσις: but in so common and so solemn a formula of the O. T., this must surely be out of the question) that I am he that searcheth the reins and the hearts (which, see reff. is the attribute of God: and therefore of the Son of God. Cf. ver. 18 above, and note. Grotius says, "Per renes intelliguntur desideria, ut et Ps. cxxxix. 13, Jer. xii. 2, Prov. xxiii. 16: per cor, cogitata, 1 Sam. xvi. 7, 1 Reg. viii. 39 al.") But it seems doubtful whether so minute a distinction is in the words; whether they are not rather a general designation for the whole inward parts of a man): and I will give to you ('will render, in My doom of judgment.' The strain of the Lord's message is sud-

v vv. 14, 15. ⁿ ἔργα ὑμῶν. ²⁴ ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατεί- ΔΡΦΝ D
 w = ch i. 7. reff. ροις ὅσοι οὐκ ἔχουσιν τὴν ὁδὸν ταύτην, οὐκ ἔργου οὐκ
 x = vs. Luke xxiv. 1. John 1v. 11. Acts 1x. 9 only. ἐργασαν τὰ ἔργα τοῦ σατανᾶ, ὡς λέγουσιν, οὐ ἔργου
 Dan. ii. 22. -65. Rom. viii. 39. xi. 33. 1 Cor. ii. 10 al. Ps. cxxix. 1. Judith viii. 14. y see Mark vii. 33. John xiii.
 2. xx. 25, 27. James iii. 3 al. to 38. 40
 to 42. 47
 to 51. 60

for υμων, αυτου B 38 vulg (but not am demid harl lips-5) Tert: ημων 36: om N¹: txt AC[P]N^{3a} rel.

24. rec (for 1st τοις) και, with vulg(ed and some mss): om k 2. 6. 16-7-8-9: txt AC[P]N B rel vss Andr Primas.—om τοις λοιποις 92¹ arm: aft 1st τοις N¹ has written εν (from below, N^{3a} disapproving). θυατειρη N^{3a}. om 1st ουκ N¹: for σοι, oi N^{3a}: txt N^{3c}(?). rec ins και bef οιτινες, with vulg-ed Quæst: om AC[P]N B 33(sic, Del) rel vss Andr Areth Primas.—om [κ.] οιτινες ουκ εγν. 41. rec βαθη, with [P]N e n 1(βαθη). 36: txt AC B rel. rec (for βαλλω) βαλω, with N B f h n 10. 33 (37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg Primas: βάλω 1. 47: λεγω 41-2: txt AC[P] rel syr-dd Andr Areth.

denly changed into a direct address to those threatened) to each according to your works (ἔργα, not the mere outward products of the visible life, but the real acts and verities of the inward man, discerned by the piercing eye of the Son of God). 24.] But (contrast to those addressed before) to you I say, the rest who are in Thyatira, as many as have not (are only do not hold, but are free from any contact with) this teaching, such as (οἷτινες, as usual, classifies) have not known the depths (deep places, in the resolved form) of Satan, as they call them (it was the characteristic of the falsely named γνώσις, to boast of its βάθεα, or depths, of divine things. Iren. ii. 22. 1, p. 146, speaks of those "qui profunda bythi adinvenisse se dicunt:" and ib. 3, p. 147, "profunda Dei adinvenisse se dicentes." And Tert. adv. Valent. 1, vol. ii. p. 538 ff., should by all means be read, as admirably illustrating this expression. He there says, "Elcusinia Valentianiana fecerunt lenocinia, sancta silentio magno, sola taciturnitate coelestia. Si bona fide quæris, concreto vultu, suspensio supercilio Altum est, aiunt." We may safely therefore refer the expression οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὰ βάθεα to the heretics spoken of. But it is not so clear to whom as their subject the words ὡς λέγουσιν are to be appropriated, and again whose word τοῦ σατανᾶ is, whether that 1) of our Lord, 2) of the heretics, or 3) of the Christians addressed. If ὡς λέγουσιν belong to the Christians, then the sense will be, that they, the Christians, called the βάθεα of the heretics, the βάθεα τοῦ σατανᾶ, and were content to profess their ignorance of them. So Andr., Areth., Heinr., Züllig, Ebrard: and so far would be true enough; but the sentence would thus be left very flat and pointless, and altogether inconsistent in its tone with the solemn and pregnant words of the rest of the message. If

ὡς λέγουσιν belong to the heretics, we have our choice between two views of τοῦ σατανᾶ: either 1) that the heretics themselves called their own mysteries τὰ β. τοῦ σατανᾶ. But this, though held by Hengst.,—and even by Neander, Pfl. u. L. edn. 4, p. 619 note, as a possible alternative, and recently by Trench,—can hardly be so, seeing that the words surely would not bear the sense thus assigned to them, viz. that they could go deeper than and outwit Satan in his own kingdom: and seeing moreover, that no such formula, or any resembling it, is found as used by the ancient Gnostic heretics: or 2) that the ὡς λέγουσιν applies only to the word βάθεα, and that, when, according to their way of speaking, τοῦ θεοῦ should have followed (cf. ref. 1 Cor.), the Lord in indignation substitutes τοῦ σατανᾶ. This has been the sense taken by most Commentators, e. g., Corn.-a-lap., Ribera, Grot., Calov., Wetst., Vittr., Bengel, Wolf, Eichhorn, Ewald, De W., Stern, Düsterd. And it appears to me that this alone comes in any measure up to the requirements of the passage, in intensity of meaning and solemnity, as well as in verisimilitude.

I need hardly remark that the rendering which I am sorry to see in Tregelles's very useful little English version of the purer text of the Apoc., "how they speak," is quite untenable. In the E. V., "as they speak," is meant to = "as they say:" but for "how they speak" (absol.), λαλοῦσιν would be required), I cast not upon you any other burden (it is better, seeing that no τοῦτο or τό follows after πλὴν below, not to carry on the sentence as if ἄλλο, πλὴν . . . were closely joined, but to break it off at βάρος: leaving however the πλὴν to take it up (see below) by and by. And this being so, to what do the words refer? There can, I imagine, be little doubt as to the answer, if we

ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἄλλο ²⁵ βάρος ^a πλὴν δ' ^b ἔχετε ^c κρατήσατε ² — Acts xv. 28 (Matt. xx. 12. 2 Cor. iv. 17. Gal. vi. 2. 1 Thess. ii. 6) only. ² Sir. xii. 2.

ἄχρις οὗ ἂν ^d ἤξω. ²⁶ καὶ ^e ο ^f νικῶν καὶ ^g ὁ ^f τηρῶν ^{gh} ἄχρι ^h τέλους τὰ ἔργα μου, ⁱ δώσω ^k αὐτῷ ^{il} ἐξουσίαν ^l ἐπὶ ^m τῶν

(2 Macc. ix. 10) only. a = Matt. Luke passim. (not Mark, John, nor Luke in Acts.) Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 11 al4 elsew here only. Judg. iv. 9. b = 1 John v. 12 reff. c = ver. 13 reff. d of Christ, Matt. xxiv. 50. Luke xii. 46. John viii. 42. Rom. xi. 26 (from Isa. lix. 20). Heb. x. 7, 37. 1 John v. 20. ch. iii. 3. e ver. 7 reff. f ch. i. 3 reff. g ver. 10 reff. h Heb. vi. 11 only. (μᾶλλον τ., Heb. iii. 14. ἕως τ., 1 Cor. i. 8.) i John i. 12 v. 27. xvii. 2. Matt ix. 8. x. 1. xxviii. 18 al. Sir. xxx. 28 (xxxi. 19). k constr., ch. iii. 12, 21. vi. 8 l w. gen., ch. xi. 6. xiv. 18. xx. 6 only. (ἐπάνω, Luke xix. 17.) w. acc., ch. vi. 8. xiii. 7. xvi. 9 xxii. 14. Luke ix. 1 al. gen. without ἐπὶ, Matt. x. 1. John xvii. 2. Sir. xvii. 2. m generic, as Matt. ix. 11. Acts iv. 1. x. 45.

25. αχρὶ CN f 33 (34-5, e sil): εως A 47: txt [P] B rel. for αν ηξω, ανοιξω B
rel: txt AC[P]N h l m n 10-7-8. 38. 51 (c 1. 6. 26. 30-4-5-6-7. 47-9 B^r e sil).
26. om επι N¹ (ins N^{3a}).

remember some of the expressions used in the apostolic decree in which these very matters here in question, fornication and abstaining from unholy meats, were the only things forbidden to the Gentile converts. For our Lord here takes up and refers to those very words. In Acts xv. 28, we read *ἔδοξεν γὰρ τῷ ἁγίῳ πνεύματι κ. ἡμῶν μηδὲν πλέον ἐπιτίθεσθαι ὑμῖν βάρος πλὴν τῶν ἐπ'ἀνάγκης, ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδώλο-θύτων κ. αἵματος κ. πνικτῶν κ. πορνείας*. This act of simple obedience, and no deep matters beyond their reach, was what the Lord required of them. And this *βάρος* resolved itself into keeping the faith once delivered to the saints, as enjoined in the next sentence. This view is taken by Bede (2) (in substance: "non ego vobis novam mitto doctrinam: sed quam accepistis, servate in finem;" but he does not mention the allusion), Primas., Lyra, Corn.-a-lap., Stern, Hengst., Düsterd. Grot. al. give a more general meaning, true in part: "jactant illi se rerum multarum cognitione; eam a vobis non exigo." Bengel understands by *βάρος* the trouble given them by Jezebel and her followers: Ewald, the punishments about to befall the heretics, which were not to be feared by the Christians: Ebrard similarly,—they had had enough trouble already in enduring Jezebel, &c., and should not have any share in her punishment: De Wette, the burden of previous suffering implied in *ὑπομονή*; and so Bede (1), "non patiar vos tentari supra quod potestis," and Beza, understanding *βάρος* in the sense of "burden," so often occurring in the prophets when they denounce the divine threatenings. But to my mind the allusion to the apostolic decree is too clear and prominent to allow of any other meaning coming into question: at least any other which sets that entirely aside. Others may be deduced and flow from that one, which have meaning for the church now that those former subjects of controversy have passed away: but (though not (see above) directly and in

the same sentence connected with ἄλλο, πλὴν distinctly looks back to it and takes it up. It is, "*only*:" q. d., forget not that the licence just accorded involves this sacred obligation) that which ye have (cf. ch. iii. 11: not to be restricted in its sense to their steadfastness in resisting Jezebel and hers, but representing the sum total of Christian doctrine and hope and privilege; the *ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσα τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστις* of Jude 3), hold fast (the aor. is more vivid and imperative than would be the present; it sets forth not so much the continuing habit, as the renewed and determined grasp of every intervening moment of the space prescribed) until the time when I shall come (the ἂν gives an uncertainty when the time shall be, which we cannot convey in our language). 26.] And (the announcement of reward to the conqueror now first precedes the proclamation to hear what the Spirit saith to the churches: and is joined, *here alone*, by καὶ to the preceding portion of the Epistle; being indeed more closely connected with it in this case than in any of the others; see below) he that conquereth and he that (by the second ὁ, this καὶ is precluded from being taken as introducing a clause merely exegetical of νικῶν, as Düsterd., al. Rather must we say, that by it ὁ τηρῶν κατ.λ. is included in the class pointed out by ὁ νικῶν) keepeth to the end (it is remarkable that immediately after the words, so pointedly alluded to above, in the apostolic decree, Acts xv. 28, was added, *ἐξ ὧν διατηροῦντες ἑαυτοὺς εὐ πράξετε*) my works (contrast to τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς, ver. 22: but extending beyond that contrast to a general and blessed truth. μου, gen. possess., which belong to Me, are the attributes of Myself and of mine), I will give to him authority over the nations (compare the *ἰσθὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχων ἐπάνω δέκα πόλεων* in Luke ix. 17, which is the reward of him who obeyed the command *πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι*. The authority here

n ch. xii 5. ἔθνων, 27 καὶ ^{no} ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ^{nr} ἐν ^{nq} ῥάβδῳ ^{nr} σιδηρᾷ, ACPS B
 xix. 15. Psa. a to n, 1.
 11. 9. 2 4. 6. 9.
 o = ch. vii 17. ὡς τὰ st σκεύη τὰ ^u κεραμικὰ ^{tv} συντριβεται, ὡς κἀγὼ 10-3. 16
 Matt ii 6 w εἴληφα w παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου. 28 καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ τὸν 7. 30. 32
 John xxi. 18 x ἀστέρα τὸν ^{xy} πρωτόν. 29 ὁ ^z ἔχων ^z οὗς ^z ἀκουσάτω τί 10-19. 26-
 p = ver. 16. τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. 42 47
 q 1 Cor. iv. 21. 20 21m ii. 20. ch. xviii 12 al t Lev. vi. 28. u here only†. (-μεως, l. c.) v - Rom. xvi.
 r as above (n). w = Acts u 33. (Lev. vii. 24) x ch. xxii. 18 only. cf. Sir. i. 6 (see note) to 38. 40
 Acts xii 10. ch ix. 9 only 3 Kings to 51. 90
 xxii. 11. s = Rom. ix. B.
 s = Rom. ix. 20 21m ii. 20. ch. xviii 12 al t Lev. vi. 28. u here only†. (-μεως, l. c.) v - Rom. xvi.
 20 (John xix 36 al.) w = Acts u 33. (Lev. vii. 24) x ch. xxii. 18 only. cf. Sir. i. 6 (see note) to 51. 90
 y Job xxxviii. 12. z ver. 7 reff.

III. 1 Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Σάρδεσιν ἐκκλησίας

27. συντριβησεται [P] B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas: συντριβονται 362.
 txt ACN 1 361-S. 51 (l. 40, e sil) Andr-a. 28. προῖνον A B.

CHAP. III. 1. for της, τω B. (Cf ch ii. 1, 8, 18.)

spoken of is that which shall be conferred on the saints when they shall inherit the earth, and reign with Christ in His Kingdom. It has been gradually realized, as the stone cut out without hands has broken in pieces other kingdoms; but shall only then find its entire fulfilment. Various insufficient meanings have been given: of which one of the most curious is that of Grot., "Evolvam illum in gradum presbyteri, ut judicet de iis qui non christiane sed *ἔθνικῶς* vivunt;" who also understands ver. 27 below of excommunication, "per gladium hic intelligitur verbum Dei, cujus pars est et excommunicatio"), and he shall govern (lit. "*shepherd*." It is the LXX rendering of the Heb. עֶזְרָא, *break in pieces*, which they have taken as עֶזְרָא, *shepherd*, in ref. Ps. The saying, as rendered by them, is sanctioned by being thrice quoted in this book, see reff.) them with (see 1 Cor. iv. 21) a rod of iron (a sceptre of severity: "inflexibili iustitia," as Lyra), as the vessels of pottery are broken up (συντριβεται, are crushed, or shattered, or broken up: the συν gives the idea of the multitudinous fragments collapsing into an heap: the "broken to shivers" of the E. V. is very good), as I also have received from my Father (viz. in Ps. ii. 9, in which Psalm it is said *υἱός μου ἐστὶ σὺ*, ver. 7. The power there conferred on Me, I will delegate to my victorious servant; see Luke xxii. 29). And I will give to him the star of the morning (it is not easy to say what, in strict exactness, these words import. The interpretations given, even in the Catena, are very various and inconsistent. Andr. and Areth. understand it of the Lucifer of Isa. xiv. 12, i. e. the devil, whom our Lord saw as lightning fall from heaven,—or, as there imported, the King of Babylon, the most powerful monarch on earth; so Züllig. Another meaning in the Catena is τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου λεχθέντα φάσφορον ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις

τῶν πιστῶν ἀνατέλλοντα, 2 Pet. i. 19. Victorinus says, "Primam resurrectionem scilicet promittit." Primas, Bede, Alcas., Corn-a-lap., Calov., Vit., Wolf, Beng., Stern, Ebrard, understand Christ Himself, who, ch. xxii. 16, declares Himself to be ὁ ἀστήρ ὁ λαμπρὸς, ὁ πρωῒνος: and doubtless, as has been before remarked on the fruit of the tree of life, ver. 7, and on the hidden manna, ver. 17, in the mystical sense, Christ Himself is the sum and inclusion of all Christ's gifts: this truth serves to connect the symbolism of all these passages, but does not justify us in disturbing that of one by introducing that of another. Here the morning star clearly is not Christ Himself, the very terms of the sentence separating the two. Then again, we have Lyra,—"*id est, corpus gloriosum dote claritatis refulgens*,"—nearly the same words in which he before explained the white stone, ver. 17, only that there it was "*charitatis*." Grot., "*dabo et fulgorem, non qualis cuique stellæ, sed Luciferi, qui cæteras stellas multum vincit*." And this interpretation is probably near the mark. In Dan. xii. 3 we read that the righteous shall shine *ὡς οἱ ἀστέρες*, and in Matt. xiii. 43 that they *ἐκλάμπουσιν ὡς ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν*. And in Prov. iv. 18 we read that "the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day." Still, this interpretation does not quite satisfy the words *δώσω αὐτῷ*: unless indeed the poetic imagery be, that he is imagined as clad in the glory of that star, putting it on as a jewel, or as a glittering robe. De Wette supposes it is to be given to him as its ruler: but such an interpretation would lead into a wide field of speculation which does not seem to have been opened by Scripture, and is hardly required by the passage itself). 29.] See above, ver. 7.

CH. III. 1.—6.] THE EPISTLE TO THE

γράφον Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἔχων τὰ ^a ἑπτὰ ^a πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ ^{a ch. i. 4 reff.}
καὶ τοὺς ^b ἑπτὰ ^b ἀστέρας, Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ὅτι ^c ὄνομα ^{b ch. i. 16, 20.}
ἔχεις ὅτι ^c ἤξῃς, καὶ ^d νεκρὸς εἶ. ^{c = Mark ix. 41. 1 Pet. iv. 16. ὄνομα μὲν εἶχες, ὡς ἐπ' Ἀθήνας ἐλάυνει, κατῆστο δὲ}
^e στήρῃσον τὰ λοιπὰ ^d ἃ ἔμελλον ἀποθάνειν. οὐ γὰρ εὖ- ^{e constr. ch. xvi. 10}

ἐς πᾶσαν τ. Ἑλλάδα, Herod. vi. 138.

d = James ii. 17. Heb. vi. 1.

e constr. ch. xvi. 10

reff f = ch. xvi. 15. 1 Thess. v. 6 al. Neh. vii. 3.

g Luke xiii. 32. Rom. i. 11. xvi.

25 al. Ps. i. 12 (14) h plur., ch. i. 19 reff.

Steph om 1st *επτα*, with n (6, e sil) : ins AC[P]N B rel. rec ins *το bef ονομα* (with 30-4, e sil) : om AC[P]N B 33(Del) rel Andr Areth. for 2nd *οτι, και* B rel Areth : txt AC[P]N h l m n 10-7. 33-7-8 (1. 13-6. 34-5-6. 49 B^r, e sil). *ζως* 1.

2. *εγρηγορων* (but *corr*) N. rec *στηριξων*, with N B rel Andr Areth : *τηρησων* b e k n 9. 13. 25-7. 30-6. 40 : *στηρησων* h¹, *στηρηζων* l : txt AC[P] a¹ c d g h² 2. 4. 6. 10-1-2-7-9. 32. 48-9¹. 50. from a to *πεπληρωμενα* are in marg of 1. rec (for *εμελλον*) *μελλει*, with *aeth* some-lat-f: *ημελλες* B b j 19. 33. 50. 92 : *εμελλες* rel : *εμελλε* a : *ημελλε* 2 : *εμελλεν* l 1-marg(Treg) Areth : *ημελλεν* 16 : *εμελλ(εμελλεν or λον)* 1-marg(Del) : txt AC[P]N m n 34-5-6-8 vulg syr-dd copt Andr Primas. for *αποθαινει, αποβαλλειν* B rel(αποβαλειν h 17. 49 B^r) : *αποθηνησκειν* n 26. 36 Andr-a Areth : txt AC[P]N l m 1-marg 16. 34-5-8.

CHURCH AT SARDIS. The Spirit of this Epistle is one of rebuke and solemn denunciation. Even the promise, ver. 5, is tinged with the same hue. For the history, see Prolegg., § iii. 10. And to the angel of the church in Sardis write: These things saith He that hath the seven spirits of God (this designation of our Lord has not before occurred: but as Dusterd. observes, it is new rather in form than in substance. We have mention in ch. i. 4 of the seven spirits which are before God's throne: and we there found occasion to interpret them of the plenitude of the Godhead in its attributes and energies. See, for further elucidation, ch. iv. 5, v. 6. These spirits, this plenitude, Christ, the Lord of the church, possesses, is clothed and invested with, in all fullness. From Him the spiritual life of his churches comes as its source, in all its elements of vitality. He searches all the depths both of our depravity and of His own applications of grace. He has in his hand all the Spirit's power of conviction. He wields the fire of purification and the fire of destruction. Whether the Spirit informs, or rebukes, or warns, or comforts, or promises, whether He softens or hardens men's hearts, it is Christ who, searching the hearts as Son of God and feeling their feelings as Son of man, wields and applies the one and manifold Spirit.

The designation here has its appropriateness in the whole character of this solemn Epistle. The Lord of the church comes, armed with all the powers of the Spirit; searching the depths of hypocrisy, judging of the worthlessness of works not done in faith. The difficulty of this general attribute of Christ, and not any one selected specially as applying to Sardis being here introduced, seems to be best

accounted for, not, as Ebrard, by the general prophetic import of the Epistle, but by the fact that the minatory strain of the Epistle justifies the alleging the whole weight and majesty of the divine character of our Lord, to create alarm and bring about repentance) and the seven stars (the former symbolism (reff.) still holds in all its strictness. Nor have we the least right here, as some (e.g. Arethas in Catena, and Wetst.), to suppose that the stars and the spirits are identical. The motive mentioned above would fully account for this designation also: The Lord of all the churches: He who appoints them their ministering angels, and has them, and all that is theirs, in His hand): I know thy works, that (there is no need of a *καὶ* being inserted: the *οτι* is the inference from the *εργα*) thou hast a name that thou livest (I need only mention for warning the childish fancy, that the Bishop of Sardis was named Zosimus or Vitalis: so some blamed by Corn.-a-lap.: so, with approval, Bengel and Hengst. The expression explains itself: see ref. Herodot.: thou hast a repute that thou livest: art *nominally*, as we commonly now say, Christian), and (the mere copula carries the contrast far more vividly and pathetically than when it is made rhetorically complete by inserting "yet." The *καὶ* is not as Ebrard, "hebraïstrend für *ἀλλὰ*," but is common in classical Greek, and indeed in all languages, in this sense) art dead (spiritually dead: void of vitality and fruitfulness: sunk in that deep deadly sleep which, if not broken in upon and roused up, is death itself: so St. Paul, Eph. v. 14, *ἐγειρε ὁ καθεύδων κ. ἀνάστα ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν, κ. ἐπιφάσει σοι ὁ χριστός*: see reff.). Be (*γίνου*, because a change is involved: be-

h 1 John i. 4
reff. Col. ii. 10 al.
i (ch. i. 4 reff.)
= Luke xvi.
15. Acts iv.
19 al. fr.
3 Kings iii.
10. k = John xx. 17. ver. 12 four times [ch. ii. 7] only.
vii. 63. n = 1 John ii. 8, 5 reff. l constr., ch. ii. 5. o absol., ch. ii. 5 reff. m ch. ii. 27. Acts
ACPN B a 10 n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16. to 19. 26-7. 30. 32. to 38. 40. to 42. 47. to 51. 90.

ευρηκαν B. έργα AC 1-marg: τα έργα [P]N B rel Andr Areth. rec om μου, with 1 (13. 41, e sil) Andr-p Vig: ins AC[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas. 3. om 1st ουν N f. om και ηκουσας και τηρει (passing from και to και) B rel: om και τηρει æth: ins AC[P]N h l m 10-7-8. 34-5-6 (1. 13-6. 27. 37-8 B^e e sil). for

come what thou art not) **watchful** (we can hardly find in English substituting the adj. for the participle "watching;" thereby losing the objective vividness of the pres. part., and getting instead a subjective attribute of character. "Awake and watch" would be, in paraphrase, tantamount to the text), and strengthen the remaining things, which were (the time is transferred to that indicated by στήρισον: which were, when thou shalt apply thyself to strengthen them) about to die (there is a question whether these λοιπα are to be understood as *things*, matters in which the Sardinian church was not yet totally without spiritual vitality, or as *persons*, who were not yet passed into the almost universal death-slumber of hypocrisy. The latter view is taken by (Andr., Areth., as reported in Düsterd.: but not in Catena, see below) Calov., Vittr., Eichh., De Wette, Stern, Ebrard, Düsterd., Trench, al. And there is nothing in the construction to preclude the view. But if I mistake not, there is in the context. For to assume that the λοιποί could be thus described, would surely be to leave no room for those mentioned with so much praise below in ver. 4. Had τα λοιπα not occurred, we might have well understood στήρισον & ἐμελλον ἀποθανεῖν of confirming those thy weak members who on account of the general deadness were near losing their spiritual life altogether: but with τα λοιπα this can hardly stand. We must therefore take the other view,—"strengthen those thy remaining few graces, which in thy spiritual deadly slumber are not yet quite extinct." And so Andr. and Areth. in Catena (I transcribe the whole, by which it appears that μέλη has been carelessly taken to mean personal members: see under the other view above),—τὸν ὕπνον τῆς βαθυμίας ἀποτιναξάμενος, καὶ τὰ μέλη σου τὰ ἀποθνήσκουσιν τελῶς μέλ-λοντα δι' ἀπιστίαν στήριξον. οὐ γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων τὸν ἐργάτην στεφανοῖ τὸν δόκιμον ἀλλ' ἡ ἐπιμονὴ ἕχρι τέλους. τὸ στήριξον δὲ οὐχ ἁπλῶς εἰρη-ται, ἀλλὰ τὸ οἶνον στεβρῶσθαι καὶ

ἐνδυνάμωσον χαλαρὰ τε ὄντα καὶ πρὸς πᾶσιν ἐτοιμότατα. ἐφ' ὅσον οὖν περιλεί- πεται σοι, βραχεία ἐπιτηδεύματά, φησι, πρόσθε, ἵνα μὴ τέλειον ἀποσπάσῃς (qu. ἐπισπάσῃς) θάνατον. ταῦτα γοῦν φύλαξον τὰ ἥδη ζῶντα, ἐκεῖνα δὲ στήριξον τὰ πρὸς θάνατον ἥδη βέποντα. οὐδὲν γὰρ σου τῶν σπουδασμάτων πληρὲς ἐστίν· ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν τέθνηκεν ἥδη, τὰ δὲ μέλλει:—so also Grot., Beng., Ewald, al.): for I have not found thy works (or, without the τὰ, I have not found (any) works of thine) complete in the sight of my God (up to the mark and measure of being acceptable to Him: i. e. not wrought in that living faith which alone renders human works acceptable to God, by uniting them to Him on whom the Father looks with perfect approval. Düsterd. well observes, "The express reference to the absolute rule of all Christian morality is here put the more strongly and strikingly, because this church had among men a name that she lived." The μου binds on the judgment of Him who speaks to that of God). Remember [therefore] how (not subjective, "with what manner of reception," as even Düsterd., after many others, but objective, "after what sort," "quomodo institutus fueris," as Castalio: as οὕτως, Eph. iv. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 11. Trench would unite both) thou hast received (perf.: of the permanent deposit of doctrine entrusted) and heardest (aor., of the act of hearing, when it took place), and keep (what thou hast received and heardest: pres., of an abiding habit) and repent (not pres. now, as the command is of a quick and decisive act of amendment). If therefore (the οὖν is hardly, as De Wette, because it is assumed, in the present evil state of the Sardinian church, that the exhortation will be in vain: far rather, as Düsterd. (alt.), Hengst., al., because repentance is so grievously needed. And it follows on the plain declaration which has been made of that present evil state; coming forcibly and unexpectedly, where we should rather have looked for δέ) thou dost not watch (aor.: shalt not have awaked and become watchful, before the

ῥ ἦξω ^q ὥς ^q κλέπτῃς, καὶ οὐ μὴ γνῶς ^s ποίαν ^s ὥραν ῥ ἦξω ^p ἐπὶ σέ. ⁴ ἀλλὰ ἔχεις ὀλίγα ^t ὀνόματα ἐν σάρδεσιν ἃ οὐκ ^u ἐμόλυναν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ ^v περιπατῇς σὺν αὐτοῖς μετ' ἐμοῦ

(q). Matt. xxiv. 43. Luke xii. 39. s acc., John iv. 52 al. fr. see note and Matt. xxiv. 42. Luke xii. 39. t = Acts i. 15. ch. xi. 13. Num. xxi. 53. u 1 Cor. vii. 7. ch. xiv. 4 only. Isa. lxx. 4 al. (-ισμός, 2 Cor. ii. 1.) v = ch. ii. 1. xxi. 24. p ch. ii. 25 reff. q 1 Thess. v. 2. 4. 2 Pet. iii. 10. ch. xvi. 15 see Jer. xxxi. 9 (xlix. 10). r as above

γρηγ., μετανοήσης ^N (txt ^N ^{sa-c}). rec aft 1st ηξω ins επι σε, with ^N B rel vulg (with am &c, agst demid fuld harl¹ tol lips-5) syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Vig: om AC[P] n 1. 12 copt Andr Primas. for γνως, γνωση ^N (γνωση οίαν) B rel Andr-coisl: txt AC[P] n 10 (32). 36 (a c h 1. 6. 37. 42-8-9. 51 Br, e sil).

4. rec om αλλα, with 1: ins AC[P] ^N B rel vss Andr Areth Orig-int Primas.—αλλ' [P] B rel (exc f 6. 38). ολίγα bef εχεις B rel Andr Areth: ol. onom. bef εχ, c f k 6. 32. 47-9: txt AC[P] ^N n 1. 17. 36-8. rec ins και bef εν σαρδεσιν, with 1: om AC[P] ^N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas. for α, οί n 1. 17. 37-8. 46 vulg copt Andr Areth Primas: txt AC[P] ^N B rel Andr-coisl. for αυτων, εαυτων C.

time about to be indicated in the threat which is coming), **I will come as a thief** (these words do not here refer to our Lord's final coming, but to some signal judgment in which He would overtake the Sardinian church. Just as the formula derived from the great eschatological truth of the suddenness of His second coming is frequently applied to His final judgment in Jerusalem, so is it to other His partial and special advents to judgment in the case of individuals and churches), **and thou shalt not know (οὐ μή, see on ch. ii. 11) at what hour** (the accus. of the time when has been called a Hebraism: so even De Wette from Gesenius: or an Aramaism, according to Ewald. But it is common enough in later Greek, and is only, in its first form, a particular case of the accusative of measure, whether of space or time: see Krüger, § 46, ann. 1, where he cites such common expressions, as ἐξήλθομεν ἔτος τούτῳ τρίτῳ εἰς Πάνακτον, Demosth.: Πρωταγόρας τρίτην ἡδὴ ἡμέραν ἐπιδεδήμεκεν. The change which the construction underwent seems to have been that which was usual in such cases; it lost its own peculiar significance of measure and duration, and became used where a mere point of time was in question. But even thus it finds abundant justification in good Greek in such expressions as that in Homer, Il. φ. 111, ἀλλ' ἐπι τοι καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταῖη ἔσσεται ἡ ἡώς, ἡ δέλις, ἡ μέσον ἡμαρ: in Herod. ii. 2, τὴν ὄρην ἐπαγινέειν σφίσι αἰγας: and in such accusatives as ἡμαρ, νύκτα, ἀρχήν, τέλος, πυκνά, and the like. See also Matthæe, Gr. Gr. § 424, a) **I will come upon thee. Nevertheless** (notwithstanding this state of apathy even to spiritual death) **thou hast** (belonging to thee as members. Notice, as Bengel remarks, that these few had not separated themselves from the church in Sardis, notwithstanding its degraded state) **a few names** ("homines

nominatim recensiti," as Vatabl. in Düsterd. See reff. The gloss. interlin. is good: "quasi paucos nominatos, i. e., bonos qui nominatione digni sunt." The term would hardly be used except of a limited number. Hengstenb., with his usual fancifulness, in which he is here followed by Ebrard, finds an allusion in the εχεις ὀλίγα ὀνόματα to the ὄνομα εχεις ὅτι . . . above. It hardly needs remark, that the whole sense and connexion is different, the stress there on ὄνομα, here on εχεις. Besides which, in my judgment nothing can be further from the solemnity of the passage than the existence of such mere verbal allusions) **in Sardis, which** (the peculiar form ὀνόματα carries its own gender through the first part of the verse; in the latter part the thing signified prevails, and we have ἔξωι) **have not defiled their garments** (the aor. is from the standing-point of the future day presently introduced, as so commonly when life is looked back on from the great time of retribution. The meaning of the figure (which occurs also in Jude 23) has been variously given. There can be little doubt that the simpler and more general explanation is the right one: viz., who have not sullied the purity of their Christian life by falling into sin. So the gloss. interlin., Lyra, al. m. It seems unnecessary, and introducing confusion, to specify further: either the garments as importing their flesh (Areth., al.), their consciences (Alcas., Tirinus, Grot., Peiræus), the robe of Christ's righteousness put on by faith (Calov.), the robe of baptismal purity (Ansbert, Bede, Ribera, Corn.-a-lap., Hengst.), or again the keeping undefiled as consisting in abstinence from contact with the dead body of the rest of the church. This last view Ebrard attributes to Hengst., but it is not in his exposition here. He characteristically finds in ἐμόλυναν an allusion to Sardes = Sordes): **and**

ver 18. ch. vi. 11. vii. 9. xix. 14. Eccl. ix. 8. neut., John xx. 12 only. ellipse, ch. i. 13. x ch. ii. 7 reff y = Matt. vi. 29 al. fr. z ch. iv. 4 only. Deut. xxii. 12. (Matt. xi. 8.) see ch. vii. 9 reff. a Acts iii. 19. Col. ii. 14. ch. vi. 17. xxi. 4 only. Ps. l. 10. (xii. 8. xii. 8.) xx. (12) 15. (xxi. 27.) Phil. ii. 3. Dan. xii. 1. xi. 9 (14). e see Matt. x. 32. Luke xii. 8. g ch. ii. 7 reff. b Exod. xxxii. 32. Ps. lxxiii. 28. d = John xii. 42. Rom. x. 9, 10 Job f so Luke xv. 10. ch. xiv. 10. see Isa. lxx. 10. c ch.

5. ο νικων is in margin of 1. * οὕτως ACN¹ a h 2, 9. 10-7-8-9. 26-7. 33(-5, e sil)-7. 40-1-2-9. 51 vulg syr-dd copt arm Primas: οὕτω 13 B^r: οὕτως [P]^Nta B rel Andr Areth. for περιβαλεται, περιβαλλεται C: περιβαλλεται m: περιπατησθ 18. rec (for ομολογησω) εξομολογησμαι: txt AC[P]^N B rel Andr Areth.—(homœotel, αυτου 1st and 2nd, n 1. 27.) for 1st ενωπιον, εμπροσθεν N.

they shall walk with me in white (so, not filling up λευκοῖς, E. V. admirably. The supply, ἱματίοις, comes below, ver. 5: where see note. The white here is not to be identified with the undefiled garments which they now wear: it is a new and glorious hue of victory: see ch. vi. 11; vii. 9; xix. 8. The allusion which Schöttg., Vitringa, al., have imagined, to their priesthood,—because when a judgment was held by the Sanhedrim on the priests, those who were condemned were clothed in black, while the blameless wore a white robe—seems, like so many of these rabbinical illustrations, to be far-fetched, and to spoil the simplicity of the passage. An allusion to Zech. iii. 3 ff. is far more obvious. μετ' ἐμοῦ, in remarkable accord with our Lord's prayer in Jch. xvii. 24, πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ: see also Luke xxiii. 43) because they are worthy (the ἀξίότης here is found in the terms of the sentence itself. They h: v: kept their garments undefiled: they of all others then are the persons who should walk in the glorious white robes of heavenly triumph. Exactly thus in ch. xvi. 6, αἶμα . . . ἐξέχεαν, καὶ αἶμα αὐτοῖς ἔδωκε πικεῖν. ἀξιοὶ εἶσιν. To dream of any merit here implied, is not only to miss, but to run counter to the sense of the whole saying and situation. The οὐκ ἐνόμιζαν is only explained by ch. vii. 14, ἐπλυνον τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν καὶ ἐλεύκαναν ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου: and as Vitringa excellently says, "Dignitas hic notat proportionem et congruentiam, quæ erat inter statum gratiæ quo fuerant in terris, et gloriæ quam Dominus ipsis decreverat æstimandam ex ipsa lege gratiæ"). He that conquereth, he (the reading οὕτως, found in so many manuscripts, may have arisen originally in the very usual confusion of ο and ω, and then have been retained,

from not being altogether without meaning; "thus," i. e. as those first mentioned. But this would perhaps be ὁμοίως, not οὕτως) shall be clad in white garments (the concluding promise takes the hue of what had gone before, and identifies those just spoken of with these victorious ones): and I will not wipe out his name out of the book of life (this again takes its colour from the preceding. Those who have a name that they live, and are dead, are necessarily wiped out from the book of life: only he whose name is a living name, can remain on those pages. Here again the Rabbinical expositors have gone wrong in imagining that the genealogical tables of the priests are alluded to. Far rather is the reference to the ordinary lists of citizens, or of living members of any body or society, from which the dead are struck out. So Wetst., citing Dio Chrys. Rhod. xxxi. p. 386 c, ὅταν δημοσίᾳ τινὰ δὲ τῶν πολιτῶν ἀποθανεῖν ἐπ' ἀδικήματι, πρότερον τὸ βύβημα αὐτοῦ ἐξαλείφεται. And Aristoph. Pac. 1180, τοὺς μὲν ἐγγράφοντες ἡμῶν, τοὺς δ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω ἐξαλείφοντες δις ἢ τρίς. Thus they whose names have been once inscribed in this book, whether by their outward admission into Christ's church in baptism, or by their becoming living members of Him by faith, if they endure to the end as His soldiers and servants, and obtain the victory, shall not, as all His mere professed members shall, have their names erased from it. The figure itself, of the book of life, is found as early as Exod. xxxii. 32 f. See reff. for other places): and I will confess his name in the presence of my Father and in the presence of his angels (see Matt. x. 32; Luke xii. 8, both of which are here combined, cf. Luke ix. 26, || Mark. The promise implies that in the great day the Judge will expressly acknowledge the name thus written in the

7 Καὶ τῷ ἁγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Φιλαδελφείᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον ἡ John (22 times) only, exc. Luke xii. 11. 1 Thess. i. 9. Heb. vii. 2. ix. 24. x. 22. Isa. lxxv. 16. Isa. xxiii. 22.
 Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἡ ἀληθινός, ὁ ἰ ἅγιος, ὁ ἔχων τὴν ἰ κλεῖν
 [τοῦ] Δαυεῖδ, ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείσει, καὶ κλείει καὶ

i ch. [iv. 11] vi. 10.

j ch. i 18 reff.

7. ἐκκλησιαίς (but corrd) Ν'. rec o αγ. bef ἡ ἀληθ., with C[P] B rel vulg syr-dd :
 txt AN. om την Ν' (ius Ν^{3a}). rec (for κλειν) κλειδα, with f m n 1. 17. 36 (13-6,
 e sil) Orig., Andr Areth : txt AC[P]N B rel Orig., Epiph Andr-coisl. om του AC
 38 : ins [P]N B rel Orig., Andr Areth. for δαυεῖδ, αδου l¹ 16. 33. 45 copt mentd-
 by-Andr. for δ (bef ανοιγ.) και Ν : om 90. rec (for κλείσει) κλείει, with c 1.
 6. 11-2. 36. 49 (51, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas : κλειων n : txt AC[P]N B rel copt
 Orig., Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Hil. (but -ση 33 al.) aft κλείσει ins αυτην B rel :
 om AC[P]N c m n 6. 34-6-8. 40-7-9¹ (51, e sil). for και κλείει, κλείων A : claudūt
 vulg(pref. et fuld lips-4 al) Iren-int Hil : και κλειων [P]N m 1. 6. 11¹-2-3. 34-6-8.
 47²-9¹ Orig., Andr Primas : και ο κλειων n 40-7¹ : και κλείσει 35 : ei μη ο ανοιγων B rel :
 ei μη ο ανοιγων και κλειων l 16. 37. 45 : txt C c (51, e sil) vulg syr-dd Iren-int Promiss.

book of life, as belonging to one of His. Cf. ch. xx. 15; xxi. 27; also Matt. vii. 23 (xxv. 12), where He repudiates those whom He knows not). 6.] See above, ch. ii. 7.

7—13.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH AT PHILADELPHIA. It has been remarked, that this Epistle bears a tinge throughout of O. T. language and imagery, correspondent to the circumstances of the church as connected with the Jews dwelling there. For the history, &c., see Prolegomena. And to the angel of the church in Philadelphia write: These things saith the true One (it is doubtful whether the distinction between ἀληθινός and ἀληθής, which lies on the surface in ordinary usage, can be held firmly, on thorough examination of the places where the word occurs in the N. T. It is not easy for instance to justify the meaning "*genuine*," "*answering fully to its name*," in passages like John vii. 28: and more experience in the habit of later Greek to break down the distinctions of derivative nouns has shaken me in the assertion of this meaning wherever the word occurs. Here, it would certainly appear as if it were chosen to declare an attribute of our Lord opposed to the λεγόντ. και οὐκ εἰσιν ἀλλὰ ψεύδονται below. Not that the meaning *genuine* would be out of place in such a connexion: but that where ἀληθινός is used *absolutely*, of a person, the two meanings, *genuine* and *truthful*, running up into one head of *truth*, we must not in later diction press the one subordinate meaning as against the other. See for the distinction, which, however, is too exclusively pressed, Trench, N. T. Synonyms, § viii. The senses here to be avoided are,—δ ἀληθῶς ἅγιος, as Corn.-a-lap. and Grot., thus losing the word altogether;—*the real Messiah*, in reference to the rejection of Him by the Jews, as Hengst.

and Düsterd.; *He that bears the truth*, as the High-priest the Urim and Thummim, δῆλωσιν κ. ἀλήθειαν, LXX, Exod. xxviii. 26 (30); so Vitringa: "promissis suis stans," as Ewald and Zillig, the *Holy One* (as opposed to the συναγωγὴ τοῦ σατανᾶ below; not with reference to Christ's High-priesthood, as Vitr.: nor as Eichhorn and Heinr., "legatus divinus:" but expressive of moral attribute), *He that hath the key of David* (i. e. He that is the Heir and Lord of the abiding theocracy, as Düsterd. In Isa. xxii. 22, it is said of Eliakim son of Hilkiah, δώσω αὐτῷ τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυεῖδ ἐπὶ τῷ ὄμῳ αὐτοῦ, και ἀνοίξει και οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀποκλείων και κλείσει και οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀνοίγων: which is manifestly the passage here incorporated into the Lord's message: and the sense is, that whatever inferior degrees there may be of this power of opening and shutting the church (= the house of David, with reference to the false Jews below), the supreme power, the one true key, belongs to the Lord Christ alone. It is hardly justified, and serves but little purpose, to attempt to set up a distinction between τὴν κλεῖν τοῦ Δαυεῖδ here, and τὴν κλεῖδα οἴκου Δαυεῖδ in l. c. (so Hengst., Ebr., Düsterd.: see the idea well refuted in Vitringa.) The key is the same in both cases: but the One possesses it as his own by right, the other has it merely entrusted to him; laid on his shoulder. Some mistaken views have been: "potestatem aperiendi intellectum Scripturarum," Lyra, so also Primas., Bede, Zega, al.: that Δαυεῖδ should be Τάφει, or Τῶφει, and that our words mean the same as ch. i. 18, ἔχω τὰς κλεῖς τοῦ θανάτου και τοῦ ἔθου (Wolf). This idea is quite distinct from that, and is closely connected with ver. 8, where the reference is entirely to the Church of God and success in God's work. The same

k so Luke xii. 51. οὐδείς ἀνοίξει, ⁸ Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα· ἰδού ^k δέδωκα ἐνώ- ACPr. 13
 1 Acts xiv. 27. πῖόν σου ¹ θύραν ¹ ἀνεφωγμένην, ^m ἣν οὐδείς δύναται κλείσαι a lo n. 1.
 1 Cor. xvi. 9. ² αὐτήν· ὅτι μικρὰν ἔχεις δύναμιν, καὶ ⁿ ἐτήρησάς μου τὸν 2 4. 6. 9.
 Col. ii. 3. ¹ λόγον καὶ οὐκ ὁ ἡγήσω τὸ ὄνομά μου. ⁹ ἰδού ^p διδῶ 10-3. 16
 Isa. xiv. 1. ^m ⁿ ^q ^r ^s ^t ^u ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk}

^t ποιήσω αὐτοὺς ^t ἵνα ^u ἤξουσιν καὶ ^v προσκυνήσουσιν ^w ἐνώ- ^t John xi. 37.
 πιον τῶν ποδῶν σου, καὶ γνῶσιν ὅτι ἐγὼ ἠγάπησά σε. Col. iv. 16.
 10 ὅτι ἠέτηρησας τὸν ⁿ λόγον τῆς ^y ὑπομονῆς ^y μου, καὶ γὰρ ^u indic. fut.,
 σε ^z τηρήσω ^z ἐκ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ ^a πειρασμοῦ τῆς μελλούσης John xvii. 2.
 Gal. ii. 4.
 ch. vi. 4.
 vii. 3.
 viii. 3.
 xiii. 23.
 v. 18. Heb. x.
 2 Cor. i. 5.
 1 Pet. i. 6.

12. xiv. 13. xxii. 14. Exod. i. 11 A (not F). Winer, edn. 6, § 41. b. 1. b.
 w ch. xv. 4. Isa. lxvi. 23, x = ch. i. 4 reff. y so 2 Thess. iii. 5. 2 Cor. i. 5. Heb. x.
 36. see ch. i. 9. z John xvii. 15 only. see Prov. vii. 5. a = 1 Pet. i. 6 reff.

καὶ 1. 49. rec ἡξωσι, with B rel Andr Areth: ἡξω(sic) 1: txt AC[P]N b c n
 2. 10. 35-6. rec προσκυνήσωσι, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N b c 1. 2. 13.
 γνωση N f Primas: γνωπονται 15. 36 (49) vulg. om εἰω B rel Areth Primas:
 ins AC[P]N n 36 (1. 1. 16. 38. 49 Br, e sil).
 10. for οτι, καὶ A: καὶ οτι 38 arm. for τηρησω, εξαγαγον 36: om N.

will make them (this αὐτοὺς is put as the object of the preceding verb rather than as the subject of the following, as in οἰδαμεν τοῦτον, πόθεν ἐστίν, not by a mere attraction of grammar, as usually represented (even in Winer, edn. 6, § 66. 5, a), but in the strictest logical propriety, αὐτοὺς being the object on which the action indicated by the preceding verb is exercised) that they shall come (for ἵνα aft. ποι., and for the fut. indic. after ἵνα, see reff.), and shall worship before thy feet (so in Isa. lx. 14, "the sons also of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee: and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet: and they shall call thee the city of the Lord, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." See also Isa. xlix. 23; Zech. viii. 20—23. These passages are decisive against the sense given by Corn.-a-lap., "significatur summa fidelium devotio, reverentia et submissio erga ecclesiam ejusque praelatos. Hæc enim adoratio procedit ex apprehensione excellentiæ praelatorum plusquam humanæ et minus quam divinæ:" a sense unknown to Estius and the better R.-Cath. expositors. Areth. in the catena says well: τοῦτους οὖν προσδραμεῖσθαι οὐ κατὰ τὸ τυχερόν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς θερμότητος καὶ συντριβῆς φησί: τοῦτο γὰρ αἰνίττεται τὸ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας προσκυνήσαι, καὶ ἐν ἐσχάτοις ἐλέσθαι τετάχθαι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, μόνον τοῦ μέρους εἶναι τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀξιοθῆναι, ὡς καὶ Δαβὶδ ἀπασπῶς φησιν δ προφήτης, "ἐξελεξάμην παραρπίπτεισθαι ἐκ τῶ οἴκῳ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, μάλλον ἢ οἰκεῖν με ἐν σκηνάμασι τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν"), and that they may know that I loved thee (the English idiom requires, "have loved thee:" but the aor. has its propriety, referring as it does to the time preceding that in which they shall do this. Düsterd. takes it as used of that great proof which Christ gave of His love by dying for His church, appealing to the same aor. in Eph. v. 25; Gal. ii. 20; 1 John iv. 10, 11. But thus we lose the especial reference to the particular church which seems to be in-

volved in the recognition. It is the love bestowed on the Philadelphian church, in signaling its success in the work of Christ, that these converted enemies shall recognize. Lyra's explanation is curious and characteristic,—"quia ego dilexi te, promovendo non solum ad fidem catholicam, sed etiam ad episcopalem dignitatem"). Because thou didst keep the word of my endurance (the λόγος preached to thee, enjoining that ὑπομονή which belongs to Me and mine, see ch. i. 9. μου belongs to ὑπομονῆς alone, not to the whole τὸν λ. τῆς ὑπ. as Düsterd., Winer (edn. 6, § 34. 3, b), al. Such a construction would, I conceive, be indefensible: certainly all the places which are quoted as for it, are against it: viz. ch. xiii. 3; Col. i. 13; Heb. i. 3. Had it been so here, I should have expected τὸν λόγον μου τῆς ὑπομονῆς), I also (I on my side: the καὶ expressing reciprocity. And this reciprocity depends, in its form, on the close juxtaposition of the ὑπομονῆς μου and καὶ γὰρ, which is materially interfered with by referring μου to the whole sentence and resolving τῆς ὑπομονῆς into a mere epithet: see above) will keep thee (σε emphatic and prominent) from (ἐκ, from out of the midst of: but whether by immunity from, or by being brought safe through, the preposition does not clearly define. Nor can the distinction which Düsterd., al., attempt to set up between τηρεῖν ἐκ and τ. ἀπὸ, be safely maintained. In comparing John xvii. 15, οὐκ ἐρωτῶ ἵνα ἄρῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, ἀλλ' ἵνα τηρήσῃς αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ, with James i. 27, ἵσχυλον ἐαυτὸν τηρεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ κόσμου, it is not easy to see that the former implies passing scatheless through the evil, while the latter imports perfect immunity from it. This last we may grant: but is it not equally true in the other case? Rev. vii. 14, ἐρχ. ἐκ τῆς θλίψ., which they cite on their side, is quite different: the local meaning of ἐκ being made decisive by the local verb ἐρχεσθαι) the hour of temptation (the appointed season

b⁵⁰ Heb. vi. 7. b⁵ ἔρχεσθαι b⁶ ἐπὶ τῆς c¹ οἰκουμένης c² ὅλης d⁴ πειράσαι τοὺς AC P² B²
 c¹ Matt xxiv. 14 Acts xi. 28. (xix 27 xii 31.) ch. xii. 9. xvi. 14. Isa. xiv. 26. d^h ἔχεις, ἵνα μηδεὶς λάβῃ τὸν i¹ στέφανόν σου. 12 j^k ὁ νικῶν, i¹ ποιήσω k² αὐτὸν m³ στύλον ἐν τῷ n⁴ ναφ⁵ τοῦ o⁶ θεοῦ e¹ = ch. viii. 13. xi. 10 xiii 8. Acts xvii. 26. Lam. iv. 21. f¹ ch xxii 7, 12, 20 (ii. 5, 16) g¹ ch ii 13, &c. reff. h = 1 John i. 12 reff. i see ch. ii 10. j¹ ch. ii 7 reff. k¹ constr. ch ii 26 reff. l = Matt. m Gal ii 9. 1 Tim iii. 15 ch. x. 1 only. = 3 Kings vii. 41. n 1 Cor. iii. 16. 2 Cor. vi. 16. Jer. vii. 4. o ver. 2 reff.

11. rec ins ιδου bef ερχομαι, with n 36 æth Bede: om AC[P]B N rel am(with tol &c, agst demid fuld lipss) syr-dd copt gr-lat-ff.

12. for 1st αυτον, αυτω N¹ 47. om εν N¹. om ετι N. om ετ' αυτον C n:

of sore trial, τοῦ πειρασμοῦ, of the well-known and signal temptation. But the article cannot be expressed in English, because it would unavoidably become the antecedent to "which" following) which is about to come upon the whole world (the time imported is that prophesied of in Matt. xxiv. 21 ff., viz. the great time of trouble which shall be before the Lord's second coming. As such, it is immediately connected with ερχομαι ταχύ following), to try them that dwell upon the earth (see ch. viii. 13, &c., as in reff., where the expression applies to those who are not of the church of Christ. In this great trial, the servants of Christ shall be kept safe, ch. vii. 3. The trial of the πειρασμός will operate in two ways: on the faithful, by bringing out their fidelity; on the unfaithful and unbelieving, by hardening them in their impenitence, see ch. ix. 20, 21, xvi. 11, 21. The expositors have

in many cases gone away from this broad and obvious meaning here, and have sought to identify the βρα πειρασμοῦ with various periods of trial and persecution of the Church: a line of interpretation carrying its own refutation with it in the very terms used in the text. Thus Grot. understands it of the persecution under Nero; Lyra, of the future increase of that under Domitian, which was raging as the Apostle wrote: Alcas., Paræus, al., of those under Trajan: Primasius and Bede, of the troubles which should arise on account of Antichrist, which is nearer the mark. Andr. and Arethas give the alternative: ἢ τὸν ἐπὶ Δομετιανῷ διωγμὸν λέγει, δεύτερον ὄντα μετὰ Νέρωνα ὡς Εὐσέβιος ἱστορεῖ ὁ Παμφίλου, ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸς δ' εὐαγγελιστὴς εἰς τὴν Πάτμον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Δομετιανοῦ κατεκρίθη, ἢ τὴν ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τοῦ αἰῶνος ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου κατὰ χριστιανῶν ἐσομένην παγκόσμιον, ἀναιρόντος τοὺς χριστιανούς). 11.] I come quickly (these words, which in different senses and with varying references form the burden of this whole book, are here manifestly to

be taken as an encouragement and comfort to the Philadelphian church, arising from the nearness of the Lord's coming to reward her; cf. τὸν στέφανόν σου below): hold fast that which thou hast (δ ἔχεις, in the language of these Epistles, imports any advantage, or progress in grace, already possessed; cf. ch. ii. 6, τοῦτο ἔχεις, &c. . . This is regarded as a treasure, to be firmly grasped, as against those who are ever ready to snatch it away. In this case the δ ἔχεις was a rich treasure indeed: cf. vv. 8, 10), that no one take (snatch away: but here the figure stops: it is not for himself that the robber would snatch it, but merely to deprive the possessor. So λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ch. vi. 4. The idea of the robber taking it for himself must, as De W. remarks, have been expressed by μηδὲς ἄλλος thy crown (ref.).

12.] The reward of the conqueror. He that conquereth (for the pendent nom., see ref.), I will make him a pillar in the temple of my God (i. e. he shall have a fixed and important place in the glorified church hereafter. That this, and nothing referring to any honour or dignity in the church militant (so Lyra, Aretius, Grot., Wetst., Schöttg., al.), or in that as leading on to the church triumphant (so Vitruv., Corn.-a-lap., Stern, al.) is intended, is manifest from the whole diction of this passage, as well as from comparing the corresponding promises, which all refer to the blessings of the future state of glory. It is no objection to this view, that in the heavenly Jerusalem there is no temple, ch. xxi. 22: but rather a corroboration of it. That glorious city is all temple, and Christ's victorious ones are its living stones and pillars. Thus as Dusterd. well remarks, the imagery of the church militant, 1 Cor. iii. 16 ff.; Eph. ii. 19 ff.; 1 Pet. ii. 5 ff., is transferred to the church triumphant, but with this difference, that the saints are no longer the stones merely, but now the pillars themselves, standing in their immovable firmness. On θεοῦ

ὄνομα τοῦ ὁ θεοῦ ὁ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ ὁ θεοῦ ὁ μου τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὁ θεοῦ ὁ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου τὸ καινόν. ¹³ ὁ ἔχων οὖς ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις.

¹⁴ Καὶ τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς ἐν Λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλησίας γράψον Τάδε λέγει ὁ ἀμήν, ὁ μάρτυς ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός,

ἐπ' αὐτῷ 36. om from 1st to 2nd *ονομα* B. om from 2nd to 3rd *μου* 1. elz καταβαινει, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC P(-βενν-) N¹ n 1. 12. 51: της καταβαινουσης N^{3a}. om last *μου* B rel Andr(-a and -coisl-comm) Areth: ins AC[P] N 10-7-8. 34-5-6 (h m n 1. 13. 37. 49 B^r, e sil).

13. ὁ is written above the line by N¹.

14. rec (for ἐν λαοδικείᾳ ἐκκλ.) ἐκκλ. λαοδικεων, with 1: txt AC[P] N B rel vulg syr-dd copt gr-lat-fl.—om ἐκκλ. g. aft *αμην* ins και N¹(N^{3a} disapproving). for 2nd και, ὁ f l n 16. 45 syr-dd Andr-a: και ο CN 2. aft αληθ. ins και N.

μου, see note on ch. ii. 7), and out of it he shall never more go out (the subject is not the στέλος, but ὁ νικῶν; and the sense, that he who is thus fixed in his eternal place as a pillar in the heavenly temple, will never more, from any cause, depart from it. Those Commentators who have understood the promise of the church militant, have been obliged to take ἐξέλθῃ as a passive, "non ejicietur," justifying this by such expressions as μήτις ὁ λύχνος ἐρχεται Mark iv. 21. Lyra takes it in both senses—"nec per apostasin, nec per excommunicationem." And thus, except that the latter word will have no place, we may well understand the general word ἐξέλθῃ: none shall thrust him out, nor shall he be any more in danger of falling, and thus thrusting himself out. It is well worth noticing, as Wetst. has done, the recorded fact, that Philadelphia was notorious for calamities by earthquake. The language in which Strabo describes this is remarkable in connexion with this promise of the pillar which should not be moved; ἡ τε Φιλαδέλφεια . . . οὐδὲ τοὺς τοίχους ἔχει πιστούς, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἡμέραν τρόπον τινα σαλεύονται καὶ δίστανται διατελοῦσι δὲ προσέχοντες τῆς γῆς τοῖς πάθεσι, καὶ ἀρχιτεκτονοῦντες πρὸς αὐτήν, xii. p. 868 B: and still more so in xiii. p. 936 B, —πόλις Φιλαδέλφεια σεισμῶν πληρής. οὐ γὰρ διαλείπουσιν οἱ τοῖχοι διστάμενοι, καὶ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλο μέρος τῆς πόλεως καταπαθεῖν οἰκοῦσιν οὖν ὀλίγοι τὴν πόλιν διὰ τοῦτο . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ὀλίγων θαυμάζειν ἐστὶν ὅτι οὕτω φιλοχοροῦσιν ἐπισφαλεῖς τὰς οἰκήσεις ἔχοντες: ἔτι δ' ἂν τις μᾶλλον θαυμάσειε τῶν κτισάντων αὐτήν. See also Tacit. Ann. ii. 47, where among the twelve cities of proconsular Asia which were overthrown by an earthquake, Philadelphia suffered, and was in conse-

quence excused its taxes, and in common with the others entrusted to a senatorian commissioner to repair): and I will write upon him (the conqueror; not as Grot., the pillar) the name of my God (Wetst. quotes from the Rabbinical book Bava Bathra 75. 2, "R. Samuel filius Nachmanni ait, R. Jochananem dixisse, tres appellari nomine Dei S. B.,—justos (Is. xliii. 7), Messiam (Jer. xxiii. 6), Hierosolyma (Ezek. xlviii. 35).") Some think of the mitre forefront of the high-priests, on which was inscribed "Holiness to the Lord," Exod. xxviii. 36: so Schöttg., Ewald, al. But this does not seem applicable here, where, from this and the following particulars, it is rather a blessed belonging to God and the holy city and Christ, that is imported, than the priestly office of the glorified Christian) and the name of the city of my God, the new Jerusalem, which descendeth (the appositive nom., see reff.) out of heaven from my God (on the whole, see ch. xxi. 2, 3, and notes. It is possible, that the name Jehovah Shammah, Ezek. xlviii. 35, may be meant; but hardly probable, seeing that the Holy Name itself has before been mentioned as inscribed on him. The inscription of the name of the city would betoken citizenship), and mine own new name (not the name mentioned ch. xix. 16, which is known and patent, but that indicated ch. xix. 12, ὁ οὐδὲς οἶδεν εἰ μὴ αὐτός: for this is clearly pointed at by the word καινόν. By the inscription of this new name of the glorified Saviour is declared, that he belongs to Him in His new and glorious state of eternal rest and triumph).

13.] See above, ch. ii. 7.

14—22.] THE EPISTLE TO THE CHURCH IN LAODICEA. And to the angel (the bishop or ruler, see on ch. i. 20) of the

x = Col. i. 18.

y = Rom. viii.

19, &c. Col.

i. 15 Judith

xvi. 14.

only + Lev. vi. 21 Aq.

cxviii. 5 only.

ή x ἀρχή τῆς y κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ, ¹⁵ Οἶδά σου τὰ ἔργα, ^{ACPN} ^{a lo n, 1.}
 ὅτι οὔτε ^z ψυχρὸς εἰ οὔτε ^a ζεστός. ^b ὄφελον ^z ψυχρὸς ἦς

z here 3cc, Matt. x. 42 only. Prov. xxv. 25. Sir. xliii. 20 only.

b 1 Cor. iv. 8.

2 Cor. xi. 1. Gal. v. 12 only.

4 Kings v. 3. Job xiv. 13. Ps.

a here (3cc)

to 19 26-

7. 30. 32

to 38.

40 to 42.

47 to 51.

90 Br.

for κτίσεως, ἐκκλησίας N¹: πιστεως b.15. om ει N¹.

om from ζεστος to ζεστος A 1. 47.

rec (for ἦς) ειης, with

k(e sil) 30-corr: txt C[P]N B rel Andr Areth. (εις B 16. 32.)

church in Laodicea write: These things saith the Amen (see ref. Isa. Christ is the Amen, inasmuch as His words shall never pass away, but shall find certain ratification. This, and not the particular case which is treated in ref. 2 Cor., seems to be the reference here, where not the ratification of promises merely, but general fidelity and certainty are concerned: as Areth., in Catena, ἰσοδυναμεῖ τοῦτο, τὰδε λέγει ὁ ἀληθινός . . . ἀμὴν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ναί· ναὶ οὖν ἐστὶν ἐν παντί τοῖς περὶ αὐτοῦ λεγομένοις, ἥτοι ἀληθεῖα καὶ οὐδὲν ψεύδος. That expression is illustrative of this, but this takes the wider range. Züllig has imagined that the title here owes its occurrence to this being the last among the Seven Epistles: but this probably is mere fancy), the faithful and true (on ἀληθινός, see above, ver. 7) witness (there does not seem in this title to be any allusion to the prophecies which are about to follow in ch. iv. ff. as some (Grot., De Wette) have imagined. Far rather does it substantiate the witness borne in the Epistle itself, as we have seen in the case of the other introductions. See a lengthened notice of the title in Trench, p. 181 f.), the beginning of the creation of God (= πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως, ref. Col., where see note, as also Bleek on the Hebrews, vol. ii. 1, p. 43 note. In Him the whole creation of God is begun and conditioned: He is its source and primary fountain-head. The mere word ἀρχή would admit the meaning that Christ is the first created being: see Gen. xlix. 3; Deut. xxi. 17; and Prov. viii. 22. And so the Arians here take it, and some who have followed them: e.g. Castalio, "chef d'œuvre;" "omnium Dei operum excellentissimum atque primum:" and so Ewald and Züllig. But every consideration of the requirements of the context, and of the Person of Christ as set forth to us in this book, is against any such view. Others, as Calov., Bengel, Whitby, al., make ἀρχή = ἔρχων, which is impossible: as it is also to interpret κτίσεως of the new spiritual creation, the church, as Ribera, Corn.-a-lap., Grot., Westt., al. There can be little doubt that ἀρχή is to be taken in that pregnant sense in which we have it, e.g., in Wisd.

xii. 16, ἡ γὰρ ἰσχὺς σου δικαιοσύνης ἀρχή, —ib. xiv. 27, ἡ γὰρ τῶν . . . εἰδῶλων θρησκεία παντὸς ἀρχή κακοῦ καὶ αἰτία καὶ πέρας ἐστίν: and in the Gospel of Nicodemus, p. ii. cap. vii. Tischdf. Ev. Apoc. p. 307, where Satan is said to be ἀρχή τοῦ θανάτου καὶ βίζα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, viz. the incipient cause. So Andr., Areth. in Catena (ἡ προκαταρκτικὴ αἰτία τῆς κτίσεως), Lyra, Vitr., Wolf, Stern, Hengst., De Wette, Ebrard, Dusterd., al. The latter asks the questions, "How could Christ write if it were only this present Epistle, if he were himself a creature? How could every creature in heaven and earth adore him, if he were one of themselves (cf. ch. xix. 10)? We need only think of the appellation of our Lord as the A and Ω (ch. xxii. 13: cf. i. 8) in its necessary fullness of import, and we shall see that in the A lies the necessity of his being the ἀρχή of the Creation, as in the Ω that of his coming to bring the visible creation to an end"): I know thy works, that (see above, ver. 1, where the construction is the same: I have thy whole course of life before me, and its testimony is, that . . .) thou art neither cold nor hot (the peculiar use of the similitude of physical cold and heat here, makes it necessary to interpret the former of the two somewhat differently to its common acceptation: so that while ζεστός, from ζέω (cf. τῷ πνεύματι ζέοντες, Rom. xii. 11), keeps its meaning of fervent, warm, and earnest in the life of faith and love, ψυχρός cannot here mean "dead and cold," as we say of the listless and careless professor of religion: for this is just what these Laodiceans were, and what is expressed by χλιαρός below. So that we must, so to speak, go farther into coldness for ψυχρός, and take it as meaning, not only entirely without the spark of spiritual life, but also and chiefly, by consequence, openly belonging to the world without, and having no part nor lot in Christ's church, and actively opposed to it. This, as well as the opposite state of spiritual fervour, would be an intelligible and plainly-marked condition: at all events, free from that danger of mixed motive and disregarded principle which belongs to the lukewarm state inasmuch

ἡ ^a ζεστός. 16 ^c οὕτως ὅτι ^d χλιαρὸς εἶ καὶ οὔτε ^a ζεστός ^c = Rom. i. 15.
 οὔτε ^z ψυχρός, ^c μέλλω σε ^f ἐμέσαι ἐκ τοῦ στόματός-μου. ^e = & v. inf.
 17 ὅτι λέγεις [ὅτι] πλούσιός εἰμι, καὶ ^g πεπλούτηκα, καὶ ^e = Rom. i. 15.
 οὐδὲν ^h χρεῖαν ^h ἔχω, καὶ οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι σὺ εἶ ⁱ ὁ ^k ταλαί- ^f here only.
 ὄν. ^g = Luke xii. 21. 1 Cor. iv. 8. 2 Cor. viii. 9. Hos. xii. 8. ^h constr., here only. ⁱ = Luke vi. 24. xi. 46. xviii. 13. ^k Rom. vii. 24 only. ^{Isa.}

^g = Luke xii. 21. 1 Cor. iv. 8. 2 Cor. viii. 9. Hos. xii. 8.
^{Matt} vi. 8. al. fr. ⁱ = Luke vi. 24. xi. 46. xviii. 13.
^{xxxiii.} 1. (-ρίε, James v. 1. -ρεύ, James iv. 8.)

^h constr., here only. ⁱ = Luke vi. 24. xi. 46. xviii. 13.
^k Rom. vii. 24 only. ^{Isa.}

16. ^{στι} bef ^{οὕτως} **N**: om ^{οὕτως} 36. ^{χλιαρος} **N**¹. for 1st ^{οὐτε}, ^{ου} a to m,
 2. 4. 9. 13-6-7-8. 32-4-7. 41-2-8-9. 50. 90 B¹. ^{rec} ^{οὐτε} ^{ψυχρος} ^{οὐτε} ^{ζεστος}, with
 A[P¹] 17-8 (19, e sil) vulg: txt **CN** B rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Salv.—om all
 between ^{ει} and ^{μελλω} 10 harl¹ spec æth Primas.—^{ζεστος} (but ^ρ erased) **N**. aft
^{ψυχρος} ins ei **N**¹(**N**^{3a} or c disapproving and inserting ^{ει} after ^{ζεστος}).—**N**¹ proceeds ^{παυσε}
 (= ^{παυσαι}) του, for which **N**³ has ^{μελλω} ^{σε} ^{ειν} ^{εκ} ^{του}. for ^{μου}, ^{σου} **N**².
 17. om 2nd ^{στι} [P]**N** B rel spec Andr Cyp^r: ins AC c g m n 17¹. 34 (1. 6. 32-8. 40-8,
 e sil) vulg Andr-coisl Areth Oros Bede. ^{rec} ^{οὐδενος}, with [P]**N** B rel Andr
 Areth: txt AC 12. ^{στι} ^{ταλαιπωρος} ^{ει}(omg ^{συ} and o) **N**¹: om o 36: om ei k.

as a man in earnest, be he right or wrong, is ever a better man than one professing what he does not feel. This necessity of interpretation here has been much and properly pressed by some of the later Commentators (De Wette, and more clearly still, Düsterd.), but was by the older ones very generally missed, and the coldness interpreted of the mere negative absence of spiritual life. So Andr., Areth. in Catena, *ψυχρός, ὁ ἐστερημένος τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐνεργείας καὶ ἐπιφουήσεως*: Grot., “qui nullam habet evangelii notitiam ac proinde nec ullos motus christianos:” so Bengel, Ebrard, and many others. There have been some singular interpretations, e.g. that of Lyra, “*frigidus*, devitans transgressiones pœnæ timore:” of Ansbart, “quia nimirum ille eos glaciali quodammodo more constringit, qui dixit, ‘Sedebo in monte testamenti, in lateribus aquilonis.’ Aquilo itaque valde frigidissimus ventus,” &c.: of Hengstenberg, who regards both hot and cold as spoken of Christ’s servants in relation to Christ, and cold as equivalent to poor in spirit, conscious of one’s own coldness and desire for warmth. Any thing more opposed to the context cannot be imagined): would that (reff., for both indic. and opt. usages) thou wert cold or hot: so (see ref. It expresses the actual relation of facts to the wish just expressed, as not fulfilling it: = “quod cum non ita fiat”) because thou art lukewarm (τοῦ μηδέπω θερμαίνοντος, ὁ χλιαρὸν καλεῖται, Galen. It is one of the many derivatives from χλιω, to melt), and neither hot nor cold, I shall soon spue thee out of my mouth (τῇ μεταφορᾷ τοῦ χλιαροῦ δεόντως ἐχρήσατο, ὁ καὶ ἱατρῶν παῖδες πλάδον ἐργαζόμενον εἰς ξημετον ἐρεβίξιν παραλαμβάνουσιν. Areth. in Catena. The μέλλω

is a mild expression, carrying with it a possibility of the determination being changed, dependently on a change in the state of the church). 17, 18.] In these verses, the *χλιαρότης* is further expanded, as inducing miserable unconsciousness of defect and need, and empty self-sufficiency. And the charge comes in the form of solemn and affectionate counsel. Because (this *ὅτι* forms the reason of *συμβουλεύω* below: = *seeing that* . . . Cf. a similar construction in ch. xviii. 7, 8) thou sayest [that] I am rich, and am become wealthy, and have need in nothing (the three expressions form a climax: the first giving the fact of being rich, the second the process of having become so (in which there is not merely outward fact, but some self-laudation: cf. ref. Hosea), the third the result, self-sufficiency. From the whole context it is evident that not outward worldly wealth, but imagined spiritual riches, are in question. The former is held to be meant by Andr., Areth., Aretius, Corn.-a-lap., Bengel, Ewald, Züllig, al., the latter by Bede, Lyra, Ribera, Alcas., Grot., Calov., Vitranga, Eich., De W., Hengst., Ebrard, Düsterd., Trench. Stern thinks the wealth is partly worldly (Cicero, Epist. ad div. ii. 17, iii. 5; Strabo xii. 16: see on the wealth of Laodicea the Prolegg.), and partly spiritual. But thus the correspondence in our sentence would be confused. Stern is doubtless so far right, that the imagined spiritual self-sufficiency was the natural growth of an outwardly prosperous condition: but the great self-deceit of which the Lord here complains was not concerning worldly wealth, which was a patent fact, but concerning spiritual, which was a baseless fiction), and knowest not that thou (σύ, emphatic; “thou, of all others:” corresponding to the use of the

11 Cor. xv. 19

only†.

m = Matt.

xxiii. 16, &c.

John ix. 40.

41. Isa. xlii.

18.

n = & constr. dat., John xxi. 14 only.

15 ref.

Exod. xviii. 19.

Acts ix. 23.

23. dat. & inf.

1 Macc. ix. 69.

o ch 1.

p = John xiii. 4.

Rom. xiii. 11.

ch. vii. 14.

q ver. 5.

g ver. 5.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

o ch 1.

παυρος καὶ [ὁ] ἑλαινὸς καὶ πτωχὸς καὶ τυφλὸς καὶ γυμ-
νός, ¹⁸ συμβουλευέω σοι ἀγοράσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ χρυσίον ὁ πε-
πυρωμένον ἐκ πυρός, ἵνα ᾖ πλουτήσης, καὶ ἱμάτια λευκά,
n = & constr. dat., John xxi. 14 only. Exod. xviii. 19. inf. Acts ix. 23. dat. & inf. 1 Macc. ix. 69. o ch 1.
15 ref. p = John xiii. 4. Rom. xiii. 11. ch. vii. 14. q ver. 5.

rec om 2nd ὁ, with C[P]N f g h n 1. 17. 36 (13. 30-2. 47. 90, e sil) Andr-a: ins A B rel
Andr-coisl Areth.—om κ. ο. ελ. Andr-p.
rec ελεεινος, with [P] B rel: txt ACN 1.

18. χρυσίον bef παρ' ἐμου B rel copt Areth: om π. e. c j m 34-5 Andr-coisl: txt
AC[P]N n 1. 17-8. 36 (16. 49, e sil). εκ πυρας B: om 16.

article below) art the wretched and [the] pitiable one (ὁ, as distinguished above others as De W., al., “the well-known”), as the person to whom above all others the epithets belong. And these epithets are especially opposed to οὐδὲν χρεῖαν ἔχω, and poor and blind and naked (are these adjectives all subordinate to ὁ preceding, or are they new predicates dependent on εἶ? Better the latter, if only for the reason that the counsel which follows takes up these three points in order, thereby bringing them out as distinct from and not subordinate to the two preceding), I advise thee (there is a deep irony in this word. One who *has need of nothing*, yet needs counsel on the vital points of self-preservation) to buy (at the cost only of thy good self-opinion. That a πτωχὸς should be advised to buy gold and raiment, and ointment, might of itself shew what kind of buying is meant, even if Isa. lv. 1, ἀγοράσατε . . . ἀνευ ἀργυρίου κ. τιμῆς, had not clearly defined it. Yet notwithstanding such clear warning not to go wrong, the Roman-Catholic expositors have here again handled the word of God deceitfully, and explained, as Lyræ, “*Emere*, operibus bonis.” Corn-a-lap, “verbum ergo emendi significat, quod multa debet homo facere, et multa conferre, ut idoneus sit a Deo accipere ista dona.” Bede and Ribera, somewhat better, “derelectis omnibus,” Bede: “etiam cum voluptatum dispendio,” Rib. (which however is travelling out of the context, making the wealth to be earthly riches): Estius, better still, but curiously characteristic, “*Emere* significat aliquod studium præcedens, quo ambiat charitatem (his interpretation of χρυσίον πεπυρ.) : quod tamen etiam ex Deo est. Unde statui potest meritum congruum, respectu justificationis.” Farber. — again Ansbert, though missing the point of ἀγοράσαι: “Numquid is qui miser et miserabilis et pauper et cæcus et nudus redarguitur, aliquod boni habet, quod pro tanto bono largitori suo tribuat, nisi forte prius ab ipso accipiat quod pro accipiendis aliis illi tribuat? Sic certe invenit quod det, qui nisi desuper accepit, non habet

quod det.” Augustine seems to be on the right track for the meaning of ἀγοράσαι when he says, “contende ut pro nomine Christi aliquid patiaris.” The term continues the irony. “All this lofty self-sufficiency must be expended in the labour of getting from Me these absolute necessities.” So most of the later expositors. So even the R.-Cath. Stern, but disguising the truth under an appearance of a ‘quid pro quo,’ “*Welches ist der Kaufpreis? Hat nicht der Herr selbst gesagt, daß sie arm seien und elend, naß und jämmerlich? Ihr Herz sollen sie Christo hingeben, ihr Fühlen, Denken, Wollen, und thatkräftiges Handeln; sich selbst ganz und gar dem Herrn zur Leibeigenschaft opfern, Matt. xiii. 45, 46*”) from me (who am the source of all true spiritual wealth, Eph. iii. 8) gold (fresh) burnt from the fire (the ἐκ gives the sense of being just fresh from the burning or smelting, and thus not only tried by the process, but bright and new from the furnace. This is better than, with many Commentators, to make the ἐκ almost = ὑπό, signifying the source from which the πίσωσις comes, as ch. viii. 11. In the interpretation, this gold represents all spiritual πλοῦτος, in its sterling reality, as contrasted with that merely imaginary sort on which the Laodiceans prided themselves. It is narrowing it too much to interpret it as *caritas* (cf. Estius above), or *fides*, as Aret., Vitringa, Hengstb., al., or indeed any one spiritual grace, as distinguished from the sum total of them all, that thou mayest be (aor., literally, mayest have become, viz., by the purchase) rich: and white garments (Düsterd. rightly remarks that the white garments are distinct from the gold only in constituting a different image in the form of expression, not really in the thing signified. On the meaning, see ver. 4, ch. vii. 14, xix. 8. The lack of righteousness, which can be only bought from Christ, and that at the price of all fancied righteousness of our own, is just as much a πτωχεία as the other), that thou mayest be clothed, and that the shame of thy

ἵνα ^a περιβάλῃ, καὶ μὴ ^r φανερωθῇ ἡ ^s αἰσχύνῃ τῆς ^t γυμ-
νότητός σου, καὶ ^u κολλύριον ^v ἐγχεῖν τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς
σου, ἵνα βλέπῃς. ¹⁹ ἐγὼ ^w ὅσους ^x ἐὰν φιλῶ ^y ἐλέγχω καὶ

^y παιδεύω. ^z ζήλευε οὖν καὶ μετανόησον. ²⁰ ἰδοὺ ἔστηκα

^a ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν καὶ ^b κρούω· ἐάν τις ἀκούσῃ τῆς φωνῆς

...καὶ
μετὰ C.
APN B a
40 n. 1.
2 4 6 9.
10-3. 16
to 19 28-
7. 30. 32
to 38.
40 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B^r.

t = here (Rom viii. 35. 2 Cor. xi. 27) only. Deut. xxviii. 48. u here only. 3 Kings xiv. 3 Ald. (-ρις A, B def) only. (-ρις, -ριζεν, 2 Kings xiii. 6.) v here only. Jer. iv. 30. Tobit vi. 8 xi. 8 (AB, not N) only. double acc., Heb. i. 9. w ch. xiii. 15. Matt. xviii. 18. xxi. 22. xxii. 9. Mark iii. 28 al. x = Heb xii. 5, from Prov. iii. 11, 12. y = Luke xxiii. 16, 22. 2 Chron. x. 11. Ps. cxviii. 18. Prov. xix. 18. z here only. b Luke xiii. 25. Acts xii. 13 al. Cant. as above.

περιβαλλῇ B f m n 37.

[ασχημοσύνη P 1]

rec κολλυριον, with A[P] g k

1. 10-7. 30-6. 49 (a h 51 B^r Beh's 4-mss, e sil) Andr-a: txt CN B rel Andr Areth. (κολυρ. B e n.)

rec εγχερισον, with [P] h 1. 10-7 (49 B^r, e sil): ινα εγχερισης 2.

4. 19. 26: ινα εγχεριση B rel: εγχεριση 37-8. 42: ινα εγχερισαι 36. 45: txt ACN(εγχερ.) l n 16-8 Andr-a. (d illeg.)

19. for εαν, αν N 36.

rec (for ζηλευε) ζηλωσον, with [P] N l n 1. 10-7. 36 (d h

16. 37-8. 49, e sil) Andr: ζηλου c 6: ζητησον B^r: txt AC B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

nakedness be not made manifest (the choice of the word *φανερωθῇ* seems as if some particular time were in view when such manifestation would take place. If we are to assign one, it will naturally be that of the Lord's coming, when *τοὺς πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ χριστοῦ*, 2 Cor. v. 10: when the Lord of the Church will come to see his guests, and all not clad in the wedding robe will be cast out, Matt. xxii. 11 ff.), and *collyrium* (the use of which is apparent from what follows. The *κολλύριον* was so called from its shape, being a stick or roll of ointment for the eyes, in the shape of a bread-cake, *κόλλυρα* or *-ρις*, 2 Kings vi. 19, LXX) to anoint (from reff. Tobit, *ἐγχεῖν* appears to have been the common technical word for anointing the eyes) thine eyes, that thou mayest see (in the spiritual interpretation, this *collyrium* will import the anointing of the Holy Spirit, which, like the gold of His unsearchable riches, and the white garment of His righteousness, is to be obtained from him, John xvi. 7 (*πέμφω αὐτὸν* . . .), 14 (*ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται* . . .); Acts ii. 33 (*ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο*), and also at the price of the surrender of our own fancied wisdom. The analogy of 1 John ii. 20, 27 is not to be overlooked: see notes at those places).

19.] Importing that these rich proofs of Christ's love are only to be sought by such as the Laodiceans in the way of rebuke and chastisement: and reciprocally, as tending not to despair, but to encouragement, that rebuke and chastisement are no signs of rejection from Christ, but of His abiding and pleading love, even to the lukewarm and careless. I (emphatically prefixed: I, for my part: it is one of My ways, which are unlike men's ways)—as many as (*ἐάν* = *ἂν*, the

common particle after the relative: see reff.) I love (not as Grot., "non absolute sed comparate, i. e. quos non plane ob diuturna peccata abjicere et objurare constitui:" but in its fullest and most blessed sense. Nor is the assertion addressed, as Vitruvius, only "ad meliorem ecclesiæ partem," but to all, as a gracious call to repentance; as is evident from the words next following), I rebuke and chasten (*ἐλέγχω*, the convincing of sin, producing conviction, is a portion of *παιδεύειν*, the Lord's chastening: the latter may extend very much wider than the former, even to judgments and personal infliction, which, however they may subserve the purpose of *ἐλέγχω*, are not, properly speaking, part of it. "Redargutio sane ad verba, castigatio vero pertinet ad flagella," Ansbart); be zealous then (*ζήλευε*, pres., of a habit of Christian life), and repent (begin that life of zeal by an act, decisive and effective (aor.), of change of purpose. There is not in the words any *ὕστερον πρότερον*, as De Wette, but the logical connexion is made plain by the tenses. Düstér. (following Grot., Beng., Hengstb., Ebrard) is clearly wrong in saying that "the Lord requires of the church a burning zeal, kindled by the love shewn by Him (but where is this in the context?), and as the practical putting forth of this zeal, true change of purpose." This goes directly against both the grammatical propriety and the facts of the case, in which change of purpose must precede *zeal*, which is the effectual working in a man's life of that change of purpose).

20.] Behold, I stand at the door (the construction with the prep. of motion after *ἔστηκα*, is perhaps owing to the idea of motion conveyed in the verb,—"I have placed myself." See reff., especially reff. Luke) and knock (the re-

= John iii. 21 al. (Jer. xl. [xxxiii.] 6 only.) s = here (Luke xiv. 5. 2 Cor. iv. 19. Phil. iii. 12. Heb. xii. 2. Jude 13) only. Ezek. xlii. 20.

e see John xiv.
23.
d Luke xvii. 8.
xxii. 20.
1 Cor. xi. 25
only. Prov.
xxiii. 1.
Tobit viii. 1
(not N), only.
e constr., ch. ii.
26. ver. 12.

μου καὶ ἀνοίξῃ τὴν θύραν, [καὶ] ° εἰσελεύσομαι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἈΡΣ πα
καὶ ὁ δειπνήσω μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς μετ' ἐμοῦ. 21 ° ὁ
νικῶν, ὁ δώσω αὐτῷ ° καθίσαι μετ' ἐμοῦ ° ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ μου,
ὡς καὶ γὰρ ἐνίκησα καὶ ° ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ° ἐν
f = & constr., ch. ii. 7 reff. g constr., here only, (Eph. i. 20 al.)

20. ανοίξω(sic) N. ins και bef εἰσελευσομαι N B rel Andr-coisl: om A[P] l n 1.
2. 30-6 (4. 13-6-8-9. 37-8, e sil) vss Orig Mac Epiph Andr Areth.

ference to Cant. v. 2 is too plain to be for a moment doubted: and if so, the interpretation must be grounded in that conjugal relation between Christ and the church,—Christ and the soul,—of which that mysterious book is expressive. This being granted, we may well say, that the vivid depiction of Christ *standing at the door* is introduced, to bring home to the lukewarm and careless church the truth of His constant presence, which she was so deeply forgetting. His *knocking* was taking place partly by the utterance of these very rebukes (ἐλέγχω), partly by every interference in judgment and in mercy. Whenever His hand is heard, He is knocking at the door. But it is not His hand only that may be heard: see below): if any man hear my voice (here we have more than the mere sound of his knock: He speaks. See Acts xii. 13 f. κρούσαντος δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου τὴν θύραν . . . ἐπιγνοῦσα τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ Πέτρου. In that case we must conceive Rhoda to have asked “who is there?” and Peter to have answered. It may not be unrestrictive to fill up this connexion in a similar manner. “It is I,” is an answer the soul may often hear, if it will enquire the reason of an unexpected knock at the door of its slumbers; or we may compare Cant. v. 2, φωνὴ ἀδελφίδος μου κρούει ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν, Ἀνοίξον μοι, and open the door (ἀκούσῃ, ἀνοίξῃ, aorists, because prior in time to the futures which follow: “shall have heard,” “shall have opened:” but it would be pedantry thus to render them in our language. On the sense, cf. Cant. v. 6.

Our verse is a striking and decisive testimony to the practical freedom of our will to receive or reject the heavenly Guest: without the recognition of which, the love and tenderness of the saying become a hideous mockery.

We then open the door to Christ, when we admit Him, His voice, His commands, His example, to a share in our inner counsels and sources of action. To say that this can be done *without* His grace, is ignorance: to say it is done only by that grace irresistibly exerted, is far worse—it is, to deprive His gracious pleadings of all meaning, [and] (this καὶ is superfluous in the

sense, merely expressing the sequence: and may on that account have been omitted) I will enter in to him, and I will sup with him, and he with me (the imagery is taken from the usages of intimate hospitality. But whereas in these it would be merely the guest who would sup with the host who lets him in, here the guest becomes himself the host, because He is the bread of life, and the Giver of the great feast of fat things and of the great marriage supper (Matt. viii. 11, xxv. 1 ff; ch. xix. 7, 9). St. John is especially fond of reporting these sayings of reciprocity which our Lord uttered: cf. John vi. 56 (x. 38), xiv. 20, xv. 4, 5, xvii. 21, 26. This blessed admission of Christ into our hearts will lead to His becoming our guest, ever present with us, and sharing in all our blessings—and, which is even more, to our being ever in close union with Him, partaking ever of His fulness, until we sit down at His table in his Kingdom).

21.] He that conquereth (see above, ch. ii. 26, and ver. 12, for the construction), I will give to him to sit (in the blessed life of glory hereafter: such promises cannot be regarded, as this by some, as partially fulfilled in this life: for thus the following analogy, ὡς καὶ γὰρ κ.τ.λ., would fail. The final and complete act is also pointed out by the aor. καθίσαι) with me (cf. John xvii. 24, πάτερ, ὁ δέδωκας ἐμοὶ θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἶμι ἐγὼ καθεῖνοι ὅσιν μετ' ἐμοῦ) on my throne (have a share in My kingly power, as ch. ii. 27, xx. 6), as I also conquered and sat down with my Father on His throne (the aor. refer to the historical facts of the Resurrection and Ascension. By the latter, Christ sat down at the right hand of God, or of the throne of God, as Heb. xii. 2. No distinction must be made between the throne of the Father, on which Christ sits, and that of Christ, on which the victorious believer is to sit with Him: they are one and the same, cf. ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀγίου, ch. xxii. 1; and the glory of the redeemed will be a participation in that of the Father and the Son, John xvii. 22). Doubtless the occurrence of this, the highest and most glorious of all the promises, in this place, is to be explained not entirely from

τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ. ²² ὁ ἡ ἔχων ἡ οὖς ἡ ἀκουσάτω τί τὸ ^{h ch. ii. 7 reff.}
^{i ch. i. 10.}
 πνεῦμα λέγει ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ^{i constr., ch.}
^{xi. 15. xix.}

IV. ¹ Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἡνεωγμένη ^{14. Gen. xv.}
 ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη ἣν ἤκουσα ἰὼς ἰσάλ- ^{1. Winer,}
 πιγγος λαλούσης μετ' ἐμοῦ, ἰλέγων ^{edn. 6, § 59.}
^{4.}
 Ἀνάβα ὧδε, καὶ ^{k -βα, Mark}
^{xv. 30 rec.}
^{-βηθί, Matt.}
^{xxvii. 40.}
^{Luke xix. 5. John iv. 49.}

CHAP. IV. 1. [μετανα(sic) P.] ^{ανεωγμένη} B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N
 1. 33(-8?). 42 (c 6. 16. 26, e sil) Andr. ins ἰδου bef η φωνη N. λαλουσαν N.
 λαλουσα k. rec (for λεγων) λεγουσα, with [P]N^{3a} h n 1. 17. 36-8 (13. 27. 37. 51
 B^r, e sil): και λεγουσης l 16 Ambr: txt AN¹ B rel Andr-coisl. for αναβα, αναβηθι A.

any especial aptness to the circumstances of the Laodicean church, though such has been attempted to be assigned (e. g. by Ebrard—because the victory over lukewarmness would be so much more difficult than that in any other case), but also from the fact of its occurring at the end of all the Epistles, and as it were gathering them all into one. It must not be forgotten too, that the ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ forms a link to the next part of the book where we so soon, ch. v. 6, read καὶ εἶδον ἐν τῷ μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου ἀρνίον ἐστηκὸς ὡς ἐσφαγμένον. ^{22.}] See on ch. ii. 7.

From this point begins the Revelation proper, extending to the end of the book. And herein we have a first great portion, embracing chapp. iv.—xi., the opening of the seals and the sounding of the trumpets. But preparatory to both these series of revelations, we have described to us in chapp. iv. v., the heavenly scenery which furnishes the local ground for these visions. Of these, chap. iv. is properly the scene itself: chap. v. being a further unfolding of its details with a view to the vision of the seals which is to follow. So that we have,—

CH. IV. 1—11.] THE VISION OF GOD'S PRESENCE IN HEAVEN. "Decrees respecting the fortunes of the future rest with God, and from Him comes the revelation of them through Jesus Christ. Hence the Revelation begins with the imparting to the Apostle, through Christ, of the vision of God's presence." De Wette.

1.] After these things (μετὰ ταῦτα (or τοῦτο) is a formula frequently occurring in this book, and no where indicating a break in the ecstatic state of the Seer, but only the succession of separate visions. Those are mistaken, e. g. Bengel, Hengstb., who imagine an interval, here and in the other places, during which the Seer wrote down that which had been previously revealed to him. The whole is conceived as imparted in one continuous revelation consisting of many parts. See

below on ver. 2) I saw (not with the bodily eye, but with the eye of ecstatic vision, as throughout the book. He is throughout ἐν πνεύματι. It is not *I looked*, as in E. V.: not the directing of the Seer's attention which discovers the door to him, but the simple reception of the vision which is recorded), and behold, a door set open (not, *was opened* (ἡνοίχθη) as E. V., which gives the idea that the Seer witnessed the act of opening. For the same reason the word "*opened*" is objectionable, as it may be mistaken for the aor. neuter) in heaven (notice the difference between this vision and that in Ezek. i. 1; Matt. iii. 16; Acts vii. 56, x. 11. In those, the heaven itself parts asunder, and discloses the vision to those below on earth: here the heaven, the house or palace of God (Ps. xi. 4, xviii. 6, xxix. 9), remains firmly shut to those on earth, but a door is opened, and the Seer is rapt in the Spirit through it. Henceforth usually he looks from the heaven down on the earth, seeing however both alike, and being present in either, as the localities of his various visions require), and the former voice (much confusion has been introduced here by rendering, as E. V., "*the first voice which*," &c., giving the idea that ἡ πρώτη means, *first after* the door was seen set open; whereas ἡ φωνὴ ἡ πρώτη is the voice which I heard at first, viz. in ch. i. 10) which I heard (aor. at the beginning) as of a trumpet speaking with me (viz. ch. i. 10. ὡς σάλπ. κ.τ.λ., is not predicative, "*was as . . .*" as E. V. and Treg. The construction simply is—"behold, a door . . . and the voice . . .," both θύρα and φωνὴ dependent on ἰδοὺ. The voice is not that of Christ (as Stier, Reden Jesu viii. 93, 207 ff.: Reden der Engel, p. 242,—and al.), but of some undefined heavenly being or angel. As Düsterd. observes, all we can say of it is that it is the *same voice* as that in ch. i. 10, which there, ver. 17, is followed by that of our Lord, not ὡς σάλπιγγος, but ὡς ἐδάτων πολλῶν, as stated

l = ch. i. 1 reff. δεῖξω σοι ἃ¹ δεῖ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα. ² εὐθέως^m ἐγενόμην ΑΡΝ Β α
m ch. i. 10 reff. m ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ ἰδοὺ θρόνοςⁿ ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ 40 π, 1.
n = John ii 6. xix. 29 xxi. 9 only. Jer. xxiv 1 ο ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον^o καθήμενος^o 3 καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ὁμοιος 2. 4. 6. 9.
o w. acc., Luke v 27 ||, xxi. 35. John xii 15 al. (see note.) 10-3. 16
to 19, 26-
7, 30. 32
to 38.
40 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B^c.

for ἃ, οσα Α.

2. rec ins καὶ bef εὐθεως, with [P] h l m n 1. 10-7-8. 34-5-6 (16. 37-8. 47-9. 51 Br, e sil) Andr Areth Bede. μετὰ ταῦτα 19: om ΑΝ¹ B rel am (with fultl harl lipss) syr-dd Primas Jer: εὐθεως δε Ν^{3a}. aft 2nd καὶ ins o (but erased) Ν. rec επι του θρονου, with [P] h n 1. 10-7-8. 36 (26-7. 37. 49 Br, e sil) Andr: txt ΑΝ B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

3. om καὶ ο καθήμενος (homæotel?) rel æth arm Andr Areth: ins Α[P]Ν Β 1 19. 26. 36 (13. 41-2, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Primas Jer. rec ins ην bef 1st ομοιος, with vulg

by anticipation in ver. 15), saying (Heb. נִשְׁמָה). The gender is placed, regardless of the ordinary concord, with reference to the thing signified: so in reff., and even sometimes in the classics; cf. Xen. Cyr. i. 2. 12, αὐτὸς πόλεις . . . ὡς παύσοντες. See more examples in Winer), Come up hither (viz. through the opened door), and I will shew thee (it is surprising how Stier can allege the δέξω as a proof that the Lord Himself only can be speaking: cf. ch. xxi. 9, 10, xxii. 3, 9, which latter place is decisive against him) the things which must (of prophetic necessity: see reff.) take place after these things (ταῦτα, the things now present: as in ch. i. 19, but the ταῦτα not being the same in the two cases. So that μετὰ ταῦτα has very much the general meaning given by the "hereafter" of the E. V.). 2.] Immediately I was (became) in the Spirit (i. e. I experienced a new accession of the Spirit's powerful influence, which transported me thither: qu. d. "I was in a trance or ecstasy:" see on ch. i. 10. It is hardly credible that any scholar should have proposed to understand ἐκεῖ after ἐγενόμην, "immediately I was there in the Spirit:" but this was done by Zullig, and has found an advocate in England in Dr. Maitland: cf. Todd on the Apoc., Note B, p. 297): and behold, a throne stood (the E. V. "was set," gives too much the idea that the placing of the throne formed part of the vision: "lay" would be our best word, but we do not use it of any thing so lofty as a throne. ἔκειτο is wrongly taken by Bengel as importing breadth; and by Hengstb. as representing the resting on the cherubim. But it is St. John's word for mere local position: see reff.) in heaven, and upon the throne (the accus. is perhaps not to be pressed; it may be loosely used as equivalent to the gen. or dat. The variations of the case in this expression throughout the book are remarkable, and hardly to be accounted for. Thus we have the gen. in ver. 10, ch. v. 1, 7 (13^p), vii. 15, ix. 17, xiv. 15,

16, xvii. 1, 9, xix. 18, 19, 21: the dat. in ver. 9, ch. (v. 13^p), vi. 16, vii. 10, xix. 4, xxi. 5: the accus. in ver. 4, ch. vi. 2, 4, 5, xi. 16, xiv. 14, xvii. 3, xix. 11, xx. 4, 11. The only rule that seems to be at all observed is, that always at the first mention of the fact of sitting, the accus. seems to be used, e. g. here, and ver. 4, ch. vi. 2, 4, 5, xiv. 14, xvii. 3, xix. 11, xx. 4 (11 seems hardly a case in point), thus bearing a trace of its proper import, that of motion towards, of which the first mention partakes. But the accus. is not confined to the first mention, witness ch. xi. 16, and no rule at all seems to prevail as regards the gen. and dat.) one sitting (called henceforward throughout the book, ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τ. θρ.: and being the Eternal Father (not as Lyra, "Deus trinus et unus,"—so also Corn.-a-lap., Calov.; for He that sitteth on the throne is distinguished in ch. vi. 16, vii. 10 from the Son, and in ver. 5 from the Holy Spirit): see ch. vii. 10, xix. 4, where we read expressly, τῷ θεῷ τῷ καθήμενῳ ἐπὶ τ. θρ. So that it is not for the reasons sometimes suggested, that the Name is not expressed: e. g. that by Eich. and Ewald, on account of the Jewish unwillingness to express the sacred Name: that by Herder (see also De W. al.), that the mind has no figure and the tongue no word by which to express it: still less that of Heinr., "Non nisi ex negligentia scribendi videtur omisum." The simple reason seems to be, as assigned by Hengstb. and Dusterd., that St. John would describe simply that which he saw, as he saw it. For the same reason he does not name Christ expressly in the first vision, ch. i. 13): and he that sat (no need to supply "was," as ἦν in rec.: the nominatives are all correlative after ἰδοὺ) like in appearance (lit., "in vision," "in sight," as E. V. in the next clause: dat. of form or manner, cf. Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 6, and see 1 Cor. xiv. 20; Phil. ii. 8, iii. 5) to a jasper and sardine stone (Epiphanius, in his treatise on the

ῥάσσει λίθῳ ἰάσπιδι καὶ ἰσάρδιῳ, καὶ ἰρις κυκλόθεν ^{p = here bis (ch. ix. 17.}
 τοῦ θρόνου ὅμοιος ῥάσσει σμαραγδίνῳ ^{Acts ii. 17, from Joel ii.} καὶ κυκλόθεν
 28) only. Ezek. i. 5 al. q ch. xxi. 11, 18, 19 only. Ezek. xxviii. 13. r ch. xxi. 20 only. Ezek.
 xxviii. 13. s ch. x. 1 only. t here bis ver. 8 only. 3 Kings xviii. 32. (-κλφ, Isa. vi.
 2 ch. v. 11.) u fem., so Luke ii. 13. 1 Tim. ii. 8. Winer, edn. 6, § 11. 1. v here
 only. (-δος, ch. xxi. 19. -δίτης, Esth. i. 6 BN.)

copt: om A[P]N B rel syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth. ins σμαραγδω και bef σαρδια
 B 13. 26. 41-2-4. rec σαρδια, with [P] 1. 36: txt AN B rel Andr Areth. for
 iris, ireis N-corr n æth arm: iereis AN¹. elz (for 2nd ὁμοιος) ὁμοια, with c h 10-
 6-7². 34-5. 47 (l m 18. 37. 49 B¹, e sil) Andr: ὁμοια ως 47: ὁμοιοι n: txt AP 1. 6. 30-6;
 ὁμοιος N^{3a} B rel Areth; ὁμοιος ως 38. — om ὁμοιος το θρονου, v. 4, (homœotel) N¹.
 ορασις σμαραγδινω B rel: ορασει σμαραγδων f, ορασει σμαραγδινω 92: ορασις σμαραγδω
 35: ορασις σμαραγδου 38. 47: ορασει σμαραγδω m 34: txt A[P]N^{3a} c h 1. 10-7-8. 36
 (l n 6. 16. 49 B¹, e sil) vulg copt.
 4. om 1st και B rels syr-dd: ins A[P]N^{3a} l m n 10-7-8. 34-5-6. 47-8-9 (ch 1. 6. 16 Bch's-5-

twelve stones in Aaron's breastplate says, λίθος ἱασπις, οὗτός ἐστι τῷ εἶδει σμαραγδίζων (see below). παρὰ δὲ τὰ χεῖλη τοῦ Θερμάδοντος ποταμοῦ εὑρίσκεται . . . ἀλλ' ἐστὶ γένος πολλὸν καλούμενον Ἀμαθοῦσιον, τὸ εἶδος δὲ τοιούδε ἐστὶ τοῦ λίθου κατὰ τὴν σμαραγδὸν ἐστὶ χλωρίζουσα, ἀλλὰ ἀμβλυτέρα καὶ ἀμυροτέρα. καὶ ἔνδοθεν χλωρὸν ἔχει τὸ σῶμα, εὐκίτια ἰφ χάλκου, ἔχουσα φλέβας τετρασίχους κ.τ.λ. He then describes several other kinds, a purple, a yellow, &c. One kind appears to be that meant in our ch. xxi. 11, where we have the glory of God like ὡς λίθῳ ἰάσπιδι κρυστάλλίζοντι: for he describes it as ἄλλη κρυστάλλου ὕδατι ὁμοία. It is true that Epiphanius may have put in this species merely to satisfy ch. xxi. 11. From this latter passage, where it is described as τιμιώτατος,—which jasper, as commonly known, never was,—Ebrard argues that by ἱασπις the diamond is meant. ἱασπις, Heb. ἡרץ, a beautiful stone of various wavy colours, semi-opaque, granulous in texture, used in ancient times for gems and ornaments, but in more modern ones on a larger scale for pavements and tables. Even Pliny wrote, xxxvii. (8.) 37, "viret, et sæpe translucet iaspis, etiamsi victa a multis, antiquitatis tamen gloriam retinens." The altar in Canterbury Cathedral stands on a platform of yellow Sicilian jasper pavement, 30 feet by 14 feet.

σάρδιος, Heb. צרם, is, as this name shews, a red stone, commonly supposed to answer to our cornelian. But Epiphanius, in his treatise on the twelve stones in Aaron's breastplate, says of it, λίθος σάρδιος ὁ Βαβυλῶνιος, οὕτω καλούμενος. ἐστὶ δὲ πυρρὸς τῷ εἶδει καὶ αἵματοειδής, σαρδίῳ τῷ ἰχθὺι τε ταριχευμένῳ εὐκίως. διδὲ καὶ σάρδιος λέγεται, ἀπὸ τοῦ εἰδους λαβὼν τὸ ἐπώνυμον. ἐν Βαβυλῶνι δὲ τῇ πρὸς Ἀσσυρίαν γίνεται. ἐστὶ δὲ διαγῆς ὁ λίθος. Several of the Commentators, e. g. Victorin., Areth., Lyra, Ansb.,

Joachim, &c., Bengel, Hengst., Düsterd., have said much on the symbolic significance of these stones as representing the glory of God. Thus much only seems, in the great uncertainty and variety of views, to stand firm for us: that if ἱασπις is to be taken as in ch. xxi. 11, as, by the reference there to τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ, it certainly seems it must, then it represents a watery crystalline brightness, whereas σάρδιος is on all hands acknowledged to be fiery red. Thus we shall have ample material for symbolic meaning: whether, as Victorinus, Tichon., Primas., Bede, al., of the one great judgment by water (or of baptism) and the other by fire,—as Andr., Areth., Lyra, al., of the goodness of God in nature (ἱασπις being green) and His severity in judgment,—as Ansb., of the divinity and humanity ("quia nimirum humanitas ejus tempore passionis sanguine coloratur"), &c., or as the moderns mostly, e. g. Bengel, Stern, Hengstb., of the holiness of God and His justice. This last seems to me the more probable, especially as the same mixture of white light with fire seems to pervade the Old Testament and Apocalyptic visions of the divine majesty. Cf. Ezek. i. 4, viii. 2; Dan. vii. 9: and our ch. i. 14, x. 1. But nothing can be confidently asserted, in our ignorance of the precise import of ἱασπις, and a rainbow (cf. Gen. ix. 12—17; Ezek. i. 28) round about the throne (i. e. in all probability surrounding the throne vertically, as a nimbus; not, as Beng. and Hengstb., horizontally) like to the appearance (ὅμοιος is here an adj. with two terminations, as those in -ιος frequently in Attic Greek: see Winer (reff.): the construction of ῥάσσει is not as above, but the dat. is here after ὅμοιος) of an emerald (on σμαραγδὸς (-δινος is the possess. adj. of two terminations) all seem agreed, that it represents the stone so well known among us as the emerald, of a lovely green co-

w constr. ch.
iii. 5 (reff.)
only. [ch. vii.
9 reff.]
x ch. iii. 5, 18.
y ch. i. 16.

τοῦ θρόνου θρόνοι ἑκοσι τέσσαρες, καὶ ὁ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἑκοσι ΑΡΝ Β α
τέσσαρας θρόνους πρεσβυτέρους ὁ καθημένους, ^w περιβε- 10 η, 1.
βλημένους ^w ἐν ^x ἱματίοις ^x λευκοῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς 2. 4. 6. 9.
αὐτῶν στεφάνους χρυσοῦς. ^δ καὶ ^γ ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου ἕκ- 10-3 16.
7. 30. 32
10 19. 26-
40 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B.

mss B⁷, e sil) vulg.

for θρόνοι, θρόνους N (but τέσσαρες below) m 34-5 Andr-coisl: om 12. rec aft εικοσι ins και (twice), with (1 16. 32 Beh's 4-mss, e sil), and 33-(4-6, e sil)-8 1st time: om A[P]N B rel.—(κδ' B 1 and most of the others.)—om 2nd εικ. τεσσ. 38.—rec (for επι τ. εικ. τεσσ. θρ.) επι τους θρονους τους εικοσι τεσσαρας, with B rel: so, but omg 2nd τους, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 11. 36. 40-2 Andr-a-p: om επι τους εικοσι τεσσαρας θρονους N: txt A[P] 17-8-9.—rec aft θρονους ins ειδον, with h 10 (a 37. 41-9 B⁷, e sil): om A[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth.—[θρονους bef εικοσι τεσσαρας P:] om τ. θρον. g: om from τεσσ. to τεσσ. 32. om εν AP n Andr-a. om ιματιους N.

rec ins εσχον bef επι τ. κεφ.: om A[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth lat.-ff.

χρυσους N.

lour:—Pliny says of it, ut supra, “quin et ab intentione alia obscurata aspectu smaragdi recreatur acies, scalpentibusque gemmas non alia gratior oculorum refectio est; ita viridi lenitate lassitudinem mulcent.” Almost all the Commentators think of the gracious and federal character of the bow of God, Gen. ix. 12—17. Nor is it any objection to this (as Ebrard) that the bow or glory here is green, instead of prismatic: the *form* is that of the covenant bow, the colour even more refreshing and more directly symbolizing grace and mercy. “Deus in iudiciis semper federis sui meminit:” Grot. So far at least we may be sure of as to the symbolism of this appearance of Him that sitteth on the throne: that the brightness of His glory and fire of His judgment is ever girded by, and found within, the refreshment and surety of His mercy and goodness. So that, as Düsterd. says well, “This fundamental vision contains all that may serve for terror to the enemies, and consolation to the friends, of Him that sitteth on the throne . . .”). 4.] *The assessors of the enthroned One.* The construction with *ειδον*, partly in the nom., partly in the accus., still continues. And round the throne twenty-four thrones (i. e. evidently smaller thrones, and probably lower than *δ θρόνος*), and upon the twenty-four thrones elders sitting (the accus., either after *ειδον* understood, or more likely loosely placed with the nominatives after *ειδον*), clothed in white garments, and on their heads golden crowns (these 24 elders are not *angels*, as maintained by Rinck and Hofmann (Weiss. u. Erfüll. p. 325 f.), as is shewn (not by ch. v. 9, as generally argued,—even by Elliott, vol. i. p. 81 f.: see text there: but) by their white robes and crowns, the rewards of *endurance*, ch. iii. 5, ii. 10,—but *representatives of the Church*, as generally understood. But if so, what sort

of representatives, and why 24 in number? This has been variously answered. The usual understanding has been that of our earliest Commentator, Victorinus; who says, “Sunt autem viginti quatuor patres: duodecim Apostoli, totidem Patriarchæ.” And this is in all probability right in the main: the key to the interpretation being the *analogy* with the sayings of our Lord to the Apostles, Matt. xix. 28; Luke xxii. 30. That those sayings do not regard the *same* session as this, is no argument against the inference from analogy. Joachim brings against this view that the twelve patriarchs were not personally holy men, and never are held up as distinguished in the Old Testament. But this obviously is no valid objection. It is not the personal characters, but the symbolical, that are here in question. It might be said with equal justice that the number of the actual Apostles is not definitely twelve. It is no small confirmation of the view, that in ch. xv. 3, we find the double idea of the church, as made up of Old Testament and New Testament saints, plainly revealed to St. John; for he heard the victorious saints sing the *song of Moses*, and the *song of the Lamb*. See also ch. xxi. 12, 14, where the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem are inscribed with the names of the twelve tribes, and its twelve foundations with those of the twelve Apostles. Various other interpretations have been: that of Lyra, “designantur universæ cathedrales ecclesiae: quæ licet sint multæ, tamen sub tali numero designantur propter concordantiam novi Testamenti ad vetus, in quo legitur, 1 Paralip. xxv., quod sanctus David volens augmentare cultum divinum, statuit viginti quatuor sacerdotes templo per hebdomadas successive ministrantes, in sacra enim scriptura frequenter ponitur determinatus numerus pro indeterminato:” that of Alcas., Calov., Vitranga, Zeger, Ewald, al., who explain the

πορεύονται ^{za} ἀστραπαὶ καὶ ^z φωναὶ καὶ ^{zb} βρονταί. καὶ ^z ch. viii. 5. xi. 19. xvi. 18. ἑπτὰ λαμπάδες πυρὸς ^c καϊόμεναι ^d ἐνώπιον τοῦ ^d θρόνου see Exod. xix 16. Ps. [αὐτοῦ], αἶ εἰσιν [τὰ] ^d ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ. ⁶ καὶ lxxvi. 18. a as above (z). ^d ἐνώπιον ^d τοῦ θρόνου ὡς θάλασσα ^e ὑαλίνη ὁμοία ^f κρυ- Matt. xxiv. 27 || L xxviii. 3 Luke x. 18. xi 36

only. b Rev. only (as above (z) & ch. x. 3, 4 al.), exc. Mark iii 17 John xii 29. c = Luke xii. 35. John v 35 ch viii. 10. Isa lxi. 1. d ch. i. 4 (reff). e ch. xv. 2 (bis) only τ. (-λως, ch xxi. 18, 21) f ch. xxii. 1 only. Num. xi. 7. Ezek. i. 22. (-λίξεν, ch. xxi. 11.)

5. om καὶ εκ 1. rec αστραπαι και βρονται και φωναί, with 1. 38: φω. κ. αστρ. κ. βρ. e: txt A[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth Primas Jer Cassiod. om θρονου to 1st θρονου in ver 6 N¹ (ins N^{3a}). rec om αυτου, with A[P]N^{3a} 18. 36-8 (1. 27. 40 Br, e sil) vss Andr: ins B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth. (in B θρονου is written over αυτου.) for αἶ εἰσιν, ἃ εἰσιν A: καὶ f: ἃ εἰσιν N^{3a} b 1. 36. om τα B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins A[P]N^{3a} n 1. 33 (f 36-8, e sil) Andr.

6. rec om ωs, with b 1 Andr Primas Tich: ins A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth.

number similarly by the 24 courses of priests and their heads,—the objection to which is, that these elders are not priests, their occupation in ch. v. 8 being simply connected with their representative character:—that of Grot., that the number is that of the presiding elders of the Jerusalem church (a pure assumption): that of Joachim, Heinrichs, Bleek, De Wette, that the number 12, that of the tribes of Israel, is doubled, to signify the accession of the Gentiles to the church: that of Primasius and Ansbart, that the doubling is “propter geminum Testamentum, quin et in veteri et in novo eadem formatur Ecclesia.” Besides these, there have been many fanciful reasons, deduced from numerical considerations: as e.g. that of Arethas in Catena, that 21 is 3 × 7, the combination of the number of perfection with that of the Holy Trinity, and then 3 is added; &c. &c.). 5.] And out of the throne go forth (the tense is changed, and the narrative assumes the direct form, which, however, is immediately dropped again, and the accumulation of details resumed) lightnings and voices and thunders (the imagery seems to be in analogy with that in the Old Testament, where God’s presence to give His law was thus accompanied: cf. Exod. xix. 16; where ἀστραπαὶ and φωναί occur in juxtaposition as here. If this idea be correct, then we have here represented the sovereignty and almightiness of God. And nearly so Vittr., Hengstb., Düsterd., al. De Wette and Ebrard understand God’s power over nature, De W. uniting it with what follows: see below. Grot. says, “Fulgura et tonitrua significant minas Dei contra impios: voces sunt in ipsis tonitribus, infra x. 3, i. e. non generaliter tantum minatur, sed et speciales poenas prædicat.” But there seems no ground for this): and seven lamps (the former construction is resumed) of fire burning before the throne

[itself] (or, before his throne, viz. the throne of the καθήμενος), which are the seven spirits of God (see notes on ch. i. 4, v. 6. These seem to represent the Holy Spirit in his sevenfold working: in his enlightening and cheering as well as his purifying and consuming agency. So most Commentators. De W. and Ebrard regard the representation as that of the Holy Spirit, the principle of physical and spiritual life, which appears only wrong by being too limited. Hengstenb. is quite beside the mark in confidently (as usual) confining the interpretation of the lamps of fire to the consuming power of the Spirit in judgment. The fact of the parallel ch. v. 6 speaking of ἑπτὰ ὀφθαλμοί, and such texts as ch. xxi. 23; Ps. cxix. 105, should have kept him from this mistake. The whole of this glorious vision is of a composite and twofold nature: comfort is mingled with terror, the fire of love with the fire of judgment): and before the throne as it were a sea (the ὡς belongs to θαλ. ὑαλ., not to ὑαλ. alone as Bengel: so also in the parallel place, ch. xv. 2) of glass (not, “glassy,” as rendered by Elliott: ὑαλίνη describes not the appearance, but the material, of the sea: it appeared like a sea of glass—so clear, and so calm) like to crystal (and that not common glass, which among the ancients was as we see from its remains, cloudy and semi-opaque, but like rock crystal for transparency and beauty, as Victorinus, “aquam mundam, stabilem, non vento agitatam.” Compare by way of contrast, ἡ καθήμενη ἐπὶ [τῶν] ὑδάτων [τῶν] πολλῶν, the multitudinous and turbulent waters, ch. xvii. 1. In seeking the explanation of this, we must first track the image from its O. T. earlier usage. There, in Exod. xxiv. 10, we have καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ· καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τοῖς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔργον πλίνθου σπαφείρου, καὶ ὥσπερ εἶδος στερεώμα-

see below. Grot. says, “Fulgura et tonitrua significant minas Dei contra impios: voces sunt in ipsis tonitribus, infra x. 3, i. e. non generaliter tantum minatur, sed et speciales poenas prædicat.” But there seems no ground for this): and seven lamps (the former construction is resumed) of fire burning before the throne

g ch. v. 6.
h w gen. ch.
v. 11. vii. 11
only (Mark
iii 34 al.).
Gen. xxv. 5.
(-λόθεν,
ver 3 reff)
i = Rev. pas-
sim. ch. v 6 al. (elsewhere, Heb. xiii. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 12. Jude 10 only) Ezek. i. 5.
3, d. xxi 9. Matt. xxiii 27 al. Amos ii. 13 1 Ezek. x 12. k ch. v 8. xv. 7. xvi
i 10 e 2 Tim. iv. 17 Heb. xi 33 1 Pet. v. 8 ch v 5 al 4 only. Ezek. x. 14. n Ezek
xv 23, 27, 30. Heb ix 12, 19 only. Ezek. i. 10. q constr., ver 1 reff p Luke

στάλλῳ. καὶ ἔν μέσῳ τοῦ ἑ θρόνου καὶ ἡ κυκλῶ τοῦ θρόνου
τέσσαρα ἰ ζῶα ἡ γέμοντα ἰ ὀφθαλμῶν ἡ ἔμπροσθεν καὶ ἡ ὀπι-
σθεν. ἡ καὶ τὸ ζῶον τὸ πρῶτον ὁμοιον ὁ λέοντι, καὶ τὸ
δεύτερον ζῶον ὁμοιον ἡ μόσχῳ, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ζῶον ἡ ἔχων τὸ

39 καὶ το
ζῶον ..
ΑΡΝ Β α
το π, 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19.
26-7. 30.
32 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B^r.

7. (d illeg.) rec εχον, with [P]^h rel: txt A B l n 30-2-3(-4-6 ?). om 5th
το B rel Iren-gr Andr Areth: ins A[P]^h h n 10-7. 33-5 (1. 34-6-7-8. 48-9. 51 B^r, e sil) 90 B^r.

τοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τῇ καθαρότητι. Compare with this Ezek. i. 22, καὶ ὁμοίωμα ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν αὐτοῖς Α] τῶν ζώων ὥσει σπερέωμα, ὥς ὄρασις κρυστάλλου, ἔκτε-
ταμένον ἐπὶ τῶν πτερύγων αὐτῶν ἐπάνωθεν. In Job xxxvii. 18 also, where the LXX appear to have gone quite astray, the sky is said to be "as a molten looking-glass." If we are to follow these indices, the primary reference will be to the clear ether in which the throne of God is upborne and the intent of setting this space in front of the throne will be, to betoken its separation and insulation from the place where the Seer stood, and indeed from all else around it. The material and appearance of this pavement of the throne seem chosen to indicate majestic repose and ethereal purity.

All kinds of symbolic interpretations, more or less fanciful, have been given. Such are those of Victorinus ("donum baptismi"), Tichonius, Primas., Bede, Lyra, Calov., al.,—of Joachim ("in mari vitreo sacrum designatur scripturarum volumen"),—of Alcas. (repentance), of Ribera ("ego mare vitreum dici arbitror multitudinem hominum in terra viventium"), Paræus, al.,—of Vitranga ("id, quo clare intelligimus regnum Dei in Christo Jesu niti et fundari: id vero est α) certa et constans Dei voluntas, qua constituit regnum gratiæ habere inter homines . . . β) jus certum et liquidum ejusmodi regnum gratiæ inter homines erigendi . . ."), Herder, al.,—of Bengel and Hengstb., that the sea of glass, on account of its being described as mixed with fire in ch. xv. 2, is "das Probuclt der sieben Feuerlampen," and (Ps. xxxvi. 6, "Thy judgments are a great deep") betokens the great and wonderful works of God, His righteous and holy ways. But as Düsterd. remarks, the parallel place, ch. v. 6, where the seven lamps are seven eyes, precludes this:—of Aretius, Grot., and Ebrard, who, because the sea, in its stormy and agitated state, represents (ch. xvii. 15) the nations of the earth in their godless state, therefore the pure and calm sea represents (Ebr.) the creatures in their

proper relation to their Creator, or (Aret) "cœtum ecclesiæ triumphantis," or as Grot. strangely, and as De W. remarks, most unfeliciously, "summa puritas plebis Hierosolymitanæ ejus quæ Christo nomen dederat: quæ puritas describitur Act. ii. et iv." Düsterd. connects it, and in fact identifies it, with the river of the water of life, λαμπρ. ὥς κρύσταλλον, which, ch. xxii. 1, proceeded out of the throne of God and the Lamb. But the whole vision there is quite distinct from this, and each one has its own propriety in detail. To identify the two, is to confound them: nor does ch. xv. 2 at all justify this interpretation. There, as here, it is the purity, calmness, and majesty of God's rule which are signified by the figure). And in the midst of the throne (not, as Hengstb., under the throne: their movements are free, cf. ch. xv. 7. See below), and round about the throne (i.e. so that in the Apostle's view they partly hid the throne, partly overlapped the throne, being symmetrically arranged with regard to it, i.e. as the number necessitates, one in the midst of each side), four living-beings (the E. V., "beasts," is the most unfortunate word that could be imagined. A far better one is that now generally adopted, "living creatures:" the only objection to it being that when we come to vv. 9, 11, we give the idea, in conjoining "living-creatures" and "created" (ἐκτιστας), of a close relation which is not found in the Greek. I have therefore preferred living-beings) full of eyes before and behind (this, from their respective positions, could be seen by St. John: their faces being naturally towards the throne. On the symbolism, see below). And the first living-being like to a lion, and the second living-being like to a steer (μόσχος is not necessarily to be pressed to its proper primary meaning, as indicating the young calf in distinction from the grown bullock: the LXX use it for an ox generally, in Exod. xxii. 1; Levit. xxii. 23; also Exod. xxix. 10, and Gen. xii. 16), and the third living-being having its face as of a man

πρόσωπον [ὡς] ἀνθρώπου, καὶ τὸ τέταρτον ζῶον ὅμοιον ^r Matt. xxiv. 2s. Luke xvii 37. ch. viii. 13 xii. 14 only. Ezech. ii cc. s 20 also (-ουεν-), ch. viii 13. xiv. 6 xix 17. Job ix 26. πετομένῳ. ⁸ καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ^t ἐν καθ' ἑν-αὐτῶν ^q ἔχων ^v ἀνά ^w πτέρυγας ἑξ. ^x κυκλόθεν καὶ ^y ἔσωθεν ^{ky} γέμουσιν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ ^{za} ἀνάπασιν οὐκ ^z ἔχουσιν ^{zb} ἡμέρας καὶ ^{zb} νυκτὸς ^q λέγοντες ^c Ἄγιος ἄγιος ἄγιος κύριος ὁ θεὸς

above & ch. xii. 14 only.

v = Matt. xx. 9. John ii. 6 al.

vi. 2, 3

(but see note).

b Mark v. 5. Luke xviii. 7.

c Isa. vi. 3.

x vv. 3, 4 reff.

a as above (z).

Matt. xi. 29 xii. 43.

Luke xi. 24 only.

Isa. xxv. 10.

Isa. xxxiv. 10.

t Mark xiv. 19. [John viii. 9] see Rom. xii. 5.

w Matt. xliii 37. Luke xiii. 34. ch. ix. 9 xii. 14 only.

y Matt. xxiii. 25, 27.

3 Macc. v. 34.

Isa. 21, xiv. 11.

πέρ., as

Andr-a.—(om from 3rd ζῶον up to ὅμοιον 9, 27.)

rec ως ἀνθρώπος, with [P] h 1

n 1. 10-7. 38 (16. 37-9. 48-9 Br, e sil) Andr-a: ως ὅμοιον ἀνθρώπου N: ἀνθρώπου B rel

Iren-gr Andr Areth: ως ἀνθρώπου A 36 vulg Iren-int Primas Vict. om last ζῶον

B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins A[P]N h l n 36 (1. 2. 13-6-7-8. 37-8-9. 40-9 Br, e sil).

rec πετώμεν, with rel Iren-gr: txt A[P]N B a b e f h j k m 2. 4. 9. 10-3-7-8-9.

33(-4-5, e sil) (38?). 47 8-9. 50 1. 90 Andr Areth.

8. rec om τα, with B rel Andr Areth: ins A[P]N a c e f g h l m n 6. 10-1-6-7-8.

30-4-6. 49. 51. 90 Andr-coisl. rec (for ἐν καθ' ἑν αὐτῶν) ἐν καθ' ἑαυτο, with 1: εν

εκαστον αὐτων N 38: εν (alone) 40-1-2. 92: εν καθ' εν (omg αὐτων) B rel Areth: txt

A[P]N h l m n 2. 10-1-6-7. 34-5-6-7-9. 49. 51 Br vss Andr Tich (d illeg). rec (for

εχων) εχον, with N (d?) 6(e sil): om c Br: εχει n: εχοντα [P] 38. 50: εσχον 9: εχον

B rel Andr-a-p: txt A a k l m 1. 13-6. 30-2-6-9. 92. πτερυγων B. om και

εσωθεν (homoeotele) k n 38: for εσωθεν, εξωθεν 33 (35 Br, e sil): εξωθ. κ. εσ. f: και εξ.

κ. εσ. B 12 Primas Victorin. rec (for γεμουσιν) γεμοντα, with 1. 38(-9?): txt

A[P]N B rel vulg Andr Areth. for εχουσιν, εξοσαν N¹ (txt N^{3a}). rec λεγοντα,

with 10. 30(-8?) 49² (a d e h 37-9. 40-1 Br, e sil): txt A[P]N B rel. αγιος is

repeated nine times in B rel Andr-coisl: eight times in N¹ e: six times in 38. 40 Br:

twice in 51: txt A[P]N^{3a} 1. 16. 36 (b c d f g l n 13. 26. 37-9. 47. 90, e sil) vss Ephr

Andr Areth Tert Vict Jer. om 1st o N¹.

(or, the face of a man), and the fourth living-being like to a flying eagle. And the four living-beings, each (reff.) of them having (ἔχων, the gender being conformed to that of the thing signified, see on φωνή . . . λέγων, ver. 1) six wings apiece (for the distributive ἀνά, see reff.). All round and within (I prefer much putting a period at ἑξ, to carrying on the construction; as more in accord with the general style of this description. Understand, after both κυκλόθεν, and ἔσωθεν,—τῶν πτερύγων: the object of St. John being to shew, that the six wings in each case did not interfere with that which he had before declared, viz. that they were full of eyes before and behind. Round the outside of each wing, and up the inside of each (half-expanded) wing, and of the part of the body also which was in that inside recess) they are full of eyes: and they have no rest by day and by night (ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός may belong either to ἀνάπ. οὐκ ἔχ., or to λέγοντες. Partly on account of the καί, partly as a matter of the mere judgment of the ear, I prefer joining it with the latter) saying (the gender, see as above), Holy Holy Holy Lord God Almighty (so far is identical with the seraphim's ascription of praise in Isa. vi. 3: παντοκράτωρ answering usually in the

LXX to ἡνίκας, though not in that place. See Bengel's remarks in note on Rom. ix. 29), which was, and which is, and which is to come (see on reff.). These four living-beings are in the main identical with the cherubim of the O. T. (compare Ezek. i. 5—10, x. 20), which are called by the same name of living creatures (ῥιπ), and are similarly described. We may trace however some differences. In Ezekiel's vision, each living-being has all four faces, Ez. i. 6, whereas here the four belong severally, one to each. Again in Ezekiel's vision, it is apparently the wheels which are full of eyes, Ez. i. 18; though in id. x. 12, it would appear as if the animals also were included. Again, the having six wings apiece is not found in the cherubim of Ezekiel, which have four, Ez. i. 6,—but belongs to the seraphim described in Isa. vi. 2, to whom also (see above) belongs the ascription of praise here given. So that these are forms compounded out of the most significant particulars of more than one O. T. vision.

In enquiring after their symbolic import, we are met by the most remarkable diversity of interpretation. 1) Our earliest Commentator, Victorinus, may serve as the type of those who have understood them to symbolize the Four Evan-

d ch. i. 8 (reff.). ὁ ἄ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. ⁹ καὶ

ΑΡΝ Β α
το π. 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 13.
26-7. 30.
32 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B.

gelists, or rather, *Gospels*:—"Simile leoni animal, Evangelium secundum Marcum, in quo vox leonis in eremo rugientis auditur, vox clamantis in deserto, Parate viam Domini. Hominis autem figura Matthæus enititur enunciare nobis genus Mariæ unde carnem accepit Christus. Ergo dum enumerat ab Abraham usque ad David et usque ad Joseph, tanquam de homine locutus est. Ideo prædicatio ejus hominis effigiem ostendit. Lucas sacerdotium Zachariæ offerentis hostiam pro populo, et apparentem sibi angelum dum enarrat, propter sacerdotium, et hostiæ conscriptionem, vituli imaginationem tenet. Joannes Evangelista aquilæ similis, assumptis pennis ad altiora festinans, de verbo Dei disputat." I have cited this comment at length, to shew on what fanciful and untenable ground it rests. For with perhaps the one exception of the last of the four, not one of the Evangelists has any inner or substantial accordance with the character thus assigned. Consequently these characteristics are found varied, and that in the earliest writer in whom the view can be traced, viz. Irenæus, who (iii. 11. 8, p. 190) makes the lion to be the gospel of St. John, which τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡγεμονικὴν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ ἐνδοξον γενεὰν διηγείται: the steer that of St. Luke, as above: the man, that of St. Matthew: the eagle, that of St. Mark, who ἀπὸ τοῦ προφητικοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἐξ ὕψους ἐπιδύοντος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο. So also Andreas in Catena. But again Augustine, de cons. evv. i. 6, vol. iii. p. 1046, attributes the lion to St. Matthew, the man to St. Mark, the steer to St. Luke, and the eagle to St. John. These notices may again serve to shew with what uncertainty the whole view is beset. It has nevertheless been adopted by Jerome (Prolog. ad ev. Matth., vol. vii. p. 5, 6), Primas, Bede, and many others of old, and among the moderns by Williams (on the Study of the Gospels, pp. 1—92), Scott (Interpretation of the Apocalypse, p. 132, but making, as Aug. above, the lion = St. Matthew, the man = St. Mark, the ox = St. Luke, and the eagle = St. John), Wordsworth (Lectures on the Apoc. p. 116, see also his note here, who, as in his statements on the other details, so here, ascribes unanimity (but see below) to the ancients: "in them the ancient church beheld a figure of the four gospels"), &c. The principal of the other interpretations have been: 2) the 4 elements; so some mentioned in the Catena; 3) the 4 cardinal

virtues: so Arethas, as cited by Corn.-a-lap., and generally: but not in the Catena: 4) the 4 faculties and powers of the human soul; "homo est vis rationalis, leo irascibilis, bos concupiscibilis, aquila est conscientia, sive spiritus;"—so Corn.-a-lap. refers to Sixtus Senensis as citing Greg. Naz. from Orig. Hom. 1 on Ezekiel, vol. iii. p. 361 f.: 5) Our Lord in the fourfold great events of Redemption: so a conjecture in the Catena (ἴσως δὲ καὶ διὰ τούτων ἡ οἰκονομία χριστοῦ δηλοῦνται διὰ τοῦ λέοντος, ὡς βασιλεὺς διὰ δὲ τοῦ μύσχου, ὡς ἱερεὺς, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἱερεῖον διὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ὡς δὲ ἡμᾶς ἀνδρωθεὶς διὰ τοῦ αἵτου, ὡς χορηγὸς τοῦ ζωοποιοῦ πνεύματος καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας καταπτήντος), Aretius, Ansbert (inter alia: for he tries to combine all possible interpretations which can relate to Christ and the Church); 6) the 4 patriarchal-churches: so Lyra, explaining the lion = Jerusalem, "propter constantiam ibi existentium," citing Acts v. 29: the ox = Antioch, "quia fuit parata obedire mandatis Apostolorum in Judæa existentium, et quia (?) primo in ea vocati sunt discipuli Christiani:" the man = Alexandria, "nam in ea a principio fuerunt doctores docti non solum in literis divinis sed etiam humanis:" the eagle = Constantinople, "nam in ea fuerunt viri per contemplationem elevati, ut Gregorius Naz. et plures alii." This is referred to by Corn.-a-lap., who ends characteristically, "Hæ quatuor sunt in circuitu throni Dei, id est, Cathedræ Romanæ, in qua sedet vicarius Dei:" 7) the 4 great Apostles, Peter, "fervens animo et in hoc leonæ similis;" James the Lord's brother, because "bos patientiam significat;" Matthew, "bonitate homo antecedit animantia cætera. Puto designari Matthæum qui diu dicitur mansisse in Judæa" (?): Paul, because the eagle "celeritatem ministerii significat, quod certe Paulo proprium qui sæpius Hierosolymis fuit. Et bene πετομένω, quia semper erat in cursu:" so Grotius: 8) all the doctors of the church: so Vitringa, al.: 9) "in quatuor animalibus istis quatuor speciales ordines designati sunt, quorum primus pastorum est, secundus diaconorum, tertius doctorum, quartus contemplantium," Joachim: 10) the 4 representatives of the N. T. church, as the four standards of the tribes Reuben, Judah, Ephraim, and Dan, which are traditionally thus reported (see also Num. ii.), were of the O. T. church. So Mede and many others: 11) the 4 virtues of the Apostles, "magnanimitas, beneficentia, æquitas sapientia,"—Alcasar (in De W.):

ὅταν δώσουσιν τὰ ζῶα ^e δόξαν καὶ ^f τιμὴν καὶ ^g εὐχαριστίαν ^h τῷ καθημένῳ ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ τῷ ^h ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν

^{xxviii. 1.}
^{Theod. vi. 26. see ch. i. 18} ^{g 1 Thess. iii. 9} ^{ch vii. 12 al. +} ^{Wisd. xvi. 28.} ^{h DAN. iv. 31 (34)}

^{† = Jude 25 reff}
^{† = 1 Tim. i.}
^{17. vi. 16.}
^{ch v. 12, 13.}
^{vii. 12} ^{Ps.}

9. δωσωσιν **N** B fl 12-6. 32-corr 39: δωσι rel, δωσει 13. 27. 40: txt A[P] 1. 18. 32¹-3(-4, e sil)-6-8 Andr. om δοξαν **N**¹. ευχαριστιας A: txt [P]**N** B rel. rec του θρονου, with B rel: txt A[P]**N**.

12) the 4 principal angels, Corn.-a-lap., Laun., al.: 13) the angelic, or is-angelic, state of the glorified church: so Elliott, vol. i. p. 87. But thus we have no account given of the peculiar symbolism of these living-beings, nor of the part which they perform in the act of praise below. There are many other interpretations and ramifications of interpretation, hardly worth recounting. But the one which above all these seems to me to require our notice is that which is indicated in the rabbinical sentence cited by Schöttgen here: "Quatuor sunt qui principatum in hoc mundo tenent. Inter creaturas homo, inter aves aquila, inter pecora bos, inter bestias leo." The four cherubic forms are the representatives of animated nature—of God's sentient creation. In Ezekiel, each form is compounded of the four. Here, the four forms are distinct. There (xxviii. 12), where the prince of Tyrrus is compared to one of them, it is called the impression of similitude, and the crown of beauty: in Isaiah vi., where the seraphim, which enter into the composition of these living beings, ascribe holiness to Jehovah, they cry, "His glory is the fulness of the whole earth." With this view, every thing that follows is in accordance. For when these, and the 24 elders, in vv. 9—11, fall down before the throne, the part which these living-beings bear in the great chorus of praise is sufficiently indicated by the reason which is given for their *ἀξιος εἶ*, viz. *ὅτι σὺ ἐκτίσας τὰ πάντα, καὶ διὰ τὸ θέλημά σου ἦσαν καὶ ἐκτίσθησαν*. The objection brought against this view by Ebrard, viz. that Behemoth, the king of the waters, is not here represented, is mere trifling. He forgets that in the record of creation, the noblest of the creatures sprung from the waters are not fishes, but birds; and that the eagle represents both. It is in strict accordance also with this view, that these living-beings are full of eyes, ever wakeful, ever declaring the glory of God: that they have each six wings, which doubtless are to be taken as in Isa. vi. from which the figure comes—"with twain he covered his face (*reverence*), in not venturing to look on the divine majesty), and with twain he covered

his feet (*humility*, hiding his own created form from the glory of the Creator), and with twain he did fly (*obedience*, readiness to perform the divine commands). This view is taken by the best of the modern Commentators: by Herder, De Wette, Rinck, Hengstb., Dusterd. Ebrard differs only in this, that he regards them as symbolic not of creation itself, but of the creative power of God. Stern, whose commentary on this whole passage is very able and beautiful, inclines rather to take them as representing the power of divine grace within the church of God: but in his usual interpretation (see in p. 209, on *ὅταν δώσουσιν, κ.τ.λ.*) treats them as "alles creatürliche Leben der Natur." See also my Hulsean Lectures for 1841, vol. i. Lecture ii. We have thus the throne of God surrounded by His Church and His animated world: the former represented by the 24 elders, the latter by the four living-beings. 9—11.] *The everlasting song of praise of creation, in which the church joins.* It is well observed by Dusterd., that the ground of this ascription of praise is not *redemption*, which first comes in ch. v. 9 ff.—but the power and glory of God as manifested in Creation; so that the words of the elders are in beautiful harmony with the praise of the four living-beings, and with the signification of the whole vision. And **whenever the living-beings shall give** (the future *δώσουσι* must not be pressed quite so strongly as is done by De Wette (so also Stern), "from henceforth for all the time to come: see ch. vii. 15 ff.: beforetime it was not so, seeing that the 24 elders have only assumed their place since Christ's work of Redemption has been proceeding and His victory developing." Still, it is more than a mere frequentative put for the regular subjunctive, as Dusterd., after Vitruv., Beng., Hengstb., and Ebr. It has a distinct pointing onward towards the future, implying eternal repetition of the act, which the subjunctive would not carry) **glory and honour** (i. e., recognition of His glory and honour) and **thanksgiving** (i. e. actual giving of thanks: the 3 accusatives are not strictly co-ordinate in meaning) **to Him that**

αίωνων, ¹⁰ i πεσούνται οἱ εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι ΑΡΝ Β 3
¹¹ i ἐνώπιον τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ προσκυνή- 10 n, 1.
²³ (see ch. 2. 4. 6. 9.
^{xix. 10} xxi. 10-3. 16
^{8. 1} σουσιν τῷ ^h ζῶντι εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, καὶ βα- to 19. 26.
^k ch. v. 12. 7. 30. 32
^{const. ch. v.} λουσιν τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῶν ^k ἐνώπιον τοῦ ^k θρόνου λέ- to 42.
^{2. 4. reff.} γοντες ¹¹ l' Ἀξίος εἶ, ὁ κύριος καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, λαβεῖν 47 to 51.
^{m = Rev only.} τὴν ^e δόξαν καὶ τὴν ^f τιμὴν καὶ τὴν ^m δύναμιν, ὅτι σὺ ἐκτι- 90 B.
^{ch v 12} vii. 12 (xii. 10.) xix 1.
^{vii. 12 (xii. 10.) xix 1.} [ex' Mat' vi 13 rec]
^{vi 13 rec]} 1 Chron. xxix. 11.
^{1 Chron.} xxix. 11.
^{xxix. 11.} n = Rom xi 36
^{n = Rom xi 36} Col. 1. 16 al. Job viii 3. o = John vi 57. p plur., ch. i. 19 reff.

(homœotel αίωνων this ver and next a 32.) at end add αμην. g 32: αμην. και Ν.
 10. rec aft εικοσι ins kai, with 33 (4. 9. 16-7-8-9. 30-4 6 Bcl's-5-mss 90, e sil) : om
 A[P]N B rel Andr Areth.—(κδ' B g h k l n 1. 10. 49. 50. 92.) Steph προσκυνουσι.
 txt A[P]N B rel Andr Areth. aft αίωνων ins αμην Ν. Steph βαλλουσι, with
 N¹ B m n 1. 17. 30-2-6. 49¹ Andr-a: txt A[P]N-corr rel vss Andr Areth. for
 λεγοντες, εντες (sic) N¹.

11. rec (for ο κς κ. ο θς ημ.) κυριε, with 1 : κυριε ο θεος ημων [P] l n 16. 36-8-9. 47 :
 κε ο κς και θς ημων Ν c : txt A B rel am syr-dd Andr-p-coisl Areth Thdor-stud. (om
 kai vss.) aft ημων ins ο αγιος B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Thdor-stud : αγιος
 (only) 13. 92 : ουρανιος k : om A[P]N l n (1, e sil) 16. 36-8-9. 47 vulg copt. om
 2nd την Ν : om kai την 50. om 3rd την A : om kai την k². om τα B rel
 Andr Areth : ins A[P]N n 10-7. 30²-6-8 (h 2. 37-9. 40-1-2-9 Br, e sil). δια
 θεληματι σου A. rec (for ησαν) εισι, with [P] l m 1. 10-3-7 (sic?) 34-5 (h 37-9.
 47-9 Br, e sil) : ουκ ησαν B (Tischdf not Mai) f 38. 51 : om ησαν και 36 : txt AN rel (and
 92) vulg syr-dd copt Areth Tich Primas. om kai εκτισθησαν (homœotel ?) A : ins
 [P]N B rel.

sitteth upon the throne, to Him that liveth to the ages of the ages, the twenty-four elders shall fall down before Him that sitteth upon the throne, and shall worship Him that liveth to the ages of the ages (cf. ch. v. 8, xix. 4), and shall cast down their crowns (to disclaim all honour and dignity of their own, and acknowledge that all belongs to Him. See instances of casting down crowns cited in Wetstein. Cf. especially Tacit. Ann. xv. 29: "ad quam (effigiem Neronis) progressus Tridates . . sublatum capiti diadema imagini subiecit") before the throne, saying, Thou art worthy, O Lord and our (Dusterd. remarks that the ἡμῶν has a force here peculiarly belonging to the 24 elders, as representing the redeemed, and thus standing in a covenant relation to God nearer than that of the 4 living-beings. But we must not forget, that Creation is only a part of Redemption, Col. i. 20) God, to receive the glory (τὴν δ. &c., as alluding to the δόξα &c., ver. 9, ascribed by the living-beings. The articles are improperly omitted in E. V.) and the honour and the might (observe that τὴν δύναμιν in the mouth of the 24 elders represents εὐχαριστίαν in that of the 4 living-beings. The elders, though themselves belonging to creation, in this ascription of praise look on creation from

without, and that thanksgiving, which creation renders for its being, becomes in their view a tribute to Him who called them into being, and thus a testimony to His creative power. And thus the reason follows): because Thou didst create all things (τὰ πάντα, "this universal whole," the universe), and on account of Thy will (i. e. because Thou didst will it: "propter voluntatem tuam," as Vulg.: not burch Deinen Willen, as Luther, which represents did with a gen. "For thy pleasure," of the E. V., introduces an element entirely strange to the context, and however true in fact, most inappropriate here, where the δτι renders a reason for the ἀξίωτης of ἡ δόξα, ἡ τιμή, and ἡ δύναμις) they were (ἦσαν, not = ἐγενήθησαν, came into being, as De W., al.: for this it cannot signify: nor again, though thus the requirement of ἦσαν would be satisfied, as Lyra, "in dispositione tua ab æterno, antequam crearentur:" nor, as Grot., "erant jam homines quia tu volueras, et conditi sunt, id est, iterum conditi, per Christum:" nor again as Bengel, "all things were, from the creation down to the time of this ascription of praise and henceforward." The best explanation is that of Dusterd., they existed, as in contrast to their previous non-existence: whereby not their

V. 1 Καὶ εἶδον ^α ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ^q θρόνου βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ἔσθωθεν καὶ ^r ὀπισθεν ^s κατ- q = ch. xx. 1.
2 Cor. iii. 15.
see ch. iii. 20
reff. & note.

^r see note. Εζεκ. ii. 9, 10.

Deut. xxxii. 34. Isa. xxix. 11. (viii. 16.)

^s here only. Job ix. 7. xxxvii. 7. Wisd. ii. 5 only. = σφραγίζω,

CHAP. V. 1. om βιβλίον γεγραμμένον ^N¹ (ins ^N^{1a}). for ὀπισθεν, ἐξωθεν [P] B rel
Orig-ed Andr Areth Ec: *foris* vulg lat-ff: txt A f 51 Orig-ms Epiph, *retro* Cyp.—εξ.
κ. εσ. 18 : ἐμπροσθεν καὶ ὀπισθεν ^N Orig.₂ ins καὶ bef κατεσφρ. ^N^{3a} : καὶ εσφραγ. 82.

coming into being, but the simple fact of their being, is asserted.

The remarkable reading οὐκ ἦσαν is worth notice: "by reason of Thy will they were not, and were created:" i.e. "they were created out of nothing." But besides the preponderance of authority the other way, there is the double chance, that οὐκ may have arisen from the preceding ου, and that it may have been an escape from the difficulty of ἦσαν) and were created (they both had their being,—ἦσαν; and received it from Thee by a definite act of Thine,—ἐκτίσθησαν).

CH. V. 1—14.] *The book with seven seals*, containing ^α δὲ γενέσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα, which the Seer was to be shewn, ch. iv. 1. *None found worthy to open it but the Lamb, who takes it for this purpose, amidst the praises of the heavenly host, of the church, and of the creation of God.*

1.] *The sealed book.* And I saw (notice, that from the general vision, in the last chapter, of the heavenly Presence of God, the scene is so far only changed that, all that remaining as described, a particular incident is now seen for the first time, and is introduced by καὶ εἶδον) (lying) on the right hand (i.e. the right hand was open, and the book lay on the open hand. So in ch. xx. 1, where see note. The common rendering, *in* the right hand, misses the ἐπὶ with the accus. Beza's and Ebrard's rendering, "on the right side of Him on the throne," is shewn to be wrong by what follows ver. 7, where the Lamb takes the book ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τ. θρ.: see there. The lying on the open hand imports, that *on God's part* there was no withholding of His future purposes as contained in this book. The only obstacle to unsealing it was as follows, ver. 3) of Him that sat upon the throne a book (i.e. "a roll of a book," as in Ezek. ii. 9 f. This explanation alone will suit the meaning of the word-as applied to the contemporary practice regarding sacred writings. See also Jer. xxxvi. 2, 23; Zech. v. 2: and below) written within and behind (such scrolls, written not only, as commonly, on the inner side, but also on the outer, which, to one reading the inner, was *behind* (see

below), are mentioned by Pliny, Epist. iii. 5, who says of his uncle Pliny the elder, "tot ista volumina peregit, electorumque commentarios CLX mihi reliquit, *opistographos* quidem et minutissime scriptos, qua ratione multiplicatur hic numerus:" by Lucian, *Vitarum auctio*, i. p. 549, ἡ πῆρα δέ σοι θερμῶν ἔσται μεστή, καὶ ὀπισθογράφων βιβλίων: by Juvenal, Sat. i. 6, "summi plena jam margine libri Scriptus et *in tergo nondum finitus* Orestes:" by Martial, viii. 22, "Scribit *in aversa* Picens epigrammata *charta*." This writing within and without, so that the whole roll was full, betokens the *completeness* of the contents as containing the divine counsels: there was no room for addition to that which was therein written. This would be of itself a sufficient reason for the *fullness* of the scroll. To see, as Elliott, i. p. 99; iii. p. 4, two *divisions of written matter* indicated, by the writing within, and by that on the back, correspondent to one another, seems hardly warranted by the text), fast-sealed with seven seals (not, consisting of seven writings, each sealed with one seal, as Grot. (who joins καὶ ὀπισθ. with κατεσφραγισμ.), Vitringa, Wetst., Storr, Ewald, al.: but one book, fastened with seven seals, which were visible to the Apostle. Various ingenious methods have been imagined, by which the opening of each of these seals may have loosened a corresponding portion of the roll: see e.g. the apocalyptic chart in Elliott, vol. i. p. 111, and its explanation, ib. note 2, p. 98. But they all proceed on the assumption that the roll in the vision was *unfolded*, which is no where to be gathered from the text. Nor have we any right to say that the separate visions which follow the opening of each seal are identical with *separate portions* of writing on the roll. These visions are merely symbolic representations of the progress of God's manifestation of the purpose of His will; but no portion of the roll is actually unfolded, nor is any thing read out of the book. Not its contents, but the gradual steps of access to it, are represented by these visions. What is *in* that book, shall not be known, until, in full completion, γνωρισθῇ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις διὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡ πολυ-

Rev. (v.—ix.
passim) only,
exc. Rom. iv
11. 1 Cor ix 2. 2 Tim. ii. 19. Hagg. ii. 24.

εσφραγισμένον [†] σφραγίσιν ἑπτά. ² καὶ εἶδον [‡] ἄγγελον

u so ch. x. 1. xxi. 21.

APN B a
to 11, 1.
2 4. 6 9.
10-3 16
to 19, 26-
7, 30, 32
to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B^c.

ποικίλος σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ, Eph. iii. 10: till those material events, which marked the gradual opening of the sum of God's purposes, are all past, and the roll is contemplated in its completeness by the spirits of the glorified hereafter. This *completeness* is here set forth to us again by the mystic number *seven*. See some excellent remarks on the entire distinctness of the *opening of the seals*, and the *reading of the book*, in Corn.-a-lap., p. 77 c:—"nihil enim in libro legi poterat, nisi post resignationem omnium septem sigillorum: omnibus enim reseratis, tunc demum aperiri et legi potuit liber, non ante." So also Ribera, p. 197: "calamitates illæ quæ sigillis continebantur, prius omnes pene venturæ erant, quam ea quæ in libro scripta erant, apparerent et cognoscerentur." Mr. Elliott, in his work "Apocalypsis Alfordiana," specially directed against my commentary on this book, treats this view with all the scorn which is unfortunately so characteristic of him, calling it absurd, unscriptural, &c. He has not produced a word of proof, or even illustrative corroboration, of his own view, that the opening of each seal corresponds to the unrolling of a certain portion of the scroll: but has contented himself with re-asserting it in the strongest language, and pouring contempt on those who hold the other view. I grieve to say, that this is so often the case throughout his above-mentioned work, as to render it generally impossible for me to meet his objections in argument. One who distrusts his own as well as all other explanations, and believes that much of this mysterious book is as yet unfathomed, is no match for one who hesitates not on every occasion to shew his confidence that he is in the right, and all who differ from him are wrong.

An enquiry here arises, *What is represented by this Book?* Opinions have been very various. 1) Some of our earliest Commentators understood by it the Old Testament: or the Old and New conjoined. So, apparently, Orig. (in Ezech., Hom. xiv., vol. iii. p. 405: where after quoting our vv. 2—5, he says, "quamdiu non venit Deus meus, clausa erat lex, clausus sermo propheticus, velata lectio veteris testamenti." But again, he says, ἡ γὰρ πᾶσα γραφή ἐστὶν ἡ δηλουμένη διὰ τῆς βίβλου: so that he can hardly be safely quoted for this view). Euseb. (Demonstr. Ev. viii. 2, vol. iv. p. 386,—ποῖας δὲ σφραγίδας, ἡ τῶν προφητῶν τὰς ἀσαφείας:), Epiphanius (Hær. li. 32, vol. i. p. 454, ὅσα γὰρ ἦν νόμος καὶ ἐν προφήταις

σκοτεινὰ καὶ αἰνιγματώδη, ταῦτα ὁ κύριος φρονόμησε διὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰς ἡμῶν σωτηρίαν τῷ δούλῳ αὐτῷ Ἰωάννῃ ἀποκαλύψαι), Hippolytus (in Dan. frag. xix., Migne, Patrol. vol. x. p. 653 f., ὅτι δὲ τὰ παλαιὰ διὰ νόμου καὶ προφητῶν λελαλημένα πάντα ἦν ἐσφραγισμένα κ. ἔγνωστα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις υπάρχοντα Ἡσαίας λέγει (xxix. 11) . . . τὰ μὲν οὖν πάλαι ἐσφραγισμένα νῦν διὰ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου πάντα τοῖς ἁγίοις ἠνέγγεν. αὐτοὺς γὰρ ἦν ἡ τέλεια σφραγὶς καὶ κλεῖς ἡ ἐκκλησία, ὁ ἀνοίγων καὶ οὐδεὶς κλείει, κ.τ.λ., ὡς Ἰωάννης λέγει. καὶ πάλιν ὁ αὐτὸς φησι καὶ εἶδον, κ.τ.λ. our vv. 1, 2 and 6, 9), Andreas (βίβλος δὲ καὶ ἡ προφητεία νοεῖται);—Victorinus ("in dextera autem sedentis super tribunal liber scriptus intus et foris, signatus sigillis septem, vetus testamentum significat, quod est datum in manibus Dei nostri"), Primasius, Bede ("hæc visio mysteria nobis Sanctæ Scripturæ per incarnationem Domini patefacta demonstrat. Cujus unitas concors vetus testamentum quasi exterius, et novum continet interius:" and so Augustine), Tichonius (similarly to Bede), Hilary (Prol. to Comm. on Psalms, vol. i. p. 6, "Liber iste, et præterita et futura in his quæ intus et foris scripta erant continens, a nemine dignus est aperiri, &c. . . . Sed vicit leo ex tribu Judæ, &c.: quia solus septem illa . . . signacula quibus liber clausus est, per sacramentum corporacionis suæ et divinitatis absolvit. Id ipsum autem Dominus post resurrectionem testatus est, dicens Quoniam oportet omnia impleri quæ scripta sunt in lege Moysis et in prophetis, et in psalmis de me." But see more on Hilary under 2), below), Ambrose (Comm. in Psal. cxviii. 64, § viii. 64, vol. i. (ii. Migne), p. 1078, "legisti in Apocalypsi quod Agnus librum signatum aperuit, quem nullus ante aperire poterat. Quia solus Dominus Jesus in evangelio suo prophetarum ænigmata et legis mysteria revelavit: solus scientiæ clavem detulit, et dedit aperire nobis"), Jerome (Comm. on Is. xxix. 9—12, vol. iv. p. 393: "Leo autem de tribu Juda Dominus Jesus Christus est, qui solvit signacula libri, non proprie unus, ut multi putant, Psalmore David, sed omnium Scripturarum, quæ uno scriptæ sunt Spiritu sancto, et propterea unus liber appellantur"), al.: and so Joachim, Gregory the Great, Haymo, Ansbert (as Bede above), the glossa ordinaria (the same), Aquinas, al. I have given several of the above testimonies at length, as helping us to estimate this view. For it

ἡ ἰσχυρὸν κηρύσσοντα ἔν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Τίς ἄξιος ἀνοῖξαι ὁ βιβλίον καὶ λῦσαι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ; ἢ καὶ οὐδεὶς
 Luke xi. 21. Acts xlii. 25. ch. iv. 11. x John i. 27. Acts xxvii. 41. Gen. xlii. 27.

2. κηρύσσοντα bef ἰσχυρον Ν. rec om εν, with [P] h m n 1. 17. 36-8 (27. 37. 49 Br, e sil) Orig-ed Epiph Andr-a: ins ΑΝ Β rel Orig-mss Andr Areth. rec ins εστιν bef αξιος, with 1 (19, e sil) vulg Primas; aft αξιος Β rel Andr Areth: om Α[P]Ν h frag-n₂ 4. 10-2-7. 36-7-8. 49 Br, Orig Epiph. (frag-n₂ = a few verses written a 2nd time on p. 18 of cod. n.)

will appear from them, that the opening of the seals was very generally by these fathers and interpreters taken to mean, the fulfilment, and consequent bringing to light, of O. T. prophecy by the events of Redemption as accomplished in the Person of our Lord. But, if so, then this view cannot consist with what follows in the Apocalypse. For manifestly the opening of the seals, as notified by the symbolic visions belonging to each, does not relate to things past, but to things which were yet future when this book was written. Nor can this apparent consensus of the early expositors be cited, as it has been e.g. by Dr. Adams ("Sealed Book, &c." pp. 82 ff.), in support of any *other* view than theirs, in which this Book shall still represent the O. T. Such for example is that of Dr. Adams himself, who regards the opening of the sealed book as symbolizing a future republication of the genuine text of the O. T., by which the Jewish people is to be converted. The untenableness of this view appears at once, if only from (so to speak) its touching the apocalyptic course of visions at this point only, and finding no justification or expansion in any of the symbolic visions accompanying the opening of the seals. 2) Some have held the Book to be *Christ Himself*: so Hilary (as cited by Corn-a-lap. from the Prologue to the Psalms, "Liber, ait, hic est Christus, quia Christus est hujus libri materia et argumentum:" and, "sigilla septem, ait Hilarius, sunt septem præcipua Christi mysteria, &c." But the words are not found in that prologue), Heterius (Migne, Patr. Lat., vol. xcvi. pp. 963 ff.), Paschasius (Præfatio in Matth. p. 11). But for the same reasons as above, neither can this be held. 3) Wetstein takes it to be "libellus repudii a Deo scriptus nationi Judaicæ:" which for the same reason falls to the ground. 4) Schöttgen, "sententiam a Judice et patribus ejus conscriptis in hostes ecclesiæ conceptam:" and similarly in the main, Hengstenberg: but this view, though strongly defended by Hengstb., is not borne out by the contents of these chapters. 5) Alcasar holds it to be that part of the Apocalypse which treats of the

opening of the seven seals (ch. vi.—xi.): and nearly so Hengstb. also, except that he allows only from vi. 1 to viii. 1 for this portion. But both are obviously wrong, seeing that the opening of the seventh seal evolves a series of symbolic actions which only ends with the book itself. So that this comes to 6) the Book being = the Apocalypse itself: so Corn-a-lap., seeing in the seven seals that part relating to their opening, and after that regarding the subsequent visions concerning Antichrist and the end of the world, as the *contents of the book itself*. But he seems, in concluding his paragraph, to resolve this view into the wider one 7) that the Book represents "divinæ providentiæ concilium et præfinitio, qua apud Se statuit et decrevit facere vel permittere, &c." This is very nearly that of Areth. (in Catena, τι δὲ τὸ βιβλίον; ἡ πάνσοφος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἀνεπίληπτος μνήμη, ἣν καὶ ὁ προφήτης Δαβὶδ καὶ Μωυσῆς παρεδῆλου, ὁ μὲν διὰ τοῦ Ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον σου πάντες γραφήσανται ὁ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Κάμὲ ἐξάλειψον ἐκ τῆς βίβλου ἧς ἔγραψας), Lyra ("liber iste est divina scientia, in qua omnia sunt scripta"), Vitringa, Mede ("codex fatidicus seu consiliorum Dei"), Ewald, De Wette, Stern, Dusterd., al. And this is, in the main, my own view. We may observe, that it is in fact but a limitation of this meaning, when many understand the Book to contain the prophetic fortunes of the Church of Christ: but also that it is a limitation which has arisen from the mistake, noticed above, of confounding the opening of the seals with the reading of the contents of the book. Those successive openings, or if we will, the fortunes and periods of the Church and world, are but so many preparations for that final state of perfection in which the Lamb shall reveal to the Church the contents of the Book itself. 2.] And I saw a strong angel (the epithet ἰσχυρὸν is by no means superfluous, but corresponds to the φωνῇ μεγάλῃ below, which, as appears by what followed, penetrated heaven and earth and Hades. Compare ch. x. 1, 3 and notes) proclaiming in (reff.; the voice is the vehicle, or investiture, of the thing proclaimed) a loud voice, Who is worthy (see

γ Exod. xx 4. ἡδύνατο ὃ ἐν τῷ ὕψι τῆς γῆς οὐδὲ ὑποκάτω ἀπὸ βα
 i = here his only. τῆς γῆς ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον οὐδὲ ὁ βλέπειν αὐτό. 4 καὶ
 a John only (ch. ii. 7 al. fr.) ex Luke xi. 22 Rom. iii. 4 (from Ps i. 4). xii 21 bis. βιβλίον οὐτε ὁ βλέπειν αὐτό. 5 καὶ εἷς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυ-
 constr., see note. τέρων λέγει μοι Μὴ κλαίε· ἰδοὺ ὁ ἀνίκησεν ὁ ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ
 b Gen. xlii. 9. c ch. xii. 16. τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα, ἡ ὁ ῥίζα Δαυεὶδ, ἀνοῖξαι τὸ βιβλίον καὶ
 see Rom. xv. 12, from Isa. xi. 1, 10.

3. aft *sup.* ins *ανω* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl: om A[P]N m n 10. 33. 51 (h 1. 2. 4. 17-8-9. 37. 47-9 Br, e sil) vulg Orig Epiph Andr Areth Cyp Hil Primas. οὐτε (thrice) B a c d e f g j k m 4 6. 13-8-9. 26-7. 30-2-4-5-6. 42-8. 50. 90, (twice) N b frag-n₂ 51, 1st time 33, 2nd time 38, and (3rd time) l 16. 33-8. om οὐτε υπ. τ. γ. N: ins aft αὐτο 1. om from οὐτε βλέπ. up to οὐτε βλέπ. in next ver A k.

4. om *εγω* [P]N frag-n₂ 1. 36 copt Orig Epiph. ἐκλααν N¹: εκλεον N^{3a} 36. rec (for πολυ) πολλα: πολλοι 1 copt: txt [P]N (B) rel Andr Areth, *multum* vulg lat.-ff.—πολυ B 92. ευρεθησεται N¹. rec aft ανοιξει ins *κα αναγινωαι*, with h 1. 10-7. 36. 49 (37-9 Br, e sil) Andr: aft βιβλιον, arm: om [P]N B rel vss Orig Epiph Andr-coisl Areth.

5. [om μοι P Orig-ms Areth.] om 2nd o N f frag-n₂. rec ins ων bef 2nd εκ, with 1 Andr-p: om A[P]N B rel Orig Eus Epiph Andr Areth. for ανοιξει, ανοιξας 90: ανοιγων 33: o ανοιγων B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N 1. 10-7. 36-8. 49. 51 (h l n 16. 37-9 Br, e sil) vulg copt Orig Epiph Andr lat.-ff.

reff. ἄξιος here = *ικανός* Matt. viii. 8) to open the book and to loose the seals of it? and no one was able, in heaven, nor yet upon the earth, nor yet under the earth (in Hades, the place of departed spirits: not, as Grot., *in mari*), to open the book, nor yet to look on it (if we were reading an ordinary Greek sentence, this οὐδέ would introduce a climax, which would rule the meaning to be, "*nor even so much as to look upon the book*;" lying there closed as it did. But the somewhat indiscriminate use of οὐδέ in the former clause, in which no such climax can be intended, removes this necessity, and enables us to take βλέπειν of an act subsequent to the ἀνοῖξαι,—the looking on the book, with a view to read it. For the claim to open the book must be founded on a claim of worthiness to see that which was contained in it). 4.] And I (ἐγὼ emphatic, 'I, for my part') wept much, because no one was found worthy to open the book nor to look upon it ("per hunc fletum designatur Johannis desiderium de sciendo ecclesiae futurum processum." Lyra. It had been promised to him, ch. iv. 1, that he should be shewn future events: and now it seemed as if this promise were about to be frustrated by the lack of one worthy to open the book. There was no weakness of faith, as Hengstb. fancies: indeed such a supposition is entirely out of place here: St. John is in this book the simple recipient of the Apocalypse: for *that* he is summoned to the heavenly scene, for *that* he is waiting in humility: but that now

seems to be precluded, and his tears burst forth in the earnestness of disappointed desire after the fulfilment of the promise. Christ, as the opener of the book, is not yet revealed to him: and to have him anticipating that revelation by the power of his individual faith, would be to put him out of his place and violate consistency).

5.] And one from among the elders ("dicunt aliqui," says Lyra, "quod fuit Matthæus evangelista, qui dixit in persona Christi, Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra:" he himself preferring *Peter*, who had before this suffered martyrdom, and who was "unus, id est, primus, inter Apostolos." But see the interpretation of the elders above, ch. iv. 4. The elders, in their triumphant place round God's throne, know better than the Evangelist, yet clothed with the infirmities of this earthly state, the nature and extent of the victory and glory of Christ.

It is the practice of the book to introduce the heavenly beings thus talking with the Seer: cf. ch. vii. 13 f.; x. 4, 8 ff.; xvii. 1; xix. 9; xxi. 9, &c.; xxii. 8, &c.) saith to me, Weep not: behold (the ἰδοὺ serves to present before him the scene of which he says in the next verse καὶ εἶπον) the Lion which is from the tribe of Judah (from ref. Gen.: the lion, as victorious: from the tribe of Judah, as the Messiah of promise, sprung from among the brethren of the Seer, and so carrying more comfort to him), the root of David (from ref. Isa.: i. e. the branch or sucker come up from the ancient root,

τὰς ἑπτὰ σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ. ⁶ καὶ εἶδον ^d ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ^d θρόνου καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ ἐν μέσῳ τῶν πρεσ-
 βυτέρων ^e ἀρνίον ἑστηκὸς ^f ὡς ^g ἐσφαγμένον ἔχων ^h κέρατα
 ἑπτὰ καὶ ⁱ ὀφθαλμοὺς ⁱ ἑπτὰ, οἳ εἰσιν τὰ ^k ἑπτὰ ^k πνεύματα
 τοῦ θεοῦ ^l ἀπεσταλμένα εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν. ⁷ καὶ ἦλθεν

^{vi} 4, 9. xiii. 3, 8. xiiii. 24. ¹ John iii. 12 (bis) only. J. Exod. xii. 6.
¹³ al⁸. only, exc. Luke i. 69. Dan. vii. 7. ¹ Zech. iv. 10.
¹ Heb. i. 14. Isa. vi. 6. see Zech. iv. 9.

^d ch. iv. 6. see
^e Rev. passim.
^f elsw., John
 xxi. 15 only.
^g Ps. cxiii. 4, 6.
^h Jer. xi. 19.
 xxvii. (1.) 45
 only.
ⁱ see ch. xiii. 3.
^j i. iv. 3.]
^g v. 9, 12 ch.
^h Rev. (ch. ix.
 k ch. i. 4 reff.

rec ins λυσαι bef τας επτα, with **N** (41, e sil) ulg-ed (with demid lipss, agst am fuld &c) Andr-p Cypr Jer: om A [P] B rel vss Orig Epiph Andr Hil.

6. rec aft και ειδον (ιδον B f 33 &c: simly elsw) ins και ιδου, with m 34-5 vulg (not lips-): και ιδου και, omg ειδον, A: txt [P] **N** B rel vss Andr Areth Iren-int Cypr Primas. εστηκως **N** l m n 1. 32. rec εχον, with [P] 1. 10 &c: txt **AN** B l n 33-6. om και οφθαλμους επτα 1. for οζ, & B rel Andr Areth: σινα j 47: txt **AN** 1. (30 P) 51 (m 38, e sil) Andr-p. [P def.] om 3rd επτα A 1. 12 am¹ (with fuld harl¹) æth Tich: ins **N** B rel vss Andr Areth Iren-int Cypr Firm. [P def: but there is not room for επτα.] rec του θεου bef πνευματα, with 1 (40, e sil): txt A [P] **N** B rel. rec ins τα bef απ., with (1 n P) 1. 6. 13-6. 37. 41-2 (B^r, e sil): om **AN** B rel. [P def.] αποστελλομενα B rel Andr Areth: απεσταλμενοι A: om n: txt **N** 1. 38. 49. [P def.]

and so representing it: not, as Calov., al., the Divine root which brought forth David, —to which Vitringa also approaches very near:—for the evident design here is to set forth Christ as *sprung from* the tribe of Judah and lineage of David, and His victory as His exaltation through suffering, ver. 6), *conquered* (as De W. well remarks, this word needs no comparison with any Hebrew usage to explain it (so Vitringa: “vox Hebræa נָצַח circa recentiora tempora reip. Hebr. receptissima fuit hoc us ut significaverit mereri, dignum esse, haberi vel censi: imo etiam simpliciter obtinere, nancisci provinciam v. munus administrandum.” And so the majority of Commentators, as E. V., “hath prevailed to open:” most of al Ewald, “Messiam a Deo veniam hanc petiisse et impetrasse”), but is simply to be taken as standing in its proper sense in a pregnant construction. The usual rendering loses sight of the victory of Christ, and of the uniform sense in which the verb *νικᾷν* is constantly used in this book. The aor. must not be resolved into a perfect, but points to the past event of that great victory, by virtue of which the opening is in His power), (so as) to open (construction, see above) the book and (in order to that) its seven seals. 6.] *The vision of the Lamb.*

And I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living-beings, and in the midst of the elders (the words seem to indicate the middle point before the throne; whether on the glassy sea (De W.) or not, does not appear; but certainly not on the throne, from what follows in the next verse. ἐν μέσῳ is repeated, as ἀναμύσον in Levit. xxvii. 12,

14) a lamb (the use of ἀρνίον, the *diminutive*, as applied to our Lord, is peculiar to the Apocalypse. It is difficult to say what precise idea is meant to be conveyed by this form. Elsewhere, it is ἀμνός, John i. 29, 36; 1 Pet. i. 19; Acts viii. 32: and as ἀμνός is found in Isa. liii. 7, from which the figure here is taken, the alteration of the word appears to be purposely made. Possibly, as De W., it may be to put forward more prominently the idea of meekness and innocence) standing (i. e. in its natural living position: the word is probably chosen on account of immediately follows. Though ὡς ἐσφαγμένον, it was not lying, but standing), as if slain (i. e. retaining the appearance of death-wounds on its body: looking as if it had been slain: cf. ch. i. 18. So the majority of Commentators: cf. especially Vitringa:—“vivens equidem, verumtamen insignitum nota majoris alicujus in jugulo vulneris, et conspersum sanguine.” Ebrard is quite wrong in supposing that the ὡς has any emphasis on it: it merely serves to solve the apparent paradox lying in the juxtaposition of ἑστηκός and ἐσφαγμένον), having (the gender again is that not of the thing expressed, but of the thing signified. See above, ch. iv. 1) seven horns (the horn is the well-known emblem of might: cf. 1 Sam. ii. 10; 1 Kings xxii. 11; Ps. cxii. 9, cxlviii. 14; Dan. vii. 7, 20 ff., viii. 3 ff.; ch. xvii. 3 ff. The perfect number seven represents that “all power is given unto Him in heaven and earth,” Matt. xxviii. 18) and seven eyes, which (eyes) are the seven spirits of God, sent forth (as they have been) into the whole earth (i. e. which eyes repre-

in perf. as aor., καὶ ἡ εἴληφεν ἐκ τῆς δεξιᾶς τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου. APN va
 ch. vii. 14. 60 n, 1.
 vii. 5. xix. 3 2. 4 6 9.
 Winer, edn. 10-3. 16
 6. 2 40. 4. to 19 26-
 n ch. iv 10 7. 30 32
 reff to 42.
 o l Cor xiv. 7. 47 to 51.
 ch. xiv. 2. 90 B.
 x. 2 only.
 Gen iv 21 al.
 p Rev (ch xv
 7. xvi. 1, 2, &c θυμι 1 xxi 9) only Zech. xiv. 20. q ch iv 6 reff r Rev. (ch viii 3, 4 xvi.
 13) only, exc. Luke i. 10, 11. Exod xxx 1. s Ps. cxl. 2 (see Luke i. 10. Tobit xii 12) t = ch.
 1 19, 20 reff u = Acts ix. 13. Rom. i. 7, and passim in Lpp ch viii 3, 4 al (Ps. xv. 3)

7. rec aft εἰληφεν ins το βιβλιον, with l 12-marg. 16. 36(-9, e sil) am²(with lips-6 tol)
 copt Cypr Primas: ins aft θρονον 38 vulg-ed Andr Areth; την (= την βιβλον?) B:
 om A[P]N rel am¹(with demid fuld harl¹ lipss) æth arm Andr-coisl¹. for 1st του,
 της N¹.

8. (επεσαν, so AN l 1. 9. 26-7. 42-9: om 36. [P def.]) εκαστος bef εχοντες N.
 rec κιβαρας, with k l 1. 10-7-8. 30-6. 49. 51 (e h 16. 37-9 B¹, e sil) vulg Andr
 Areth, Cypr Primas: txt A[P]N B rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr-a²-coisl Areth, Hil.
 χρυσεας N. for 1st αι, α N. om 2nd αι N¹ b c f g j k m 30-2-3-4-5. 40-8. 50.

sent the watchful active operation of God's Spirit poured forth through the Death and by the victory of the Lamb, upon all flesh and all creation. The weight of the whole sentence lies on the predicative anarthrous participle ἀπεσταλμένα. As the seven burning lamps before the throne represented the Spirit of God immanent in the Godhead, so the seven eyes of the Lamb represent the same Spirit in his sevenfold perfection, profluent, so to speak, from the incarnate Redeemer: busied in His world-wide energy: the very word ἀπεσταλμένα reminding us of the apostolic work and church.

Observe, οἱ εἰσιν does not as Bede ("Spiritus in Christo septiformis propter eminentiam potestatis cornibus, propter illuminationem gratiæ comparatur oculis"), Bengel, De W., al., refer to both κέρατα and ὀφθαλμοί: this would be of course grammatically possible, but it seems otherwise decided here both by the context, and by Zech. iv. 10: ἐπὶ οὗτοι ὀφθαλμοί εἰσιν [add κυρίου A; pref. N], οἱ ἐπιβλέποντες (E. V. which run to and fro; Heb. מַשְׁפִּיכִם, from מָשַׁךְ, renigare, cursitare) ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.

7.] The Lamb takes the Book. And he (or, it) came and took (not, 'received,' as Ebrard. The book lay on the open hand of Him that sat on the throne, for any to take who was found worthy. That "das Buch überreichen" which Ebrard insists on, is found not here, but in the previous description: and to introduce it here, confuses the distinctness of the symbolism.

The perfect εἴληφεν apparently cannot be pressed: see reff.) it (i.e. the Book; cf. next verse) out of the right hand of Him that sat upon the throne (Vitrings's enquiry, whether we are to imagine the Lamb to have had partly a human form and hands, is rightly dis-

missed by Düsterd. as "unnöthig und geſchmacklos"). 8—10.] Song of praise following thereupon. And when he took (the aor. ἔλαβεν is not an imperfect, "when he was taking," αἰς ἐς νᾶημ," Luth.: nor again is it a pluperf. "when he had taken," as E. V. (our idiom perhaps so requiring it), and many Commentators (even De W. and Düsterd.);—but a pure past: the context, and not the word itself, indicating that the act to be described was subsequent to that thus expressed. And so in all places commonly cited for aorists "put for" pluperfects) the book, the four living-beings and the twenty-four elders fell down before the Lamb (who shares the divine throne, and honour, and worship, cf. ver. 13; ch. xxii. 1; and ch. iii. 21), having each (of them) (εχοντες εκαστος apparently applies only to the elders: not for any grammatical reason, but on account of the symbolism: for

1) it is unnatural to suppose figures described as the four living-beings are, having harps or vials; and even if this is not to be pressed (see above on ver. 7), yet 2) it is inconsistent with the right view of the four living-beings, as representing creation, that they should present the prayers of the Saints) a harp (κιθάρα, properly a zither or kind of guitar: the harp of David, which the LXX call κινύρα in 1 Kings xvi. 16, 23, al., but always κιθάρα in the Psalms, is described by Josephus, Antt. vii. 12. 3, ἡ μὲν κινύρα, δέκα χορδαῖς ἐξημμένη, τύπτεται πλήκτρῳ: and then he adds, ἡ δὲ νάβλα, δώδεκα φθόγγους ἔχουσα, τοῖς δακτύλοις κρούεται. But David, in the passages above cited, appears to have played with his hand: so that perhaps the κινύρα or κιθάρα was played in both ways), and golden vials (cups, or bowls. or, by the context, censers) full of incense

^vw ἄδουσιν ^vw ᾠδὴν ^v καινὴν λέγοιτες ^x Ἄξιος εἶ λαβεῖν τὸ ^vch xiv 3.
 βιβλίον καὶ ἀνοῖξαι τὰς σφραγίδας αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ^vἔσφάγης ^vPs. cxliii 10.
 καὶ ^zἡγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ^aἐν τῷ αἵματι σου ^bἐκ πάσης ^cφυ- ^vsee Ps xxxii.
 λῆς καὶ ^cγλώσσης καὶ ^cλαοῦ καὶ ^cἔθνους, ¹⁰ καὶ ^dἐποίησας ^v3. xcv 1 al.
 αὐτοῦς ^dβασιλεῖαν καὶ ^dἱερεὺς, καὶ ^eβασιλευσουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς ^vas above (x).
^z = 1 Cor. vi 20 vii 23. 2 Pet. ii 1. ch. xiv. 3, 4. ^a ch. i 5. Eph. ii. 13 al. ^x ver 2
^c ch vii 9 xi 9. xiii. 7. xiv. 6. Dan. iii. 4 Theod.-A. ^d ch. i 6. ^y ver. 8 i eff.
^e ch. xx 4, 6 reff

9. ἀδωσιν Α. λαβων 1. rec aft τω θεω add ἡμας, with [P(appy)] N B rel
 (1 copt Cyp); pref, c 1 m 16. 34-5-9 vulg arm; add ἡμων 44: om A æth.—(1 harl¹
 copt Cyp Fulg om τω θεω.)

10. rec (for αὐτοῦς) ἡμας, with (41, e sil) vulg-ed (with fuld &c.) Andr-coisl Areth: txt
 AN B rel am syr-dd copt æth Andr. [P def.] rec adds τω θεω ἡμων, with [P (At
 this point P has only the beginnings of lines, but the letters μων clearly testify to the
 insn)] N B rel vss Andr Areth: om A. rec (for βασιλεῖαν) βασιλεῖς, with B rel
 Andr Areth: txt AN vulg copt Cyp Primas Fulg Idac. [P def.] ιερατεῖαν N.
 rec (for βασιλευσουσιν) βασιλευσόμεν, with (26-7. 41, e sil) vulg-ed (with demid
 lipss) Areth Primas Firm: βασιλευσουσιν N rel am (with harl tol lips-s) copt Andr
 Areth lat-ff: txt A[P] B a b e f g l n 12. 37-8. 48. 51. 90.

(θυμίαμα is generally used in the plural, e. g. Herod. ii. 86, διηθέουσι θυμῆμασι τετριμμένοι: viii. 99, ἐθυμίαν θυμῆματα), which (αἷ) might well have θυμμάτων for its antecedent, being fem. to suit προσευχαί below: but it is perhaps more likely that φιάλας is its antecedent—each vial being full of incense) are (represent: see reff.) the prayers of the saints (see reff.: especially ch. viii. 3: Ps. cxl. 2, κατενυθῆτω ἡ προσευχή μου ὡς θυμίαμα ἐνώπιόν σου. The twenty-four elders, representing as they do the whole church of God, offer the praises and the prayers of the whole church: the harps symbolizing the former, the censers the latter. Of any thing approaching intercession on the part of the glorified saints for the church below, or indeed of the glorified saints at all, there is not the least mention, nor does this passage at all touch the question of the fact of such intercession. In the division of the two employments, the most of prayer falls to the lot of the church in trial, and the most of praise to the church in glory: and this is perhaps the reason why, while they have harps on which they themselves play, they only offer or present the vials of incense. De W. remarks, that the Writer of the Apocalypse seems not to know any thing of the intercessory office of Christ. But that office is prominent through this whole scene. What is the lamb as it had been slain—what the ἡγόρασας τῷ θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου, but recognitions of it? It underlies the whole book): and they sing (why present? Is it because the sound still lingered in his ears? Or more probably, as describing their special and glorious office

generally, rather than the mere one particular case of its exercise?) a new song (new, because the occasion was new; the manifestation of the worthiness of the Lamb calls forth fresh words springing from fresh and living thoughts. These words which follow could not be spoken except by those who had seen Christ's redemption complete; therefore they must needs be new), saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals of it: for Thou wert slain, and didst redeem (the object is not expressed, nor need it be: see similar constructions with ἐκ, Matt. xxv. 8; 1 John iv. 13. The ἡμᾶς, which is in the MSS. added or prefixed to the verb, has considerable authority, but on the whole seems more likely to have been inserted, considering the prevalent early interpretation of the elders as Apostles and Prophets, than omitted because they were imagined to be angels) to God through (ἐν, as the vehicle, and conditioning element of redemption) thy blood out of every tribe and tongue and people and nation (the only thing to be noticed is the quadruple number of these specifications, as indicating universality: see again below, ver. 13. To identify φυλῆς as Bengel, or λαοῦ as Züllig, with the Jewish people, seems forbidden by the πάσης), and madest them a kingdom and priests, and they reign upon the earth ("this clause differs from that in ch. i. 6, both by the καὶ before ἱερείς, and by the important addition καὶ βασιλ. κ.τ.λ. This last would be superfluous, if we were with Hengstb., al., to adhere to the rec. βασιλεῖς, or if βασιλεῖαν could have the sense given to it by Hengstb. in ch. i. 6, 'a people invested

f ch. iv 6 reff. ἡγῆς. ¹¹ καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἤκουσα [ὡς] φωνὴν ἀγγέλων πολ- APN B a
 isa vi. 2. λῶν ^εκυκλῶ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν ζώων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέ- io n. 1.
 g Heb. xii 23 reff. λων, καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτῶν ^{gh} μυριάδες ^ε μυριάδων καὶ 2. 4 6. 9.
 h DAN. vii 10. ^h χιλιάδες χιλιάδων, ¹² ⁱ λέγοντες φωνῇ μεγάλη ^k Ἀξίον 10-3. 16.
 i const. ch. iv 1 reff. ἐστὶν τὸ ¹ ἄρνιον τὸ ¹ ἐσφαγμένον λαβεῖν τὴν ^m δύναμιν καὶ to 19. 26-
 k ch. iv. 11. ^{no} πλοῦτον καὶ ^{op} σοφίαν καὶ ^q ἰσχὺν καὶ ^r τιμὴν καὶ ^r δόξαν 7. 30. 32.
 l ver 6 καὶ ^s εὐλογίαν. ¹³ καὶ πᾶν ^t κτίσμα ^δ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ to 42.
 m = ch. iv. 11 reff. 47 to 51.
 n Rom. ix 23. 90 B.
 o Eph. i. 7, 8. q = ch. vii 12. 1 Chron. xxix 11. r ch. iv. 9, 11. s = ch. vi 12 reff.
 u. 7. u. 8, 16. 1 Cor. i. 21. t ver 3.
 Phil iv. 19 al. o Rom. xi 33
 p ch. vii 12
 1 Cor. i. 21.
 e 1 Tim. iv. 4. James i 18 ch. viii. 9 only t. Wisd ix. 2.

11. ins *ως* bef *φωνην* N B² rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Fulg Cassiod: om A[P] B¹ n 17 (f 1. 2. 16. 49, e sil) vulg Primas. rec (for *κυκλω*) *κυκλοθεν*, with 1. 18 (30. 41, e sil): txt A[P] N B rel Andr Areth. om from *ζων* to *πρεσβυτερων* 1.—Steph om further from *καὶ* to *μυριαδων*, with 1: om *μυριαδες μυριαδων* vulg Primas Fulg Cassiod: ins A[P] N B rel vss.

12. *αξις* A: txt N B rel. [P def.] ins *τον* bef *πλουτον* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om A[P] N n 17-9. 36 (h 1. 37. 41-9 Br, e sil).—(om *καὶ πλουτον* g.)—om *καὶ* 38.

13. rec aft *δ* ins *εστιν*, with [P] h m n 1. 10-7. 34-5-6 (37. 41-7-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr lat-ff: om (N) B rel tol copt Areth.—for *δ*, *το* N: om 39.

with kingly power.' Here we have three particulars: 1) that those who are bought to be God's own are made into a kingdom, viz. God's,—2) (*καὶ*) that they are made into priests,—3) (*καὶ*) that they are invested with kingly power. So rightly Ebrard." Düsterd. The present *βασιλευσύν* is not to be rendered as a future, but keeps its own meaning (the whole aspect and reference of this heavenly vision being *not future*, but *present*: the world and church as now existing, cf. Eph. ii. 6). The Church even now, in Christ her Head, reigns on the earth: all things are being put under her feet, as under His: and even if this meaning be questioned, we have her kingly rank and office asserted in the present, even in the midst of persecution and contempt).

11, 12.] *The ascending chorus of the host of angels.* And I saw (*εἶδον*, not in a general vague sense, introducing a fresh particular merely; but in its proper sense: John saw the host of angels whose voice he heard: cf. ch. vi. 1 f. The gloss. ord. refers *εἶδον* to what has preceded: but this is contrary to St. John's usage), and I heard [as it were] a (or, *the*: *φωνή*, like many other substantives in regimen with their possessive genitives, being definite though anarthrous) voice of many angels around the throne and the living-beings and the elders (i. e. surrounding on all sides, in the more distant space, the smaller circle hitherto described. The Church, as the vehicle of the work of Redemption, of which Creation is but a part, is the central and crowning manifestation of God's power and love and wisdom. Round it, and Him who is its Head, the heavenly hosts are

ranged in humble admiration; and into its wonders they desire to look. Cf. Eph. iii. 10; 1 Pet. i. 12); and the number of them was myriads of myriads and thousands of thousands (i. e. innumerable in its vastness. See Ps. lxxviii. 18, and ref. Dan., where *χίλια χιλιάδες* comes before *μύρια μυριάδες*: but it is of very little import whether the specification is by way of climax or of anti-climax, the same idea being conveyed), saying (the appositional nom. instead of the gen.: as in ch. iv. 1) with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb which hath been slain to receive (by way of ascribed praise: cf. ch. iv. 11 and note) the power and riches and wisdom and might and honour and glory and blessing (here, as in ch. vii. 12, but in differing order, we have *seven* particulars of ascription. But here there is a difference both from ch. vii. 12 and iv. 11. In each of those places the art. is repeated before each particular: here, one article includes them all. Bengel well remarks, that we must regard them all as if they formed but one word. And when they are thus regarded, the article seems to point out the fact of all these, as one, belonging to God, whose power and glory the Lamb is declared worthy to share. Of the particulars themselves, *πλοῦτος* is better kept in its generality, all riches and fullness, than limited, as by De W., to *spiritual* riches; see 1 Chron. xxix. 11: *εὐλογία* is *blessing*, in the sense so frequent when the word and its cognate verb are used of an act passing from man to God: viz. that of ascribed praise; the *will* on the part of the creature, though unaccompanied by the *power*, to return blessing for blessing con-

^u ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ^u ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς καὶ ^v ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ἐστίν, καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ἤκουσα ^w λέγοντας Τῷ ^x καθήμενῳ ^x ἐπὶ * τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ^y ἄρνιῳ ἡ ^s εὐλογία καὶ ἡ ^t τιμὴ καὶ ἡ ^t δόξα καὶ τὸ ^z κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ¹⁴ καὶ τὰ τέσσαρα ζῶα ἔλεγον ^a ἁμήν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ^b ἔπεσαν καὶ ^{bc} προσεκύνησαν.

C κυνη-
σαν...
ACPN B
a 60 n, 1
2. 4. 6, 9,
10-3 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30. 32
to 42 47
to 51. 90
B.

a = 1 Cor xii. 16. Neh. v. 13.
xx. 20 John iv. 20.

b absol., Dan iii 6 (not Theod.-A).

c absol., Matt.

rec (for ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς) ἐν τῇ γῇ, with 1 syr-dd Andr-a lat-ff: txt A[P]N B rel vulg copt Andr Areth, ἐπὶ γῆς n 16. om και υποκατω της γης (homæotel) N 33. for ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, τα ἐν τῇ θαλάσσει N: ἐπὶ τὴν θαλάσσαν 38. rec aft θαλάσσης ins ð, with [P] B 10-7. 30² (h 1. 37. 49 B², e sil) vulg Andr-p Fulg: oia m 34 Andr-coisl: om AN rel Areth. (om εστιν as well as ð N n 38. 47 syr-dd Andr-a Primas Cassiod.) for παντα, παντας A rel: παντα και παντας B: παντας, insg παντα bef τα, 40: txt [P]N c f k m 1. 30-3 (6. 9. 17. 32-4-5-6 B², e sil) vulg Andr-a Areth Primas.—pref και f n 13. 47: add και N k m 30-4-5-6 Andr-coisl. for λεγοντας, λεγοντα A 1. 12 some-vss Andr-p(omg ηκ.): txt [P]N B rel vulg Andr-a Areth Primas. * rec τοῦ θρόνου, with [P]N b n 1. 2. 10-7-8. 33 (g h 13-6. 36-7-8-9. 42-7-9 B², e sil) Andr Thdor-stud Areth: τω θρονω A B rel Andr-coisl.—(om τω k 40.) om και (bef. τω αρνω) N^{3a}. [om 1st η P.] for και το κρατος, παντοκρατορος N¹. aft αιωνων ins αμην B rel æth Andr Thdor-stud Areth: om A[P]N l m 35 (b 41, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Primas Fulg.

14. for ελεγον, λεγοντα B rel copt Areth: ελεγον m 34 Andr-coisl: λεγουσα 42: txt A[P]N l n 16. 35-6. 49² (1. 18. 38-9, e sil) vulg syr-dd æth Andr lat-ff.—(om from αμην in last ver to αμην in this g 19.) ins το bef αμην B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om A[P]N f k n 1. 36 (37-8. 42, e sil) Andr. rec ins εικοσι τεσσαρες bef πρεσβυτεροι, with vulg-ed (with demid) Primas: om A[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth Cassiod., επεσον B rel Andr-a Areth: txt A[P]N d l m 9¹(appy). 19. 33 (1. 2. 16. 26-7. 30-4-5-6-9. 41-2-9, e sil) Andr. rec at end ins ζωντι εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, with vulg-ed Primas: om ACN B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff_m.

ferred. The idea of Bengel, that the septenary number has to do with the seven seals, is hardly probable: the number, as indicating completeness, running through the whole book). 13, 14.] *The chorus of assenting praise from Creation itself.* And every creature (i.e. by the very terms, animated creature: for heaven and earth and sea themselves are mentioned as the *abodes* of these *κτίσματα*) which is in the heaven (the chorus being *universal*, this will include the angels, previously mentioned, and the glorified saints) and on the earth and under the earth (i.e. not the devils, as even Vitringa: but as in Phil. ii. 10, the departed spirits in Hades: see note there), and upon the sea (i.e. most probably, on the surface of the sea; meaning not those on ships, but those sea-animals which are regarded as being on the surface), and all the things in them (so in Exod. xx. 11. The clause added seems to serve the purpose of *complete* enumeration, applying here to γῇ and θάλασσα only, as ἐν τῷ ὀρανῷ has occurred already. The ἐπὶ and ὑποκάτω being both superficial, ἐν completes the list—in the depths of the

earth and the sea: cf. ch. viii. 9) I heard saying (the gender again is that of the things signified, not that of κτίσμα: see ch. iv. 8), To Him that sitteth upon the throne (for the various cases after καθῆμι, ἐπὶ, see note, ch. iv. 2) and to the Lamb (the Church, including Creation, gives praise to the Lamb for Redemption, vv. 9, 10: the angels praise the infinite condescension of the Son of God: the entire universe celebrates the glory of the universal Father and of the Redeemer, thence accruing) (he (or, *is*, belongs) the blessing and the honour and the glory and the might (notice the fourfold arrangement where *universality* is set forth: and the repeated article, exhaustive of each predicate separately. It is fanciful, with Bengel, to allot the four ascriptions among the four classes of creatures above mentioned. In each case the number has the same signification: but they need not separately correspond) to the ages of the ages. 14.] *The solemn assent of the celestial representatives of Creation and of the Church.* And the four living-beings said Amen (as above, in ch. iv. 11, the four living-beings assert the worthiness of

v see Matt. xiv. 25. Job ix. 8.
w acc., Acts ix. 4.
x w dat. (but see i. r.), ch. iv. 9 v. 15.
y vii 10. xix. 4. xxi. 5
only see ch. iv. 2 reff & note
z ver. 6 reff.
ch i 6.

d ch. v. 1.
e so ver. 12.
ch. x. 7.
f ch. xiv. 2.
xix. 6. Ps.
lxxvi. 18.
nom., ch. iv.
1 reff.

VI. ¹ Καὶ εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὸ ἄρνιον μίαν ἐκ τῶν

^a ἑπτὰ σφραγίδων, ^e καὶ ἤκουσα ἐνὸς ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων

λέγοντος ὡς ^f φωνῇ ^g βροντῆς Ἐρχου. ² Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ

g ch. iv. 5 reff.

ACPN B
a lo n, 1.
2. 4. 6 9.
10-3. 16
to 19 26-
7. 30 32-
to 42.
47 to 51.
90 Br.

CH. VI. 1. σι B (Mai) rel vulg (with am &c, agst demid &c) Andr Areth Bede: txt AC[P]N l n 16-8-9. 33 (in Alter's errata) 38 (1. 36-7-9. 41, e sil) vss Andr-a Primas.

om μίαν 1. rec om ἑπτα, with [P] c n 1. 33 (6. 9. 27. 36, e sil) copt Bede: ins ACN B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas. om σφραγίδων N¹. εκ (2nd)

(k 6. 18, e sil): φωνῇ N 26 Br: txt AC B rel Andr Areth. aft βροντῆς ins another

λεγοντος A, arm has λεγ. in this place but om above. rec aft ερχου ins και βλέπε;

και ιδε N B rel; ιδε 6. 9. 11: om AC[P] h n 1. 2. 10-7-8. 36-7-8. 41-2-7-9 Br am.

2. om και εἶδον B rel demid (with harl¹ tol lips-6) Areth Primas: ins AC[P]N h l n

God to receive the glory and the honour and the power *on account of His having created all things*, so here they say their Amen to *creation's* chorus of praise: being themselves the representatives of the animated Creation). And the elders fell down and worshipped (in silent adoration of God and of the Lamb. The inference of Ewald from the rec. text (which is itself here wholly untenable), "presbyteri adoratione repetita Deum prosequuntur, ut a quo auctore omnia progressa sunt et Messias creatus est, ad eum omnis redeat honor, omnis reverentia," would be unwarranted even were that text retained: ζῶντι, anathrous, would apply to the whole object of praise in ver. 13).

CH. VI. 1—VIII. 1.] THE OPENING OF THE SEVEN SEALS. As preliminary to the exegesis of this section, I may observe that it is of the first importance to bear in mind, that the openings of these seals correspond to the various arrangements of God's Providence by which the way is prepared for the final opening of the closed book of His purposes to His glorified Church. That opening shall not fully and freely be made, till His people will know even as they are known. And that will not be, till they are fully gathered in to His heavenly garner. This book the Lamb opens, containing as it does matters which οὐδὲς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ ἄγγελος ἐν οὐρανῷ, οὐδὲ δ υἱός, first by the acts and procedures of His establishment of His reign over the earth, and then finally by His great second coming, the necessary condition of His elect being gathered out of the four winds into His glory. When these preparations for His coming have taken place, and that coming itself has passed, and the elect are gathered into glory, then will be the time when the last hindrance to our perfect knowledge will be removed, and the book of God's eternal purposes will lie open—the theme of eternity's praise.

I may add that for the sake of per-

spicuity, I shall mainly follow, in these notes, the track of that interpretation which seems to me to be required; noticing only differences in those of other Commentators where grammar and philology are concerned.

1—8.] THE OPENING OF THE FIRST FOUR SEALS, marked by the ministration of the four living-beings. 1, 2.] And I saw when the Lamb opened one from among the seven seals, and I heard one from among the four living-beings saying, as the voice (a pendent nominative; the regular construction would be dative) of thunder (which is to be taken not as peculiarly belonging to this first as resembling a lion, but as belonging to all alike, and accounted for by their mysterious and exalted nature: cf. ch. i. 10, x. 3), Come (to whom, and with what meaning is this ἔρχου spoken? The great majority of Commentators have taken the rec. reading, which fixes it by adding και βλέπε, as an address to the Seer, to approach nearer and look at the coming vision. And even those who have rejected this addition have yet regarded it as a true gloss, and the "Come" as addressed to the Seer. But whither was he to come? Separated as he was by the glassy sea from the throne, was he to cross it? And where shall we find the simple verb ἔρχεσθαι used absolutely in such a sense, "Draw near," without ὦδε or some such particle? Compare also the place where the Seer is to go and take the little book (ch. x. 8), and see how different is the whole form of expression. In interpreting so unusual a term of address, surely we should rather begin by enquiring whether we have not the key to it in the book itself. And in this enquiry, are we justified in leaving out of consideration such a verse as ch. xxii. 17, τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν Ἐρχου, καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω Ἐρχου, and the following ἀμὴν ἔρχου, κύριε Ἰησοῦ, ib. ver. 20? This seems to

ἰδοὺ ^{hi} ἵππος ^{ik} λευκός, καὶ ὁ ¹ καθήμενος ¹ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἔχων ^h Rev. only (vv. 4, &c. ch. ix. 7, &c. xiv. 20, xviii. 13, xix. 11, &c.), exc. James iii. 3.
^m τόξον, καὶ ⁿ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ⁿ στέφανος, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ^o νικῶν
καὶ ἵνα ^o νικήσῃ.
i Zech. vi. 2, 3. k ch. xix. 11, 14. l ch. iv. 2 reff. & note. m here only. Ps. vii. 12. n ch. ii. 10. o ch. v. 5 reff.

16-7-8. 36. (1. 13. 37-9. 42-7-9 B^r, e sil) vss Andr. rec (for αὐτὸν) αὐτῶ, with
1 Andr-a¹: αὐτῶν 39: αὐτοῦ 18: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth. ins o bef νικῶν
A. for ἵνα νικήσῃ, ἐνίκησεν N: καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ καὶ ἐνίκησεν 32-6.

shew, in my mind, beyond a doubt, what, in the mind of the Seer, the remarkable and insulated exclamation *ἔρχου* imported. It was a cry addressed, not to himself, but to the Lord Jesus: and as each of these four first seals is accompanied by a similar cry from one of the four living-beings, I see represented in this fourfold *ἔρχου* the groaning and travailling together of creation for the manifestation of the sons of God, expressed in each case in a prayer for Christ's coming: and in the things revealed when the seals are opened, His fourfold preparation for His coming on earth. Then at the opening of the fifth seal the longing of the martyred saints for the same great consummation is expressed, and at that of the sixth it actually arrives). And I saw, and behold a white horse, and he that sat on him having a bow, and a crown was given to him, and he went forth conquering, and in order that he may conquer (in the first place, the figure of the horses and their riders at once brings to mind the similar vision in Zechariah, i. 7—11, vi. 1—8, where the men on the horses are they whom the Lord hath sent to walk to and fro through the whole earth. In Zech. i., as here, that part of the vision is followed, ver. 12, by the cry of the *ἕως τίνος*. Here the horses and their riders are the various aspects of the divine dispensations which should come upon the earth preparatory to the great day of the Lord's coming. As regards this first, the whole imagery speaks of *victory*. The horses of the Roman commanders in their triumphs were white. Wetst. quotes Virg. *Æn.* iii. 537, where Æneas says, "Quatuor hic primum omen equos in gramine vidi, Tondentes campum late, candore nivali;" where Servius's comment is "Hoc ad victoriæ omen pertinet." The *bow* serves to identify the imagery here with that in Habakkuk iii. 9, where God goes forth for the salvation of His people: see also Isa. xli. 2; Zech. ix. 13: and even more strikingly with that in Ps. xlv. 4, 5, "In thy majesty ride prosperously, because of truth and meekness and righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in

the heart of the king's enemies; whereby the people fall under thee." It is hardly possible that one whose mind was full of such imagery, should have had any other meaning in his thoughts, than that to which these prophecies point. The *crown* finds its parallel in the vision of Zech. vi., where, ver. 11, it is said, "take silver and gold, and make crowns (*στεφάνους*, LXX), and set them upon the head of Joshua the son of Josedech, the high-priest." The *going forth conquering and in order to conquer* can only, it seems to me, point to one interpretation. The *νικῶν* might be said of any victorious earthly power whose victories should endure for the time then present, and afterwards pass away: but the *ἵνα νικήσῃ* can only be said of a power whose victories should last for ever. Final and permanent victory then is here imported. Victory, we may safely say, on the part of that kingdom against which the gates of hell shall not prevail: whose fortunes and whose trials are the great subject of this revelation. Such is the first vision, the opening of the first seal in the mystery of the divine purposes: *victory for God's church and people*: the great key-note, so to speak, of all the apocalyptic harmonies. And notice, that in this interpretation, there is no lack of correspondence with the three visions which follow. All four are *judgments* upon the earth: the beating down of earthly power, the breaking up of earthly peace, the exhausting of earthly wealth, the destruction of earthly life. Nor is this analogy disturbed, when we come to enquire, *who is the rider* on this white horse. We must not, in reply, on the one hand, too hastily introduce the Person of our Lord Himself, or on the other, be startled at the objection that we shall be paralleling Him, or one closely resembling Him, with the far different forms which follow. Doubtless, the resemblance to the rider in ch. xix. 11 ff. is very close, and is intended to be very close. The difference however is considerable. There, He is set forth as *present* in his triumph, followed by the hosts of heaven: here, He is working, in bodily absence, and the rider is not Himself, but only a symbol of His vic-

p ch. xii. 3
only. Gen.
xxv. 30.
q = ch. ii. 7
reff.
r red., ch. ii. 7,
17. Matt. iv.
16 al.
s constr., ch.
ii. 9 reff.
t ch. v. 6 reff.

³ Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν δευτέραν, ἤκουσα ACPN B
τοῦ δευτέρου ζώου λέγοντος Ἔρχου. ⁴ καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄλλος a fo n, 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
¹ ἵππος ¹ πυρρὸς, καὶ τῷ ¹ καθήμενῳ ¹ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ⁹ ἐδόθη 10-3. 16
10-19. 26-
¹ αὐτῷ λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ⁵ ἵνα ἀλλήλους 7. 30. 32
to 42.
st σφάξουσιν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ μάχαιρα μεγάλη. 47 to 51.
90 B.

3. rec (for τ. σφρ. τ. δ.) τὴν δευτεραν σφραγίδα, with B rel æth Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N m 1. 6. 12. 34-5. 49 vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Primas. rec aft ερχου ins και βλεπε, with Areth; και ιδε N b m 30-2-4-5. 40-1-2 copt Vict Primas: om AC[P] B rel am (with fuld al, agst many mss) syr-dd.

4. aft 1st και ins ιδον και ιδου N m 34-5. for πυρρος, πυρος A[P] B rel copt Andr-coisl: æth-rom joins the two: txt CN b² h j k 4. 13¹. 33 (a 9. 17-9. 30-7-9. 40-1-2-7-8, e sil) vulg syr-dd æth-pl Andr Areth Primas. ins εν βεφ τω καθημενω A. rec (for αυτω) αυτω, with k m 1. 30 (16. 90, e sil) Andr-a: αυτοι e 18: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth. om αυτω (bef λαβειν) AN^{3a}. rec (for εκ) απο, with 1. 36: om A l 16. 89. 46: txt C[P]N¹ B rel vulg (de) copt Andr Areth Primas.—om εκ της γης N^{3a}. om και (bef ινα) B rel copt arm Andr Areth: ins AC[P]N m 1 (e sil) 17. 38. rec σφαξωσι, with [P]N B 1 &c.: txt AC 36. μεγαλη bef μαχαιρα A copt æth.

torious power, the embodiment of His advancing kingdom as regards that side of its progress where it breaks down earthly power, and makes the kingdom of the world to be the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ. Further it would not be wise, nor indeed according to the analogy of these visions, to specify. In all cases but the last, these riders are left in the vagueness of their symbolic offices. If we attempt in this case to specify further, e. g. as Victorinus, "Equus albus verbum est prædicationis cum Spiritu sancto misum in orbem. Ait enim Dominus, Prædicabitur hoc Evangelium per totum orbem terrarum in testimonium coram gentibus, et tunc veniet finis,"—while we are sure that we are thus far right, we are but partially right: we do not cover the extent of the symbol, seeing that there are other aspects and instruments of victory of the kingdom of Christ, besides the preaching of the Word. The same might be said of any other of the partial interpretations which have been given by those who have taken this view. And it was taken, with divergences of separate detail, by all expositors from the earliest times down to the year 1500).

3, 4.] And when he opened the second seal, I heard the second living-being saying, Come (see above on ver. 1). And there came forth another horse, red (the colour of blood: so 4 Kings iii. 22, ὄδατα πυρρὰ ὡς αἷμα. The colour of the horse in each case has reference to the employment of the rider. Tertullian, de Spectaculis, 9, vol. i. p. 641, says: "russeum . . Marti . . consecraverunt"), and to him that sat upon him it was given (to him) to take away peace (τὴν εἰρ. not, as Elliott, "the peace left by the former seal," for 1) the former seal neither im-

plies nor leaves such peace, and 2) these four seals are strictly correlative, not consecutive on one another: but, peace in its entirety, the τὴν distributing, as the logicians say, the substantive. See for εἰρήνη without the art., Matt. x. 34 (peace, at all: any peace): Luke ii. 14 (peace, in each particular case, under every circumstance), &c.: with the art., Rom. xiv. 19, τὰ τῆς εἰρ. διάκωμεν: xv. 33, al., ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης: Eph. ii. 14, αὐτὸς ἐστὶν ἡ εἰρήνη ἡμῶν, &c.) out of the earth (generally, as ever: not, Judæa, nor the Roman "orbis terrarum," nor any special portion merely) and that they (men: the inhabitants of the earth) shall kill (the pregnant future after ἵνα not only imports the result of purpose, but includes also matter of fact, "that they may . . . which they also shall;" see Winer (edn. 6, § 41 δ. 1. b), who however interprets it as expressing duration (?), whereas the aor. denotes rapid transition) one another: and there was given to him a great sword (the key to the interpretation of this seal is to be found in Matt. x. 34, μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἤλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἤλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν: see also Luke xii. 51. It represents to us the taking away of peace from the earth, the slaying one another, the reign of the sword, as one of the destined concomitants of the growing and conquering power of Christ, and one of the world-long and world-wide preparations for His coming. Observe, all limitations of this meaning are wrong: whether to the persecutions of the Christians, or to any period of time, ancient or modern. The above was the most ancient interpretation; e. g. we have in Victorinus, "Equus roseus et qui sedebat super eum habens gladium, bella sunt significata fu-

7 Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν τετάρτην, ἤκουσα ACPN B
φωνὴν τοῦ τετάρτου ζώου λέγοντος "Ἐρχου. a lo n, 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16.

7. τὴν τετάρτην σφραγίδα 38. om φωνὴν (C)[P] B rel syr-dd copt Andr-coisl to 19. 26-
Areth Primas: ins AN h n 1. 10-7. 33. 91 (2. 13. 34-6-7. 49 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr-a, 7. 30. 32
φωνὴς Andr-p.—το τετάρτον ζων C. rec (for λέγοντος) λεγουσαι, with 1. 33 (26. 47 to 51.
51, e sil): txt AC[P]N B rel. rec aft ερχου ins καὶ βλεπε; καὶ ἰδε N B rel Andr 90 B^r.
Areth: om AC[P] h l n 1. 2. 10-2-6-8. 36-7-8-9. 47-9 B^r am Andr-a.
8. om καὶ εἶδον B rel vulg Andr-coisl Vict Primas: ins AC[P]N b h l n 10-7-8. 36.

usage. The tendency of the voice is then to check or limit the agency of the rider on the black horse, and to provide that notwithstanding his errand sustenance shall not utterly fail. With regard to the three choenixes of barley, the cheaper and less profitable grain, it seems to have been rightly interpreted as taking in the other case, of the workman who, out of his denarius a day, has to maintain not himself only, but his family also, and cannot consequently afford the dearer wheaten bread; and the oil and the wine do not thou injure (not, as Heinr. and recently Elliott, "do thou not commit injustice in the matter of the oil and the wine." The usage of this book should have prevented such an interpretation: for ἀδικεῖν with the accus. of the material object hurt or injured is the constant habit of our Writer, see ref.: and in no case do we find the other construction used by him, or indeed by any other writer to my knowledge, except with such general adverbial accusatives as τι and οὐδέν, e. g. Gal. iv. 12; Philem. 18. This statement of the usage of ἀδικεῖν in this Book and in Greek literature, Mr. Elliott, *more suo*, calls a "vain dictum:" and adds, "In the three Apocalyptic examples of the *thing injured*, occurring in connexion with the verb ἀδικεῖν in the active sense of *injury*, the accusative follows the verb: vii. 2, 3, ix. 4." It did not suit his purpose to cite xi. 5, αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆσαι, and he therefore appears to introduce a distinction (of course untenable) between the *person* and *thing* injured. But this whole matter of the position of the accusative has to do with the emphasis only, and not with the construction at all. Not one of the examples which he cites in his note is to the point: in that from Xenophon, Cyrop. iv. 5. 42, τὴν δ' ἀγορὰν τὴν οὐτὰν ἐν τῷ στρατοπέδῳ κηρυξάτω μὲν ἦδη, ἔφη, μὴ ἀδικεῖν μηδένα, πωλεῖν δὲ τοὺς καπλήλους ὅτι ἔχει ἕκαστος πρόσμον... the pendent accusative being evidently prefixed to the whole subsequent enactment, not connected with the first verb in it only. Rinck gives another meaning, equally untenable, "*waste* not the oil and the wine," seeing they are so costly.

As regards the meaning, the spirit of the saying is as explained above: the

rider on the black horse symbolizing Famine, is limited in his desolating action by the command given, that enough is to be reserved for sustenance. Wheat, barley, oil, and wine, formed the ordinary sources of nourishment: cf. Ps. civ. 14, 15. So that as regards its *intent*, the command is parallel with that saying of our Lord in Matt. xxiv. 22: καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σὰρξ: διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκείναι. It is the mercy of God, tempering His judgments. And in its general interpretation, as the opening of the first seal revealed the certain proceeding on to victory of Christ and His church, and the second, that His coming should be prepared in the world not by peace but by the sword, so now by this third we learn that Famine, the pressure of want on men, not sweeping them away by utter failure of the means of subsistence, but keeping them far below the ordinary standard of comfort, and especially those who depend on their daily labour, will be one of the four judgments by which the way of the Lord's coming will be opened. This seems to point, not so much to *death* by famine, which belongs to the next vision, as to agrarian distress with all its dreadful consequences: ripening in some cases (see below) into the hunger-death, properly the consequence of Famine.

The above interpretation of the third seal is given in the main by Victorinus—"Equus niger autem famem significat; ait enim Dominus: Erunt fames per loca:" but he allegorizes the latter part of the vision: "vinum et oleum ne læseris, id est, hominem spiritalem ne plagis percusseris").

7, 8.] And when he opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of the fourth living-being saying, Come (see above on ver. 1). And I saw, and behold a livid horse (χλωρός, originally and properly grass-green, when used of flesh implies that greenish pallor which we know as *livid*: the colour of the corpse in incipient decay, or of the complexion extremely pale through disease. Thus Thucyd. in describing the symptoms of the plague at Athens, says that the body was οὐκ ἄγαν θερμόν, οὔτε χλωρόν, ἀλλ' ὑπέρυθρον.

καὶ ἰδοὺ ^a ἵππος ^b χλωρός, καὶ ὁ ^c καθήμενος ^{cd} ἐπάνω ^a αὐτοῦ, ^e ὄνομα ^e αὐτῷ [ὁ] θάνατος, καὶ ὁ ^f ἔδης ^g ἡκολουθεῖ ^g μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ^h ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς ^{hi} ἐξουσία ⁱ ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον ^j τῆς γῆς ^k ἀποκτεῖναι ^{lm} ἐν ^l ῥομφαίᾳ καὶ ^m ἐν λιμῷ καὶ ⁿ ἐν ^k θανάτῳ καὶ ⁿ ὑπὸ τῶν ^o θηρίων τῆς ^o γῆς.

e ch. ix. 11. John i. 6. iii. 1. (xviii. 10.) 1 Kings i. 1. f ch. i. 18 ref. g Luke ix. 49 ch. xiv. 13 h ch. ii. 26 ref. i constr., ch. xiii. 7. xvi. 9. xxii. 14. Luke ix. 1. k = ch. ii. 23. l so ch. ii. 16 (reff.). xix. 21. Num. xxxi. 8. m = ch. ii. 27. ix. 19. 20. xi. 6. xii. 5 al. fr. n constr., here only. so *πραγαγορεύει ὑπὸ κήρυκος*, Herod. ix. 95. o here (Acts xi. 6) only. Gen. i. 24.

47-9 (16. 37-9, e sil) syr-dd copt Andr. om 1st o C. om 1st αὐτου C[P] 1 (and 12: but 12 has *ονομα αὐτου*) demid(with harl tol lips-5, agst am lipss al) Ansb Bede Ruf. om 2nd o CN g h 16¹. 37. 49 Br. for *θανατος, αθανατος A.* rec *ακολουθεῖ*, with h n 1. 10-7. 30 (37. 49. 51 Br, e sil) syr-dd copt Orig^s Andr-a Vict: txt C[P]N B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas Bede. (A illeg.) for μετ' αὐτου, αὐτω N B rel Andr Areth: μετ' αὐτω 33(-5, e sil): txt AC[P] h j¹ l n 10-6-7 (1. 37-9. 49 Br, e sil) Andr-a. for αὐτοις, αὐτω B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]N n 17. 49 (1. 40, e sil) Andr. rec *αποκτεῖναι βεβ. ἐπὶ τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς*, with 1(-κτηναι): txt AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—(om αποκτ. 51 ?) om 2nd and 3rd en N, 2nd k, 3rd j 9. 26. 42. om last καὶ 1. for *υπο, τὸ τέταρτον A.*

Callistratus, as quoted in Wetst. says, ἡ μὲν γὰρ χεὶρ ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου χλωρόν τε καὶ τεθνηκὸς ὄρασα. Hippocrates, *ibid.* says of the colour, μελάντερόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐρυθροῦ, καὶ οἷον ἀρχὴ τις τοῦ μελανεῖσθαι καὶ πελιδνοῦσθαι. And again, in describing the symptoms of approaching death,—*ῥίς ὀξεία, ὀφθαλμοὶ κοινοί, . . . καὶ τὸ χρῶμα τοῦ ξύμπαντος προσώπου χλωρόν τε καὶ μέλαν ἐν . . . σημαίνει θανάτωδες.* See also Wetst.'s other quotations), and he that sat upon him (ἐπάνω αὐτοῦ, lit. on the top of him: in the three other cases, ἐπ' αὐτόν. The nominative is pendent, see ch. iii. 12, 21) his name was Death (i. e. he was death personified. In this case only of the four is the explanation given. It is wrong to understand Pestilence by this θάνατος: see below), and Hades (the impersonation of the place of the departed: see ch. i. 18, xx. 14, where as here θανάτου καὶ ἔδου go together. Eichhorn and Ebrard understand it of the whole multitude of the departed: but this clearly is beside the purpose: personification being the prevailing character of these four riders) was following with him (in his train: ready to engulf and detain his victims), and there was given to them (Death and Hades, considered as joint partners in the baleful work) power over the fourth part of the earth (ἐπὶ with accus., as *extending over, spreading over, τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς*, perhaps owing to the fourfold division of these former seals: not implying thereby that this last rider divided the earth with the three former, but thus specifying his portion as being one of four. At all events this suggests itself here as a possible reference of the number four: whereas in ch. viii.

the continually recurring τὸ τρίτον has no such assignable solution. The expositors for the most part pass it over, merely as signifying a considerable portion. Elliott, with whose historical interpretation it will not square, takes refuge in the reading of the vulg., "super quatuor partes terræ"), to kill with (the ἐν of *investiture*, expressing the element or vehicle in which the action transpires) sword and with famine and with death (i. e. here, *pestilence*: see below), and by (ὑπο, seeing that the other three were rather general indications of the manner in which, but this last of the actual agent by whose administration. Wetst. gives examples of ἀποθανεῖν, τελευτᾶν, ὑπο, but the construction with an active verb is not common. See Matthiae, § 592, who gives, besides ref., Eurip. Alcest. 753, εἰ δὲ ἀπειπεῖν χρῆν με κηρύκων ὑπο τὴν σὴν πατρῶαν ἐστίαν,—Plato, Phileb. p. 320, ὑπὸ ἀγγέλων φράζειν,—and Thuc. vi. 32, ὑπὸ κήρυκος εὐχὰς ποιεῖσθαι. It is singular that these examples should all belong to the same description of employment of agents) the wild beasts of the earth (the enumeration comprehends the "four sore judgments" enumerated in Ezek. xiv. 21, and in the same terms: τὰς τέσσαρας ἐκδικήσεις μου τὰς πονηράς, ῥομφαίας καὶ λιμὸν καὶ θηρία πονηρὰ καὶ θάνατον. This fixes the meaning of this second and subordinate θανάτῳ as above. This seal also is interpreted as above by the earliest Commentators: e. g. Victorinus: "Hæc eadem quoque inter cæteras clades præmiserat Dominus, venturas pestes magnas et mortalitates." But as on the third seal, so here also, he goes off into vague allegory about the latter part of the vision).

p ch. v. 3, 13.
xii. 1. Mark
vii. 28 al. Ezek. xxiv. 5.

9 Καὶ ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν πέμπτην σφραγίδα, εἶδον ὅτι

ACPS B
a lo n. 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19 26-
7. 30. 32
to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B.

9. for την πέμπτην σφραγίδα, την σφραγίδα την ε' N¹ f.

aft εἶδον ins και C; pref f.

We have now passed the four first seals, after which the character of the vision changes. One feature common to these four is, Personification: the representation of processions of events by the impersonation of their leading features. Another is, the share which the four living-creatures bear in the representation, which after this point ceases, as far as the seals are concerned. No interpretation can be right, which does not take both these common features into account. And in my view this may best be done by viewing, as above, these four visions as the four solemn preparations for the coming of the Lord as regards the visible Creation, which these four living-beings symbolize. The whole Creation demands His coming. Ἐρχου, is the cry of all its tribes. This cry is answered, first by the vision of the great Conqueror, whose arrows are in the heart of his enemies, and whose career is the world's history. The breaking of this first seal is the great opening of the mystery of God. This in some sense includes and brings in the others. Those others then, as we might expect, hold a place subordinate to this. They are, in fact, but exponents of the mysteries enwrap within this conquering career: visions of the method of its being carried out to the end in its operation on the outward world. That the world-wide declaration of the everlasting Gospel should be accompanied by war, by famine, by pestilence, and other forms of death, had been announced by our Lord Himself (Matt. xxiv. 7), and is now repeated in this series of visions. The fulfilment of each of these judgments is, as it were, the removing a seal from the book of God's mysterious purposes: the bringing nearer of the time when that book shall be open for all the redeemed to read.

With regard to the question whether these four visions are to be regarded as consecutive or contemporaneous, I have already expressed an opinion. In their *fulness*, I believe them to be contemporaneous, and each of them to extend through the whole lifetime of the church. The analogy of the whole four symbols seems to require this. We read nothing implying that there are "days" of the opening of any particular seal, as there are, ch. x. 7, of the sounding of the several trumpets. The *ἡνα νύκτωρ* of the first seal speaks of a purpose which will not be accomplished till the earth be all subju-

gated: and if I am right in supposing the other visions subordinate to this, their agency is necessarily included in its process. At the same time I would by no means deny that they may receive continually recurring, or even ultimate fulfilments, as the ages of the world go on, in distinct periods of time, and by distinctly assignable events. So far we may derive benefit from the Commentaries of those who imagine that they have discovered their fulfilment in successive periods of history, that, from the very variety and discrepancy of the periods assigned by them, we may verify the fact of the prevalence of these announced judgments, hitherto, throughout the whole lifetime of the Church.

As regards *ultimate* fulfilment, there can be no doubt, that all these judgments on the world without, as well as the manifestation (of which they form a part) of the conquering career of the Kingdom of Christ, will reach their culminating point before the coming of the great and terrible day of the Lord. I may add, that no account whatever is taken, in the common *historic* interpretation, of the *distinctive* character of the four first seals, as introduced by the cry of the four living-beings: nor indeed is any interpretation commonly given of that cry itself.

9—11.] OPENING OF THE FIFTH SEAL.

We may at once observe, that the whole character of the vision is altered. The four living-beings have uttered each his cry of ἔρχου, and are now silent. No more horses and riders go forth upon the earth. The scene is changed to the heavenly altar, and the cry is from thence. Any interpretation which makes this vision of the same kind with and consecutive to the four preceding, must so far be wrong. In one point only is the character of the former vision sustained. It is the *κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς* who are objects of the judgment invoked: as it was the earth, and its inhabitants, and its produce, which were the objects of the former judgments. See again below on the sixth seal.

9.] And when he opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar (it is an altar of *sacrifice* which is here meant; ἑσφαγμένων, which follows, seems plainly to imply this: see below) the souls (i. e. departed spirits. It is manifestly idle to enquire, seeing that the Apostle was in a state of spiritual and supernatural vision, how these disembodied spirits became visible to him. That they were not, as

κάτω τοῦ ^α θυσιαστηρίου τὰς ^ι ψυχὰς τῶν ^ς ἐσφαγμένων ^{q = ch. viii. 3, 5 reff.}
^τ διὰ τὸν ^ι λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ [διὰ] τὴν ^τ μαρτυρίαν ἣν ^{r = Acts ii. 27 (from Ps. xv. 10), 31. ch. xx 4 only. Wisd. iii. 1. Jos. Antt. vi. 14. 2. s. ch. v. 6 reff. t = ch. i. 2. u. ch. xii.}
^{uv} εἶχον, ¹⁰ καὶ ἔκραξαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγοντες ^w Ὡς
^w πότε, ^ς ὁ ^γ δεσπότης ^z ὁ ^z ἄγιος καὶ ^α ἄληθινός, οὐ ^b κρίνεις
καὶ ^{cd} ἐκδικεῖς ^τ ὁ ^α αἶμα ἡμῶν ^{bc} ἐκ τῶν ^f κατοικούντων ^f ἐπὶ

17. xix. 10. v = John xiv. 21. w Matt. xvii. 17 ff. John x. 24. Ps. xii. 1, 2. Ixi. 3.
x voc, Luke xii. 32 xviii. 11. John xx. 28 al. Ps. v. 2. y = Luke ii. 29. Acts iv. 24. Jude
4 only. Isa. i. 24. iii. 1. see 2 Pet. ii. 1. z ch. iii. 7. [iv. 11.]
3. 1 Thess. i. 9. see ch. iii. 7 reff. b ch. xviii. 20. Ps. xlii. 1. c ch. xix. 2. 4 Kings
ix. 7. d as above (c). Luke xviii. 3, 5. Rom. xii. 19. 2 Cor. x. 6 only. 1 Kings xxiv. 13.
e Matt. xiii. 30. Gen. iv. 10 al. ff. f ch. iii. 10 reff.

aft ψυχας ins των ανθρωπων [P] N h 1. 10-2. 36-7. 46 copt æth arm. om 2nd
δια A tol copt Cypr Primas. και δια την μαρτυριαν is repeated by N¹. aft
μαρτυριαν ins του αρνιου B rel syr-dd Andr-p Areth; αυτου αρνιου 46; ιησου χριστου in
34-5 Andr-coisl: om AC[P] N n (1, e sil) 36. (38.) 47 vulg Andr-a Primas.—for μαρτ.,
εκκλησιαν 38. εσχον N¹.

10. rec (for ἐκραξαν) ἐκραζον, with [P] c 1. 38 (n, e sil) Andr, *clamabant* vulg: ἐκεκρα-
ξαν 19: txt ACN B rel Andr-coisl Areth, *clamaverunt* Cypr Primas. φωνην μεγα-
λην B a b c d f g m 2. 6. 9. 11-3-6-9. 26-7. 30 2-3. 40-1-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-coisl.
rec ins o bef ἀληθινός, with m 1. 16. 30²-5. 51 (d f h 13. 39. 90, e sil) Andr: om AC[P] N
B rel Andr-coisl Areth. εκδικησεις N. rec (for εκ) απο, with [P] 1 (17¹) P 33
(1 35-6-9. 40, e sil) Andr: επι n: και 38: txt ACN B rel Andr-coisl Areth, *de* vulg lat-ff.

Eichhorn, clothed with bodies, is manifest) of those that have been slain on account of the word of God and on account of the testimony which they had (i. e. which was committed to them to bear, and which they bore: see reff., especially ch. xii. 17. The testimony is one *borne by them*, as most Commentators: not one *borne to them* by the faithful Witness, as Düsterd. and Ebrard, most unnaturally: for how could the testimony borne to them before the Father by Christ (so Ebr.) be the cause of their being put to death on earth? Much has been said about the souls of the martyrs not being their departed spirits, which must be conceived of as being in bliss with Christ (cf. Hengsth.), and in consequence it has been imagined that these were only their animal lives, resident in the blood and shed forth with it. But no such difficulty really exists. We know, whatever be the bliss of the departed martyrs and confessors, that they are waiting for the coming of the Lord, without which they are not perfect: and in the holy fire of their purified zeal, they look forward to that day as one of righteous judgment on the ungodly world. The representation here, in which they are seen *under the altar*, is simply symbolical, carrying out the likening of them to victims slain on an altar. Even as the blood of these victims was poured under the altar and the life was in the blood, so their souls are represented as under the symbolical altar in heaven, crying for vengeance, as blood is often said to do. After this, it hardly need be said that no inference can be drawn from this vision respecting the intermediate state

between the death of the saints and the coming of the Lord): and they cried with a great voice, saying (viz. αἱ ψυχαι, which are identified in the sentence with the persons themselves: not, as Ebr. and Düsterd. the ἐσφαγμένοι as distinguished from the ψυχαι) Until when (i. e. how long: see reff.), thou Master (δεσπότης is the correlative of δούλος, cf. σύνδουλοι below, ver. 11, and see ch. i. 1; Luke ii. 29; 1 Tim. vi. 1. It is God who is here addressed; with Him rests the time when to avenge His elect, cf. Luke xviii. 7, 8) holy and true (see on ch. iii. 7, for the sense of ἀληθινός in such connexion: here it is too evidently intended of subjective truthfulness for the other meaning even to be brought into question: and it is wonderful that Düsterd. should have insisted on it, "der Herr, welcher in Wahrheit diejen Namen verbient." For the voc. expressed by the nom. with the art., see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 29. 2), dost thou not judge (give decision in the matter of; with ἐκ, see reff.) and exact vengeance for our blood from (reff.: ἀπο is found in Luke xviii. 3) them that dwell upon the earth (i. e. the ungodly world, as distinguished from the church of God)?

As hitherto, so here again, the analogy and order of our Lord's great prophecy in Matt. xxiv. 11 is closely followed. "The signs of His coming, and of the end of the world" were there announced by Himself as war, famine, and pestilence, vv. 6, 7. And when He had declared that these were but the beginning of sorrows (ᾠδινών), He next, vv. 9 f., announces the persecution and martyrdom of His

g ch vii. 9

teff.

h ch iii. 4, 5

teff.

i ch ix. 4 only.

j ch. xiv. 13.

Mark vi. 31.

Dan. xii. 13.

(-σις, ch. iv.

(8.)

k Luke xx. 9. John vii. 33. xii. 25. xiv. 9. Acts xix. 22 al. Isa. liv. 7.

m Matt. xviii. 28, 29, 31, 33, xiv. 49. Col. i. 7. iv. 7. ch. xix. 10. xxii. 9 only. Ezra iv. 7, 9.

n Matt. x. 28. Mark xii. 5. Luke xii. 4. 2 Cor. iii. 6.

1 = (see note) here only

n (-κτεν-) 90 B.

ACPN B

a lo n. 1.

2. 4. 6. 9.

10. 13. 16.

to 19. 26.

7. 30. 32.

to 42.

47 to 51.

to 42.

47 to 51.

90 B.

τῆς γῆς; ¹¹ καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς [ἐκάστῳ] ^{8h} στολὴ λευκή, ^{ACPN B}
καὶ ⁱ ἐρῶρέθη αὐτοῖς ⁱ ἵνα ⁱ ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι ^k χρόνον
μικρόν, ἕως ^{*1} πληρώσωσιν καὶ οἱ ^m σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ
ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν οἱ μέλλοντες ⁿ ἀποκτενεσθαι ὥς καὶ αὐτοί.

11. rec εδοθησαν . . . στολαι λευκαι, with 39 (e sil) vulg copt Primas: txt AC[P]N
B rel (1) syr-dd Clem Andr Areth Cypr.—εδοθη αυτοις ινα (omg αυτοις το αυτοις) 1.

rec εκαστοις: εκαστω 2. 4. 19 Clem; εκαστω αυτων n syr-dd aeth: αυτοις B
rel arm Areth: αυτοις εκαστω AC[P]N f h l m 10-1-2-3-6-7-8. 34-6-8-9. 47-9. 51. 90 B

Andr. αναπαουσονται A[P] B d k l n 1. 13. for ετι, ετι N 6: om 9: χρονον bef
ετι A am (with fuld al). om μικρον B rel aeth-rom Andr-coisl Areth: ins AC[P]N n

1. 38. 51 vss Andr Primas, and bef χρονον 36. 47. rec aft εως ins ov, with h n 1. 10-
7, 33-6, 49. 51 (4. 37 B, e sil) Andr: om AC[P]N B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec πλη-

ρωσονται, with Areth (P): * πληρωθωσιν AC e 51: πληρωσουσιν c g n 36: πληρω-
σωσιν [P]N B rel Andr.—πληρωσω (with σ superscribed) 1. om 3rd και B vulg arm

Cypr. ins και bef οι μελλοντες B a b c d e f g j 2. 6. 9. 13. 26-7. 30-2-3(-5, e sil)-9.
40-1-2-7-8. 50 Andr-a Areth Cypr, Primas. rec αποκτεινεσθαι, with [P] f j 1 (6.

16. 27. 30 and Beh's mss, e sil) Andr Areth; αποκτεινεσθαι B rel: txt ACN a 2. 9.
17-8-9. 34-5. 47. 50-1 Andr-coisl. add υπ αυτων N¹(N² disapproving).

people. Similarly here, after the judgments already announced, we have the prayer for vengeance on the part of the martyrs, and the announcement of more such martyrdoms to come. And as our Lord's prophecies received a partial fulfilment in the events preceding the destruction of Jerusalem, and may have done so again and again since, but await their great and final fulfilment when the day of His coming approaches, so it is with these. The cry of the martyrs' blood has been ever going up before God since Stephen fell: ever and anon, at some great time of persecution, it has waxed louder: and so on through the ages it shall accumulate and gather strength, till the great issue of the parable Luke xviii. 1 ff. is accomplished. And there was given to them [each] a white robe (there will be no real difficulty in understanding this, if we are careful to mark its real place and interpret it accordingly. The white robe, in this book, is the vestment of acknowledged and glorified righteousness in which the saints walk and reign with Christ: cf. ch. iii. 4; vii. 13 ff., al. This was given to the martyrs: but their prayer for vengeance was not yet granted. The Seer saw in vision that this was so. The white robe was not actually bestowed as some additional boon, but seemed in vision to be thus bestowed, because in that vision one side only of the martyrs' intermediate state had been presented, viz. the fact of their slaughter and their collective cry for vengeance. Now, as over against that, the other more glorious side is presented, viz. that though the collective cry for vengeance is not yet

answered, yet individually they are blessed in glory with Christ, and waiting for their fellows to be fully complete), and it was said to them that they should rest (not merely, abstain from their cry for vengeance, be quiet (so De W., al.):—but rest in blessedness, see ch. xiv. 13, and ref. Daniel) yet a little while until (construction, see reff.) their fellow-servants (see above on δεσπότης) also and their brethren (the καὶ . . . καὶ may be taken as “both . . . and,” in which case two different sets of persons are indicated by the σύνδουλοι and the ἀδελφοί, which distinction it would not be easy to give an account of. So that I prefer regarding the first καὶ as “also,” “as well as themselves,” and the two substantives as describing (notwithstanding the repetition of the οἱ before ἀδελφοί) the same persons; those who are οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν and οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν: the former term reminding them of the necessity of completeness as far as the service of their one Master is concerned: the latter, as far as they belong to one and the same great family) shall have accomplished (scil. “their course.” Considering that this absolute use of πληροῦν without an object following is an ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, it is strange that Ehr. and Düsterd. should designate πληρώσωσιν as an explanatory reading for πληρωθῶσιν. If this latter be read, then we must render, shall have been completed (in number); a meaning found Luke xxi. 24; Acts vii. 23, 30, ix. 23, xxiv. 27: cf. also Col. ii. 10, which suggests another reason for altering to -θῶσιν), who are about to be slain as also they were.

12 Καὶ εἶδον ὅτε ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν ἑκτὴν, ^ο καὶ ^ο σεισμός μέγας ἐγένετο, καὶ ὁ ἥλιος ἐγένετο ^α μέλας ὡς ^π σάκκος ^ς τρίχιμος, καὶ ἡ ^τ σελήνη ὅλη ἐγένετο ὡς ^τ αἷμα, ¹³ καὶ οἱ ^υ ἀστέρες τοῦ ^ο οὐρανοῦ ^υ ἔπεσαν εἰς τὴν γῆν ὡς ^ν συκὴ βάλλει τοὺς ^ω ὀλύνθους αὐτῆς ὑπὸ ἀνέμου μεγάλου ^α σεισμένη, ¹⁴ καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς ^γ ἀπεχωρίσθη ὡς ^ζ βιβλίον ^α ἐλυσσόμενον, καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ νῆσος ^β ἔκ τῶν ^ο τόπων

... ειλίσ-
σόμενος
καὶ ὁ.

1. 3. s here only. Exod. xxvi. 7. Zech. xii. 4 only. t Acts ii. 20, from
Joel ii. 31. see Matt. xxiv. 29. u Matt. xxiv. 29. (Isa. xii. 10.) v Matt.
xxiv. 32. Hab. iii. 17. Cant. ii. 13 only. x Matt. xxi. 10. xxv. 11.
51 xxviii. 4. Heb. xii. 26 (from Hag. ii. 7) only. y Acts xv. 39 only. Ezek. xlii. 21 only.
z Isa. xxxiv. 4. a Heb. i. 12 only, from Ps. ci. 26. Job xviii. 8 only. b w, ἔκ, ch. ii.
5 (Matt. xxiii. 4. xxviii. 39) Mk. Acts xii. 28. xxi. 30. xxiv. 5) only. Prov. xvii. 13. c = Matt.
xxvi. 52. John xi. 48. ch. ii. 5. xii. 14.

12. aft εἶδον ins ka 1. rec (aft 2nd ka) ins ἰδου, with A vulg-ed (with some mss and lat-f): om C[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff. εγενετο bef μεγας A c am (with demid fuld lipss tol) Vict: txt C[P]N B rel Andr Areth Primas. μελας bef εγενετο N B rel copt Andr-coisl: μεγας εγ. m: εγ. μεγας 19: txt AC[P] n 17. 33 (1. 36-8-9. 41-2, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Areth. rec om ολη, with [P] h m 1. 10-7. 35 (37. 40-9 B, e sil) Andr Promiss: ins ACN B rel vss Andr-p Areth.

13. for ουρανον, θεου A. επεσον B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N 19¹. 17. 33-8. 51 (1. 13. 30. 39. 40-1-2, e sil). (d illeg.) for eis, επι N 47. for βαλλει, βαλουσα rel syr-dd æth Andr-comm: βαλλουσα N j m 13-6. 30-4-5-9. 51. 90: αποβαλλει n 37: αποβαλουσα 38: βαλει 1: txt AC[P] B 10-7. 36 (f h 49 B, e sil) vulg Andr-a Areth. for υπο, απο N c2-marg f. rec μεγαλον bef ανεμου, with [P] h n 17. 36 (1. 37-9. 40-1-9 B, e sil) copt Andr: txt ACN B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas.—N¹ has μετ between με and γαλου, but marked for erasure, for σειομενη, σαλευομενη A 12.

14. rec om δ, with 1 (2. 13, e sil): ins AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth.—om ο ουρανος k. rec ειλις., with [P] d (appy) n 1. 18. 27. 33(-6, e sil). 47-9². 51: txt ACN B rel. — -σμενος N a b c d e g k n 2. 4. 6. 9. 16-8-9. 27. 30-2-8-9. 40-7-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-p Areth. for νησος, βουνος N (see Isa xl. 4): νησος C B.

12—VII. 17.] OPENING OF THE SIXTH SEAL, AND ITS ATTENDANT VISIONS. And herein (12—17) *Immediate approach of the great day of the Lord*, Matt. xxiv. 29 ||: (vii. 1—8) *gathering of the elect out of the four winds*, Matt. xxiv. 31: (vii. 9—17) *vision of the whole glorified church*, Matt. xxv.

The interpretation of this sixth seal is a crucial point in Apocalyptic exegesis. We may unhesitatingly set down all interpretations as wrong, which view as the fulfilment of this passage any period except that of the coming of the Lord. See the grounds of this below. And I saw when he opened the sixth seal, and a great earthquake took place (we have no word but “earthquake” for σεισμός, but it does not by any means cover the meaning. For here the heavens are shaken (against Dūsterd.), and the sea, and the dry land. See Hag. ii. 6, 7, and the comment in Heb. xii. 26 f. Compare also Zech. xiv. 4, 5), and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair (see ref. Isa. The cloth meant is the cilicium: see note on Acts xviii. 3. This answers to Matt. xxiv. 29,—εὐθὺς δὲ μετὰ τὴν θλίψιν τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων ὁ ἥλιος σκοτισθήσεται . . . and to δ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος, in Joel ii. 31), and the whole moon (i. e.

not the moon in her crescent or her incomplete form, but entire; as we say, the full moon) became as blood (so Matt. i. c., καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς; and Joel ii. 31, καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, πρὶν ἔλθειν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ), and the stars of the heaven fell to the earth (so Matt. i. c., καὶ οἱ ἀστέρες πεσοῦνται ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), as a fig-tree casteth her unripe figs (ὄλυνθος, τὸ μὴ πεπαμμένον σῦκον, Hesych. De W. explains it to mean, the winter figs, which almost always fall off unripe) when shaken by a great wind (so Matt. again, i. c., καὶ αἱ δυνάμεις τῶν οὐρανῶν σαλευθήσονται. It is remarkable, that in Matt., when the description has finished, the next words are ἀπὸ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν. The similitude from the fig-tree, though a different one, rises to the mind of the Apostle as he sees in vision the fulfilment of his Master's words which were so shortly followed by a similar illustration. The imagery itself, as that in the beginning of the next verse, is from Isa. xxxiv. 4). And the heaven parted asunder as a scroll when rolled up (the stars having fallen from it, the firmament itself was removed away, as an open scroll which is rolled up and put by. So also almost verbatim,

d Mark vi. 21. αὐτῶν ^b ἐκινήθησαν ¹⁵ καὶ οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ οἱ ἀστροὶ
 ch. xviii. 23. only Isa. xxxiv. 12 al. ^{a b c e i o}
^e ch. xix. 18. ^d μεγιστᾶνες καὶ οἱ ^e χιλιάρχοι καὶ οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ οἱ ^{n, 1. 2.}
 Mark vi. 21. ^f ἰσχυροὶ καὶ πᾶς ^g δοῦλος καὶ ^h ἐλεύθερος ἔκρυψαν ἑαυτοὺς ^{4. 6. 9.}
 John xviii. 12 only, exx. ⁱ εἰς τὰ ^j σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰς πέτρας τῶν ὀρέων, ¹⁶ καὶ ^{10-13. 16}
 Acts xxi. — ^k λέγουσιν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ ταῖς πέτραις ^l Πέσατε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ^{to 19, 20-}
 xxv. passim. ^m καὶ κρύψατε ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ ⁿ προσώπου τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τῷ ^{7 80.}
 1 Chron. xiii. ^o θρόνῳ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ^p ὀργῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου, ¹⁷ ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ^{32 to 42.}
 1. ^q ἡμέρα ἡ ^r μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ τίς ^s δύναται ^{47 to 51.}
 f ch. v. 2 al. ^t ^{90 B.}
 Prov. xii. 32. ^u σταθῆναι;
 Lam. i. 15 al.
 g ch. xiii. 16
 reff.
 h Matt. xxi. 13 ^v ^w ^x ^y ^z ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tt} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py} ^{pz} ^{qa} ^{qb} ^{qc} ^{qd} ^{qe} ^{qf} ^{qg} ^{qh} ^{qi} ^{qj} ^{qk} ^{ql} ^{qm} ^{qn} ^{qo} ^{qp} ^{qq} ^{qr} ^{qs} ^{qt} ^{qu} ^{qv} ^{qw} ^{qx} ^{qy} ^{qz} ^{ra} ^{rb} ^{rc} rd ^{re} ^{rf} ^{rg} ^{rh} ^{ri} ^{rj} ^{rk} ^{rl} ^{rm} ^{rn} ^{ro} ^{rp} ^{rq} ^{rr} ^{rs} ^{rt} ^{ru} ^{rv} ^{rw} ^{rx} ^{ry} ^{rz} ^{sa} ^{sb} ^{sc} ^{sd} ^{se} ^{sf} ^{sg} ^{sh} ^{si} ^{sj} ^{sk} ^{sl} sm ^{sn} ^{so} ^{sp} ^{sq} ^{sr} ^{ss} st ^{su} ^{sv} ^{sw} ^{sx} ^{sy} ^{sz} ^{ta} ^{tb} ^{tc} ^{td} ^{te} ^{tf} ^{tg} th ^{ti} ^{tj} ^{tk} ^{tl} tm ^{tn} ^{to} ^{tp} ^{tq} ^{tr} ^{ts} ^{tt} ^{tu} ^{tv} ^{tw} ^{tx} ^{ty} ^{tz} ^{ua} ^{ub} ^{uc} ^{ud} ^{ue} ^{uf} ^{ug} ^{uh} ^{ui} ^{uj} ^{uk} ^{ul} ^{um} ^{un} ^{uo} ^{up} ^{uq} ^{ur} ^{us} ^{ut} ^{uu} ^{uv} ^{uw} ^{ux} ^{uy} ^{uz} ^{va} ^{vb} ^{vc} ^{vd} ^{ve} ^{vf} ^{vg} ^{vh} ^{vi} ^{vj} ^{vk} ^{vl} ^{vm} ^{vn} ^{vo} ^{vp} ^{vq} ^{vr} ^{vs} ^{vt} ^{vu} ^{vv} ^{vw} ^{vx} ^{vy} ^{vz} ^{wa} ^{wb} ^{wc} ^{wd} ^{we} ^{wf} ^{wg} ^{wh} ^{wi} ^{wj} ^{wk} ^{wl} ^{wm} ^{wn} ^{wo} ^{wp} ^{wq} ^{wr} ^{ws} ^{wt} ^{wu} ^{wv} ^{ww} ^{wx} ^{wy} ^{wz} ^{xa} ^{xb} ^{xc} ^{xd} ^{xe} ^{xf} ^{yg} ^{yh} ^{yi} ^{yj} ^{yk} ^{yl} ^{ym} ^{yn} ^{yo} ^{yp} ^{yq} ^{yr} ^{ys} ^{yt} ^{yu} ^{yv} ^{yw} ^{yx} ^{yy} ^{yz} ^{za} ^{zb} ^{zc} ^{zd} ^{ze} ^{zf} ^{zg} ^{zh} ^{zi} ^{zj} ^{zk} ^{zl} ^{zm} ^{zn} ^{zo} ^{zp} ^{zq} ^{zr} ^{zs} ^{zt} ^{zu} ^{zv} ^{zw} ^{zx} ^{zy} ^{zz} ^{aa} ^{ab} ^{ac} ^{ad} ^{ae} ^{af} ^{ag} ^{ah} ^{ai} ^{aj} ^{ak} ^{al} ^{am} ^{an} ^{ao} ^{ap} ^{aq} ^{ar} ^{as} ^{at} ^{au} ^{av} ^{aw} ^{ax} ^{ay} ^{az} ^{ba} ^{bb} ^{bc} ^{bd} ^{be} ^{bf} ^{bg} ^{bh} ^{bi} ^{bj} ^{bk} ^{bl} ^{bm} ^{bn} ^{bo} ^{bp} ^{bq} ^{br} ^{bs} ^{bt} ^{bu} ^{bv} ^{bw} ^{bx} ^{by} ^{bz} ^{ca} ^{cb} ^{cc} ^{cd} ^{ce} ^{cf} ^{cg} ^{ch} ^{ci} ^{cj} ^{ck} ^{cl} ^{cm} ^{cn} ^{co} ^{cp} ^{cq} ^{cr} ^{cs} ^{ct} ^{cu} ^{cv} ^{cw} ^{cx} ^{cy} ^{cz} ^{da} ^{db} ^{dc} ^{dd} ^{de} ^{df} ^{dg} ^{dh} ^{di} ^{dj} ^{dk} ^{dl} ^{dm} ^{dn} ^{do} ^{dp} ^{dq} ^{dr} ^{ds} ^{dt} ^{du} ^{dv} ^{dw} ^{dx} ^{dy} ^{dz} ^{ea} ^{eb} ^{ec} ^{ed} ^{ee} ^{ef} ^{eg} ^{eh} ^{ei} ^{ej} ^{ek} ^{el} ^{em} ^{en} ^{eo} ^{ep} ^{eq} ^{er} ^{es} ^{et} ^{eu} ^{ev} ^{ew} ^{ex} ^{ey} ^{ez} ^{fa} ^{fb} ^{fc} ^{fd} ^{fe} ^{ff} ^{fg} ^{fh} ^{fi} ^{fj} ^{fk} ^{fl} ^{fm} ^{fn} ^{fo} ^{fp} ^{fq} ^{fr} ^{fs} ^{ft} ^{fu} ^{fv} ^{fw} ^{fx} ^{fy} ^{fz} ^{ga} ^{gb} ^{gc} ^{gd} ^{ge} ^{gf} ^{gg} ^{gh} ^{gi} ^{gj} ^{gk} ^{gl} ^{gm} ^{gn} ^{go} ^{gp} ^{gq} ^{gr} ^{gs} ^{gt} ^{gu} ^{gv} ^{gw} ^{gx} ^{gy} ^{gz} ^{ha} ^{hb} ^{hc} ^{hd} ^{he} ^{hf} ^{hg} ^{hh} ^{hi} ^{hj} ^{hk} ^{hl} ^{hm} ^{hn} ^{ho} ^{hp} ^{hq} ^{hr} ^{hs} ^{ht} ^{hu} ^{hv} ^{hw} ^{hx} ^{hy} ^{hz} ^{ia} ^{ib} ^{ic} ^{id} ^{ie} ^{if} ^{ig} ^{ih} ⁱⁱ ^{ij} ^{ik} ^{il} ^{im} ⁱⁿ ^{io} ^{ip} ^{iq} ^{ir} ^{is} ^{it} ^{iu} ^{iv} ^{iw} ^{ix} ^{iy} ^{iz} ^{ja} ^{jb} ^{jc} ^{jd} ^{je} ^{jf} ^{jj} ^{jk} ^{jl} ^{jm} ^{jn} ^{jo} ^{jp} ^{jq} ^{jr} ^{js} ^{jt} ^{ju} ^{jv} ^{jw} ^{jx} ^{ky} ^{kz} ^{la} ^{lb} ^{lc} ^{ld} ^{le} ^{lf} ^{lg} ^{lh} ^{li} ^{lj} ^{lk} ^{ll} ^{lm} ^{ln} ^{lo} ^{lp} ^{lq} ^{lr} ^{ls} ^{lt} ^{lu} ^{lv} ^{lw} ^{lx} ^{ly} ^{lz} ^{ma} ^{mb} ^{mc} ^{md} ^{me} ^{mf} ^{mg} ^{mh} ^{mi} ^{mj} ^{mk} ^{ml} ^{mm} ^{mn} ^{mo} ^{mp} ^{mq} ^{mr} ^{ms} ^{mt} ^{mu} ^{mv} ^{mw} ^{mx} ^{my} ^{mz} ^{na} ^{nb} ^{nc} nd ^{ne} ^{nf} ^{ng} ^{nh} ⁿⁱ ^{nj} ^{nk} ^{nl} ^{nm} ⁿⁿ ^{no} ^{np} ^{nq} ^{nr} ^{ns} ^{nt} ^{nu} ^{nv} ^{nw} ^{nx} ^{ny} ^{nz} ^{oa} ^{ob} ^{oc} ^{od} ^{oe} ^{of} ^{og} ^{oh} ^{oi} ^{oj} ^{ok} ^{ol} ^{om} ^{on} ^{oo} ^{op} ^{oq} ^{or} ^{os} ^{ot} ^{ou} ^{ov} ^{ow} ^{ox} ^{oy} ^{oz} ^{pa} ^{pb} ^{pc} ^{pd} ^{pe} ^{pf} ^{pg} ^{ph} ^{pi} ^{pj} ^{pk} ^{pl} ^{pm} ^{pn} ^{po} ^{pp} ^{pq} ^{pr} ^{ps} ^{pt} ^{pu} ^{pv} ^{pw} ^{px} ^{py}

...39. VII. ¹ [Καὶ] μετὰ τοῦτο εἶδον τέσσαρας ἀγγέλους ⁿ ch. xx. 8. ἑστῶτας ἐπὶ τὰς ⁿ τέσσαρας ⁿ γωνίας τῆς γῆς ^o κρατοῦντας ⁿ Ezek. xliii. 20. (vii. 2.) εἰς τὰς τέσσαρας ⁿ ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μὴ ^q πνέῃ ἄνεμος ^p Matt. xxiv. 31. Mk. Jer. xxv. (xlix.) 36. τοὺς ⁿ τέσσαρας ⁿ ἀνέμους τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μὴ ^q πνέῃ ἄνεμος ⁿ Dan. vii. 2. ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μήτε ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης μήτε ἐπὶ [τι] δένδρον. ⁿ Zech. ii. 6. ² Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον ἀναβαίνοντα ἀπὸ ^q ἀνατολῆς ⁿ Matt. vi. 25, Luke xii. 55. John iii. 8. vi. 18. ἡλίου, ἔχοντα ^s σφραγίδα st θεοῦ ^t ζῶντος, καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ ⁿ Acts xxviii. 40 only. μεγάλη τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀγγέλοις ^u οἷς ⁿ ἐδόθη ^u αὐτοῖς ⁿ Isa. xli. 24. ^w ἀδικήσαι τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν, ³ λέγων Μὴ ^w ἀδι- ^r so ch. xxi. 12. Job i. 3. Isa. xi. 14. s ch. ix. 4. see Rom. iv. 11. t Acts xiv. 15. Rom. ix. 26 (from Hos. i. 10). 2 Cor. iiii. 3. vi. 16 1 Tim. iii. 15. iv. 10. Heb. xii. 12. ix. 14. xii. 22. ch. xv. 7. u constr., ch. iii. 8 reff. v ch. ii. 7 reff. w = ch. vi. 6 reff.

CHAP. VII. 1. om και AC vulg copt Primas: ins [P]N B rel syr-dd æth Andr Areth. rec (for *τοῦτο*) *ταυτα*, with g n 1. 33 (27. 30. 47, e sil) vss Andr Primas: txt AC[P]N B rel copt Andr-coisl Areth. [*τεσσαρες* (2nd) P.] for *ανεμους*, *αγγελους* 1. πνευσθι N m 34. 40. ins o bef ανεμος C a f g k 26. 30. om επι της γης A. om της (bef θαλασσης) A. for last *μπε, μη* C. rec (for τι) παν, with [P]N h n 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr: om A syr-dd æth: *τινι* 19: txt C B rel vulg copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas. δενδρον A: δενδρων syr-dd æth. 2. rec (for *αναβαινοντα*) *αναβαντα*, with 1: txt AC[P]N B rel Orig Andr Areth. ανατολων A 90. σφραγίδα(sic) N¹. εκραξεν A[P] Andr-a-p. τεσσαρες(sic) N¹. [3. λεγον(sic) P.]

approach, and those terrible signs with which all Scripture ushers it in, have taken place. We are now then arrived at the time described in Matt. xxiv. 30: the coming itself of the Son of man being for a while kept in the background, as hereafter to be resumed. He is seen as it were coming: but before the vengeance is fully accomplished, the elect of God then living on the earth must be gathered, as Matt. xxiv. 31, out of the four winds of heaven, from among the inhabitants of the earth. To this ingathering the sealing in our text is the necessary preliminary. The correspondence between the series of prophecies holds even in the minutest particulars, and where they do not correspond, their very differences are full of instruction. See these pointed out as we proceed.

CH. VII. 1—8.] *The sealing of the Elect.* [And] after this (these words, μετὰ τοῦτο, shew that the opening of the sixth seal is complete, and that what is now to follow,—viz. the two visions each introduced with similar words, μετὰ τοῦτο (ταῦτα) εἶδον,—comes in by way of episode. They represent two great events, the sealing of the elect on earth, and the great final assemblage of the saints in heaven. The great day of the Lord's judgment is not described; it is all but brought before us under the sixth seal, and is actually going on in the first of these episodes (see below): but only that part of it which regards the saints appears to us, and that only by its result—their gathering in to heaven) I saw four angels (not, as many interpreters, bad angels;

nor does it necessarily follow that we are to adopt the analogy of ch. xvi. 5 and to regard them as “angels of the winds:” but simply angels, to whom this office is committed. This is all that is declared to us in the text, and it is idle to enquire beyond it. All allegorizing and all individualizing interpretations are out of the question) standing upon the four corners (ἐπὶ with accus. at the first appearance, as indicating the coming into that position, “sensu prægnanti;” see on ch. iv. 2) of the earth (i. e. North, South, East, and West, the cardinal points from which the winds blow) holding the four winds of the earth, that the wind may not blow on the earth nor on the sea, nor against any (or a, i. e. any) tree (the three disjunctives, *μητε, merely* couple, without any climax), and I saw another angel (as before, simply an angel; not as has been fancied, our Lord, nor the Holy Spirit; cf. τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν below) coming up from the rising of the sun (ἀναβαίνοντα, because the rising of the sun is low on the earth's horizon, whereas the Apostle was in heaven, looking down on the earth: and ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς ἡλίου, as naturally agreeing with the glorious and salutary nature of his employment. Cf. Ezek. xliii. 2; Mal. iv. 2. The allegorical interpretations which have been given are entirely uncountenanced in the text), having the seal (σφραγίδα, though anarthrous, is defined by the possessive gen. following) of the living God (ζῶντος, as giving to the seal solemnity and vital import): and he cried with a great voice to the four angels to whom it was

x ch. xv. 8. xvi. 17. xx. 3, 5.
 y = here, &c. only. (Joh. vi. 27. Eph. i. 13. i. 20. ch. x. 4. ref.)
 z = Matt. xxv. 14. Ezra. v. 11.
 a Rev. only; ch. ix. 4.
 xiii. 16. xiv. 1, 8. xvi. 5. xx. 4. xxii. 4. EZEK. ix. 4.
 b = ver. 8. Eph. iii. 15. Col. iv. 12. 1 Pet. i. 15 al. B.
 ACPSB n. 1, 2. a b c e i o. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16. to 19. 26. 7. 30. 32. to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 B.
 κησητε τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν μήτε τὰ δένδρα, ^x ἄχρι
 ὕσφραγίσωμεν τοὺς ^z δούλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῶν
^a μετώπων αὐτῶν. ⁴ καὶ ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ὕσφρα-
 γισμένων, ἑκατὸν τεσσαράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες ὕσφρα-
 γισμένοι ἐκ ^b πάσης φυλῆς υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ. ⁵ ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰούδα

αδικησεται (sic) N: αδικισετε I. for 1st μπετε, και A 37-8. 41-2 vulg (with am, agst demid fuld lips-4 tol): μητε n, μηδε (twice) N. rec (for αχρι) αχρις ου, with B rel Andr Areth: αχρις αν n 18 Andr-a: txt AC[P]N (αχρις) 1. 12 Orig².

4. om και . . . ὕσφραγισμένων A. ηκουσαν (sic) N. om τεσσαρες N c. χιλιάδας 1.

given (reff.) to injure (viz. by letting loose the winds, which they as yet held in) the earth and the sea, saying, Do not ye injure the earth nor the sea nor the trees, until we (not I: see Matt. xxiv. 31, cited below) shall have sealed the servants of our God (the God alke of the speaker and of those addressed) upon their foreheads (the noblest, as well as the most conspicuous part of the human frame).

This vision stands in the closest analogy with Matt. xxiv. 31, where immediately after the appearing of the sign of the Son of man and the mourning of the tribes of the earth, we read καὶ ἀποστελεῖ τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ μετὰ σάλπιγγος φωνῆς μεγάλης, καὶ ἐπισυνάξουσιν τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀπ' ἑκραν οὐρανῶν ἕως ἑκραν αὐτῶν. The judgment of the great day is in fact going on in the background; but in this first and general summary of the divine judgments and dealings, in which the signs of Creation and of the Church for Christ's coming are set before us, only that portion of its proceedings is described which has reference to these two. When the strain is again taken up, the case and reference are different.

The questions now arise, 1) who are these that are sealed? and 2) what is the intent of their being sealed? 1) Those who have followed the preceding course of interpretation will have no difficulty in anticipating the reply. They are, primarily, those elect of God who shall be living upon earth at the time here indicated, viz. that of the coming of the Lord: those indicated in Matt. xxiv. 31, above cited. (On the import and reason of the use of *Israel* and its tribes, I shall speak below.) As such, they are not *identical with*, but are *included in*, the great multitude which no man can number of ver. 9 ff. But they are also symbolical of the first-fruits of the Church: see notes on ch. xiv. 1 ff. 4.] And I heard the number of the sealed, an hundred and forty-four thousand sealed (the num-

ber is symbolical of fixedness and full completion, 12 × 12, taken a thousand fold. No one that I am aware of has taken it literally, and supposed that just this particular number and no more is imported. The import for us is that the Lord knoweth and sealeth His own: that the fulness of their number shall be accomplished and not one shall fail: and, from what follows, that the least as well as the greatest of the portions of his Church, shall furnish its quota to this blessed company: see more below) from every tribe (i. e. from the sum of the tribes; from every tribe, all being taken together. This is evident from what follows. For this accumulative sense of *πᾶς* with an anarthrous substantive, see reff. and Winer, edn. 6, § 18. 4) of the sons of Israel (this has been variously understood. By many, and even by the most recent Commentator, Dusterdieck, these sealed ones are taken to represent Jewish believers: the chosen out of the actual children of Israel. I need hardly say that such an interpretation seems to me to be quite inconsistent with the usage of this book. Our rule in such cases must be, to interpret a term, where it may possibly be ambiguous, by the use of the same term, if we can discover any, in a place or places where it is clear and unmistakable. Now in the description of the heavenly Jerusalem, ch. xxi. 9 ff., we have the names τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ inscribed on its 12 gates. Can there be any doubt as to the import of those names in that place? Is it not that the city thus inscribed is the dwelling-place of the Israel of God? Or are the upholders of the literal sense here prepared to carry it out there, and to regard these inscribed names as importing that none but the literal descendants of Israel dwelt within? (For observe that such an inference could not be escaped by the fact of the names of the 12 Apostles being inscribed on its foundations: those being individual names, the others collective.) It seems certain, by this expression

δώδεκα χιλιάδες ὃς σφραγισμένοι, ἐκ φυλῆς Ῥουβὴν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Γὰδ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ὃς ἐκ φυλῆς Ἀσὴρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Νεφθαλὶμ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Μανασσὴ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ὃς ἐκ φυλῆς Συμεὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Λευὶ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰσσαχὰρ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ὃς ἐκ φυλῆς Ζαβουλὼν δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Ἰωσήφ δώδεκα χιλιάδες, ἐκ φυλῆς Βενιαμὶν δώδεκα χιλιάδες ὃς σφραγισμένοι.

5—8. rec aft χιλιάδες ins εσφραγισμένοι (ten times), with c (6 B^r?) vulg Areth : twice (in ver. 5) l (-ων) 1 : once, n : om AC[P]N^s v rel harl¹ syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Primas.

5. om εκ φ. γὰδ δωδ. χιλ. N : for γὰδ, δὰδ 1.

6. νεφθαλι N.

7. om εκ φ. συμ. δωδ. χιλ. N m 35.

λευει N.

(ισσαχαρ, so A[P]N 1.)

8. transp ιωσηφ and βενιαμιν N.

βενναμειν [A]P.

εσφραγισμενοι B rel :

om 36 : txt ACN f h m n 10. 35 B^r (1. 16-7. 30-7-8. 40-7-9, e sil). [P def., having only the beginning of the word.]

being again used there "totidem verbis," that the Apostle must here, as there, have intended Israel to be taken not as the Jewish nation, but as the Israel of God. Again, we have a striking indication furnished in ch. iii. 12, who these children of Israel are, and to what city they belong :—ὁ νικῶν . . . γράψω ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς πόλεως τοῦ θεοῦ μου τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἡ καταβαίνουσα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα μου τὸ καινόν. These words serve to bind together the sealing here, and the vision of the new Jerusalem in ch. xxi. Nor is it any valid objection to this view that the persons calling themselves Jews in ch. ii. 9, iii. 9, have been taken to be actual Jews. There is a wide difference in the circumstances there, as there is also in the appellation itself) : out of the tribe of Judah, twelve thousand sealed, &c. &c. The points to be noticed in this enumeration are, 1) that with the exception of Judah being placed first, the order of the tribes does not seem to follow any assignable principle. It may indeed be not without reason, that Reuben, the eldest, next follows Judah, and Benjamin the youngest is placed last, with Joseph his own brother : but beyond this all is uncertainty : as any one will find, who attempts to apply to the order any imaginable rule of arrangement. So far has been generally confessed. "Nul-lus servatur ordo, quia omnes in Christo pares," says Grotius. 2) That the tribe of Dan is omitted. This is accounted for by the fathers and ancient interpreters, from the idea (founded on Gen. xlix. 17) that antichrist was to arise from this tribe. So Areth. in Catena,—ἡ τοῦ Δὰν φυλὴ τῆς σωτηρίας ἐκβέβληται, ἅτε μακρύνουσα τὸν Ἀντίχριστον, καὶ ὕπ' αὐτοῦ συγκροτου-

μένη, καὶ τούτῳ προσανέχουσα, καὶ καύχημα τοῦτον προβαλλομένη καὶ κλέος ἀκλέες καὶ ὀλέθριον : by most Commentators, from the fact, that this tribe was the first to fall into idolatry, see Judg. xviii. : by others (Grot., Ewald, De W., Ebrard, Düsterd., al.), from the fact that this tribe had been long ago as good as extinct. Grot. quotes for this a Jewish tradition,— "jam olim ea tribus ad unam familiam Hussim reciderat, ut aiunt Hebræi, quæ ipsa familia bellis interiisse videtur ante Esdræ tempora." Accordingly we find in 1 Chron. iv. ff. where all Israel are reckoned by genealogies, that this tribe is omitted altogether. This latter seems the more probable account here, seeing that in order to the number 12 being kept, some one of the smaller tribes must be omitted. In Deut. xxxiii., Simeon is omitted. 3) That instead of Ephraim, Joseph is mentioned. We have a somewhat similar instance in Num. xiii. 11, with this difference, that there it is "of the tribe of Joseph, namely of the tribe of Manasseh." The substitution here has been accounted for by the "untheocratic" recollections connected with the name Ephraim (so e.g. Düsterd.). But this may well be questioned. In the prophecy of Hosea, where the name so frequently occurs, it designates Israel repentant, as well as Israel backsliding ; cf. especially Hos. xiv. 4—8, the recollection of which would admirably fit the spirit of this present passage. I should rather suppose that some practice had arisen which the Apostle adopts, of calling the tribe of Ephraim by this name. 4) That the tribe of Levi is included among the rest, hardly appears to depend on the reason assigned by Bengel, al., that the Levitical ceremonies being now at an end, all are alike priests and have access to

c ch. iii. 8 reff.
d Matt. x. 30.
Luke xii. 7
only Gen.
xvi. 10
e = ver. 4 reff.
f ch. v. 9 reff.
g plur., ch. x.
11. xi. 9. xvii. 15.
1 ch. i. 4 reff.

⁹ Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ὄχλος πολὺς, ^c ὃν ^d ἄριθ-
μῆσαι ^e αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο, ἐκ ^e παντὸς ^f ἔθνους καὶ
^f φυλῶν καὶ ^g λαῶν καὶ ^f γλωσσῶν, * ^h ἑστῶτας ⁱ ἐνώπιον

ACPN B
a b c e to
n, 1. 2.
4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30. 32
to 33. 40
1-2 47 to
51. 90
B'.

9. om. ἰδον C. ὄχλον πολὺν A vulg. copt. æth. Primas. for on, και A: os
N'. om. αὐτον B rel. Andr. Areth.: ins. AC[P]N f. 1. 33 (13. 26-7. 36 B', e sil).
rec. ἡδύνατο, with [P] f. g. m. n. 1. 18-9. 35 (16. 37-9. 40-1-2. 51, e sil) Meth. Andr.:
δυναται k: txt. ACN B rel. om. και φυλων 1. * rec. ἑστῶτες, with A[P]N
10-7-8. 36 (h j 1. 13. 37. 40-1-2-9. 90 B', e sil) Andr.: ἑστῶτων C 38: εστωτα a 11-9:
εστωτας B rel. Andr.-coisl. Areth.

God: for in some O. T. catalogues, even where territorial division is in question, Levi is not omitted: the cities of the priests being mentioned under the head of this tribe. Cf. 1 Chron. vi.

It yet remains to enquire, before passing on to the second vision in this episode, what is the import and intent of the sealing here mentioned. It has been the general view, that it was to exempt those sealed from the judgments which were to come on the unbelieving. And it can hardly be denied, that this view receives strong support from Scripture analogy, e. g. that of Exod. xii. and Ezek. ix., especially the latter, where the exempted ones are marked, as here, on their foreheads. It is also borne out by our ch. ix. 4, where these sealed ones are by implication exempted from the plague of the locusts from the pit. It is again hardly possible to weigh fairly the language used in this place itself, without coming to the same conclusion. The four angels are commanded not to begin their work of destruction, until the sealing has taken place. For what imaginable reason could such a prohibition be uttered, unless those who were to be sealed were to be marked out for some purpose connected with that work? And for what purpose could they be thus marked out, if not for exemption? The objection brought against this view by Düsterd., that so far from being exempt from trials, the saints in glory have come out of great tribulation, is grounded on the mistake of not distinguishing between the trials of the people of God and the judgments on the unbelieving world. In the latter, the saints have no part, as neither had the children of Israel in the plagues of Egypt. And indeed the very symbolism here used, in which the elect are pointed out under the names of the 12 tribes, serves to remind us of this ancient exemption. At the same time, exemption from the coming plagues is not the only object of the sealing. It serves a positive as well as a negative purpose. It appro-

priates to God those upon whom it has passed. For the seal contains His own Name, cf. ch. iii. 12, xiv. 1. And thus they are not only gathered out of the world, but declared to be ready to be gathered into the city of God. And thus the way is prepared for the next vision in the episode.

9—17.] *The great multitude of the redeemed in heaven.* The opening of the sixth seal introduced the coming of the Lord. The first vision of the episode revealed the gathering together of the elect from the four winds. But before the seventh and *last* seal can be opened, and the book of God's purposes be unrolled, not only must all things on this earth be accomplished, but the whole multitude of the redeemed must be gathered in to the joy of their Lord. Then, and not till then, shall we know even as we are known, and read the mystery of God's ways without hindrance. Accordingly, in this sublime vision we are admitted to a sight of the finished state of glory, in which the seventh seal shall be opened. **After these things** (see above on ver. 1. The term indicates separation from that which went before, and introduces a second and distinct vision in the episode) **I saw, and behold a great multitude, which** (construction, see reff.) **no one could** (the past *ἐδύνατο* represents the classical *ἂν δύναιτο*: not that the attempt was actually made, but that if made it was sure to fail) **number, out of every nation** (see ch. v. 9) **and (all) tribes and peoples and tongues** (observe, that this very specification, of a multitude without number, carries us on past the first or millennial resurrection, indicated in the two former parables of Matt. xxv. (see notes there), and past the final judgment sublimely described at the end of that chapter: *οἱ δὲ δίκαιοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον* is the point at which our vision takes up that prophecy. We have *οἱ δίκαιοι*, in their robes of righteousness, made white in the blood of the Lamb, already, vv. 15—17, in the midst of those pleasures for

τοῦ ¹ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου, ¹ περιβεβλημένους ¹ constr., Matt. κ1 στολὰς ^{km} λευκάς, καὶ ⁿ φοίνικες ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν, ¹⁰ καὶ κράζουσιν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγοντες Ἡ ^o σωτηρία τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν τῷ ^p καθήμενῳ ^p ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ. ¹¹ καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄγγελοι ^q εἰστήκεισαν ¹ κύκλῳ τοῦ θρόνου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων, καὶ st ἔπεσαν ^{is} ἐνώπιον τοῦ ¹ θρόνου ἐπὶ τὰ ^t πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσ-
 ἐκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ ¹² λέγοντες Ἀμήν· ἡ ^u εὐλογία καὶ ἡ ^v δόξα καὶ ἡ ^w φία καὶ ἡ ^x εὐχαριστία καὶ ἡ ^y τιμὴ καὶ ἡ ^z δύναμις καὶ ἡ ^a ἰσχὺς τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰῶνων, ἀμήν. ¹³ καὶ ^a ἀπεκρίθη εἰς ἐκ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων λέγων μοι

ch. xii. 10. xix. 1. Ps. iii. 8. p ch. v. 13 reff. q see Matt. xii. 46.
 r ch. iv. 6 reff. s ch. iv. 10 reff. t ch. xi. 16 reff. u 1 Cor. x. 16 ch. v. 12. 12, 13. Neh.
 ix. 5. Sir. 1. 20. v = Jude 25 reff. w = ch. v. 12 x Rev. ch. iv. 9
 only. = Paul, 2 Cor iv. 15 al. y ch. iv. 11 reff. z ch. v. 12. 1 Chron. xxxix. 11.
 a = Matt. xi. 25. Acts iii. 12 al. Deut. xxv. 9 al. o (but w. gen.)
 m see ch. iii. 4, 5 reff. n = here (John xii. 13) only. (Ps. xci. 12.)
 2 Macc. xiv. 4.

for 1st ἐνώπιον, ἐπι A. rec περιβεβλημένοι, with [P]N^{3a} n 1. 10-7-8 (h j 37-9 B^r, e sil) Andr Fulg¹: περιβεβλημένος g 47: txt ACN¹ b rel Andr-coisl Areth Fulg¹.
 φοινικας N¹ B rel Areth: txt AC[P]N^{3a} m (1 1. 13-7-9. 38, e sil) vulg Andr.

10. rec (for κραζουσιν) κραζοντες, with 1 Andr-p (Del.) Areth: txt AC[P]N³ b rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr lat-ff, κραζουσιν m. Steph om τω θεῳ ἡμῶν, with 1: ins C[P]N¹ B rel, του θεου A, των k. om τω καθήμενῳ N¹. rec του θρονου, with N^{3a} B l 1. 17-8. 36 (j 37-8. 47. 51, e sil): txt AC[P]N¹ rel Andr Areth. Steph (aft θρον.) ins του θεου ἡμῶν, with 37-8: θεῳ ἡμῶν 1: om AC[P]N¹ B rel. του αρνιου N^{3a}, το αρνιον k: επι τω αρν. 40. at end ins εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων αμην N¹ (N^{3a} disapproving).

11. om οι N¹. rec εστηκεισαν (for -κεισαν), with 1. 17. 33. 51 (26 Bch's-5-mss, e sil): txt A[P] rel Andr Areth, -κησαν b l² 32-5-6. 501, -κισαν CN.—rec εστ., with C 9. 13-7. 30. 51 (26 Bch's-5-mss, e sil): txt b rel Andr Areth, ιστ. A[P]N¹ 36. (επεσαν, so AC[P]N¹ 9¹. 13-6. 27. 33.) aft θρονου ins αυτου b rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]N¹ g h n 10-7-8 (1. 37-8. 40-1. 49. 51 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr lat-ff. rec (for τα προσωπα) προσωπον, with 1 copt Andr-p Fulg: txt AC[P]N¹ b rel vulg syr-dd arm Andr Areth Primas.

12. om η (bef εσχαρ.) N¹ k. om 2nd αμην C 36 Andr-p Primas Fulg Ansb.

13. om εκ N: εις των πρεσβ. λεγων μοι is repeated by N¹.

evermore which always stand in Scripture for a description of the employments of the life everlasting) standing before the throne and before the Lamb (by these words the vision is fixed as belonging to that heaven itself which has been previously described, ch. iv. The celestial scene becomes filled with this innumerable throng: its other inhabitants remaining as before) clothed in white robes (see ch. vi. 11, note: and below, ver. 14), and palm-branches in their hands (bearing the palm-branch was a mark of festal joy, cf. John xii. 13; 1 Macc. xiii. 51: and this practice extended beyond the Jews, cf. Paus. Arcad. 48, οἱ δὲ ἄγῶνες φοίνικος ἔχουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ στέφανον· εἰς δὲ τὴν δεξιὰν ἔστι καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ νικῶντι ἔστιθήμενος φοῖνιξ. Remember also Virgil's "palmae, pretium victoribus," Æn. v. 111. As regards the palm-branch being also called φοῖνιξ, we have the authority of Pollux (Weist.), τοῦ μέντοι φοίνικος καὶ ὁ κλάδος δμῶνύμωσ φοῖνιξ καλεῖται: and they cry (the pres. expresses their

unceasing occupation) with a loud voice, saying, Salvation (ἡ σωτηρία, the praise of our salvation: the ascription of the salvation which we have obtained) (be) to our God who sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb.

11, 12.] The choir of angels, as in ch. v. 11, respond to the ascription of praise. And all the angels were standing (εἰστήκειν is in sense imperfect, just as ἔστηκα is in sense present: this latter importing "I have placed myself," = "I stand," and the former "I had placed myself," = "I was standing") round the throne and the elders and the four living-beings, and fell before the throne on their faces (then they were in the vision in the similitude of men) and worshipped God, saying, Amen: the blessing and the glory and the wisdom and the thanksgiving and the honour and the power and the might (observe the sevenfold ascription) be to our God unto the ages of the ages. Amen.

13—17.] Explanation of the vision. And one of the elders answered (on this

bier 9.
c perf. as aor.,
ch. v. 7 refl.
d ΕΞΕΚ. xxxvii.
3.
e ΜΑΤΤ. xxiiv
21
f ch. xxiiv. 14
only. G. L. N.
xlix 11
g as above (f).
Take v. 2
only.
h Mark ix. 3 only. Psa. l. 7. Isa. i. 18.

Οὗτοι οἱ ^b περιβεβλημένοι τὰς ^b στολὰς τὰς ^b λευκάς, ^b τίνες
εἰσίν, καὶ πόθεν ἦλθον; ¹⁴ καὶ ^c εἶρηκα αὐτῷ ^d Κύριέ μου,
σὺ οἶδας. καὶ εἶπέν μοι Οὗτοι εἰσιν οἱ ἐρχόμενοι ἐκ τῆς
^e θλίψεως τῆς ^e μεγάλης, καὶ ^{fg} ἐπλυναν τὰς ^{fb} στολὰς αὐτῶν
καὶ ^h ἐλεύκαναν [αὐτὰς] ἐν τῷ ⁱ αἵματι τοῦ ἀρνίου. ¹⁵ διὰ

i see ch. i. 5. (Heb. ix. 14. 1 John i. 7)

om 2nd τας C n.

om εισιν 1.

12. for εἶρηκα, εἶπον B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]N n 36 Andr. rec om μου, to 38 40-
with A 1 æth Primas: ins C[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Cyp. om μοι 1-2. 47 to
N. ἀπο θλιψ. μεγ. [omg της twice] A. ἐπλάτυναν a b e g j k 2. 9. 13. 30. 41. B.
2. 50. 82: ἐπλάτειναν 1. rec aft ἐλεύκαναν ins στολὰς αὐτῶν (with n?); αὐτὰς
A[P]N h(n?) 1. 10-2-9. 37. 49 B: vulg Andr-p lat-ff: om B rel æth arm Andr-coisl Areth.

...ουτοι
εισιν C.
APB n a
b c e to
n, 1. 2.
4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19 26-
7 30 32
to 38 40-
1-2. 47 to
51. 90
B.

use of ἀπεκρίθη, see reff.) saying to me (the elders symbolizing the Church, one of them fitly stands out as the interpreter of this vision in which the glorified Church is represented), These that are clothed in the white robes, who are they, and whence came they ('ad hoc interrogat, ut doceat,' Bede. The questions are those ordinarily put when we seek for information respecting strangers. Wetst. compares the τίς; πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; of Homer, and the "Qui genus? unde domo?" of Virgil. Both enquiries are answered in ver. 14)? And I said to him, My Lord (the address is one of deep reverence as to a heavenly being. See the limits of this reverence in ch. xix. 10, xxii. 8, 9), thou knowest (see ref. Ezek., from which the form of expression comes. The σὺ οἶδας must not with Ebrard be forced to mean, "I know well, but thou knowest better;" but must be taken in its simple acceptance, "I know not, but thou dost." And this again need not mean that the Apostle had no thought on the subject, but that he regarded himself as ignorant in comparison with his heavenly interlocutor). And he said to me, These are they that come (not, as E. V., "that came;" nor again must the present be put prominently forward, that are coming, as if the number in the vision were not yet complete: still less is it to be taken as a quasi-future, "that shall come," cf. ἐπλυναν and ἐλεύκαναν below;—but as in the expression δ' ἐρχόμενος, the present is merely one of designation. Their description, generically, is, that "they are they that come," &c.) out of the great tribulation (the definite art. ought not to be omitted as in E. V. It is most emphatic: "out of the tribulation, the great one." And in consequence some, e. g. Düsterd., have explained the words of that last great time of trial which is to try the saints before the coming of the Lord. But to limit it to this only, is manifestly out of keeping with the spirit

of the vision. I would rather understand it of the whole sum of the trials of the saints of God, viewed by the Elder as now complete, and designated by this emphatic and general name: q. d. "all that tribulation", and they washed their robes (the aor. is that so often used of the course of this life when looked back upon from its yonder side: they did this in that life on earth which is now (in the vision) past and gone by) and made them white (the reff. are full of interest) in the blood of the Lamb (i. e. by that faith in the atoning blood of Christ of which it is said, τῇ πίστει καθαρίσας τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν, Acts xv. 9: and 1 John i. 7, τὸ αἷμα Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ . . . καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας. See also Eph. v. 25—27. Several of the ancient Commentators have misunderstood this: e. g. Areth., —φαμὲν ὡς ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν ἡ ὑπὲρ χριστοῦ ἔκχυσιν πάσης ἀπῆλλαξεν αὐτοὺς κηλίδος. τῷ γὰρ οἰκείῳ αἵματι βαπτισθέντες λευκοὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ τοιοῦτου λουτροῦ ἀνέβησαν πρὸς τὸν ἐαυτῶν βασιλεῖα χριστόν: and, though differently, Joachim: —"sed cum sancti martyres in sanguine suo baptizati sint, quomodo sanguini Christi ascribitur quod abluti sunt, et non potius proprio sanguini quem pro Christo fuderunt? sed sciendum est, quod postquam empti sumus sanguine Christi, et ejus sacratissimo cruori communicare concessi, etiam sanguis noster sanguis ejus effectus est." Similarly Lyra: "merito dicitur sanguis Agni, quia est sanguis membrorum ejus, in quibus dicit se persecutionem pati." Ausbert ambiguously, "eas in sanguine agni candificant, subaudis, in Christi passionibus habitum mentis exornant." And Ewald has fallen into the same mistake: "sanguine Christi, i. e. cæde quam ob Christi doctrinam, Christi et in hac re exemplar secuti, passi sunt." Observe, we must not separate the two acts, washing and making white, as Hengstb., interpreting the former of the forgiveness of sins, the

τοῦτό εἰσιν ^k ἐνώπιον τοῦ ^k θρόνου τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ^{lm} λατρεύ-
ουσιν αὐτῷ ^{mn} ἡμέρας καὶ ^{mn} νυκτὸς ἐν τῷ ναφῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ
καθήμενος ^o ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου ^p σκηνώσει ^q ἐπ' αὐτούς.
16 οὐ ^r πεινάσουσιν ἔτι οὐδὲ ^r διψήσουσιν ἔτι, * οὐδ' οὐ μὴ
^s πέσῃ ^s ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὁ ^t ἥλιος οὐδὲ ^u πᾶν ^v καύμα, 17 ὅτι τὸ
ἄρνιον τὸ ^w ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ θρόνου ^x ποιμαίνει αὐτοὺς καὶ
^y ὀδηγήσει αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ^z ζωῆς ^z πηγᾶς ^z ὑδάτων, καὶ ^{ab} ἐξ-
αλείψει ὁ θεὸς πᾶν ^b δακρῦον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.

C δακ-
ρυον...
ACPN B
a b c, e
to n, 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19.
26-7. 30.
32 to 38.
40-1-2.
47 to 51.
90 B^r.

q = Luke ii. 8. v. 27. xii. 14 Acts xxi. 5. r Matt. v. 6. JOHN vi. 35. Isa. xlii. 10. s = ch. u. 1 c Ps cxx. 6. u = ch. ix. 4. Matt. xii. 10. Matt. xii. 44. L. Amos ix. 9. t = Isa. l. c Ps cxx. 6. u = ch. ix. 4. Matt. xxi. 22. Acts x. 14. Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16. Exod. xv. 26. w = Matt. xii. 25. Mark vii. 31 (1 Cor. vi. 5) only. Isa. liii. 5. see ch. xii. 12. xii. 6. xxi. 3 only. J. Gen. xii. 12. Judg. viii. 11 B only. (Lev. xxvi. 11. Ezek. xxxiii. 27.)

15. **ἐπι τῷ θρονῷ** [P] B rel Andrē: txt AN n 1. 34-5-6. 49¹ (e j m 17-8-9 Bch's-5-
mss, e sil) Andr. for σκηνώσει, γινώσκει (omg επ, which is insd by N^a) N¹(txt
N^{3c}): κατασκην. n 79 Andr-a.

16. om 1st **ετι** N 36 vulg syr-dd aeth arm Cyprr Primas Fulg. aft 1st ουδε ins
μῃ A f 18: om [P]N B rel Andr Andrē. διψασουσιν N e[: διψησωσιν P f.] om
2nd **ετι** m 1. 34-5-6-8. 40 aeth arm Fulg. * rec οὐδ'ε, with A[P]N f n 1. 17-8.

36-7. 40: ουδ' ου B rel Andr Andrē. aft ηλιος ins **ετι** (but marked for erasure) N¹.
17. **ποιμαίνει** and **οδηγει** a b c e g h² j k m 4. 6. 9. 19. 26-7. 32-3(-4-5, e sil) 47-8-9¹.
50 B^r: **ποιμανει** and **οδηγει** l 2. 13-6. 30-7. 40-1, but of these 16 (al P) has **ποιμανει**.
rec (for ζωης) ζωας, with 1. 38 Andr: txt A[P]N B rel vulg aeth Andr-coisl
Arēth lat-ff. δρακνον N¹. rec (for εκ) απο, with N f n 9. 16 (g 27. 47. 90, e
sil) Andr Tert: txt AC[P] B rel vulg Andr-coisl Arēth Cyprr. (1. 38 omit the clause.)

latter of sanctification: the latter is only the result of the former: they washed them, and by so doing made them white. The act was a life-long one,—the continued purification of the man, body, soul, and spirit, by the application of the blood of Christ in its cleansing power). On this account (because they washed their robes white in Christ's atoning and purifying blood: for nothing that has spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, can stand where they are standing: cf. again Eph. v. 27: none will be there who are not thus washed) they are before the throne of God (in the presence of His throne: seeing Him (Matt. v. 8; 1 Cor. xiii. 12) as He sees them), and they serve Him by day (gen. sing.) and by night ("more nostro loquens aeternitatem significat," Bede) in His temple (as His priests, conducting the sweet praises of that heavenly choir, ver. 10, and doing what other high and blessed service He may delight to employ them in): and He that sitteth on the throne shall spread His habitation over them (it is exceedingly difficult to express the sense of these glorious words, in which the fulfilment of the O. T. promises, such as Levit. xxvi. 11; Isa. iv. 5, 6; Ezek. xxxvii. 27, is announced. They give the fact of the dwelling of God among them, united with the fact of His protec-

tion being over them, and assuring to them the exemptions next to be mentioned. In the word σκηνώσει are contained a multitude of recollections: of the pillar in the wilderness, of the Shechinah in the holy place, of the tabernacle of witness with all its symbolism. These will all now be realized and superseded by the overshadowing presence of God Himself). They shall not hunger any more, nor yet (the repeated οὐδέ is exclusive, and carries a climax in each clause) thirst any more, neither shall the sun ever light upon them, no, nor any (reff.) heat (as, e.g., δ καύσων, the sirocco, which word is used in Isa. xlix. 10, from whence this whole sentence is taken): because the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne (the ἀνὰ μέσον is somewhat difficult to express in its strict meaning. In ref. Matt., it has the sense of among: in ref. Mark, that of through the midst of: in ref. Isa., of between. It seems to imply at least two things, between or in the midst of which any thing passes, or is situate. And in order to apply this here, we must remember the text and note at ch. v. 6, where we found reason to believe that ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ θρόνου, κ.τ.λ., imported in the middle point in front of the throne. If so, the two points required for ἀνὰ μέσον would be the two extreme ends of the throne to

see ch. iv. 9.
Mark iii. 11.
1 Tim. v. 11.

VIII. ¹ Καὶ ὅταν ἤνοιξεν τὴν σφραγίδα τὴν ἑβδόμην,
Winer, edn. 6, § 42. 5.

CHAP. VIII. 1. rec (for *οταν*) *οτε*, with [P] N B rel Andr Areth: om k: txt AC.

the right and to the left. See, besides *reff.*, Exod. xi. 7; Levit. xxvii. 12, 14; Judges xv. 4; 3 Kings v. 12; Ezek. xxii. 26) shall tend them (as a shepherd his flock), and shall guide them to the fountains of the waters of life (*cf.* ch. xxii. 1. ζῶης is prefixed for emphasis, as *σαρκός* in 1 Pet. iii. 21, οὐ σαρκὸς ἀπόθεσις ῥύπον. It is not found in the place of Isaiah, which runs thus: ὁ ἐλεῶν αὐτοὺς παρακαλέσει, καὶ διὰ πηγῶν ὕδατων ἔξει αὐτούς. See Ps. xxiii. 2) and God shall wipe away (*see reff.*) every tear out of their eyes.

All is now ready for the final disclosure by the Lamb of the book of God's eternal purposes. The coming of the Lord has passed, and the elect are gathered in. Accordingly, THE LAST SEAL IS NOW OPENED, which lets loose the roll.

CH. VIII. 1.] And when (for *ὅταν* with *indic.*, *see reff.* Notice, that it occurs in the opening of this seal only, giving it an indefiniteness which does not belong to any of the rest. The touch is so slight as not to be reproducible in another language: but it can hardly be denied that in the Writer's mind it exists) he opened the seventh seal (what sign may we expect to follow? The other six seals have been accompanied each by its appropriate vision. Since the opening of the last one, followed as it was by the portents and terrors of the day of the Lord, there has been an episodal series of visions, setting forth the gathering in of the elect, and the innumerable multitude of the glorified Church. What incident is appropriate for the removal of this last, the only obstacle yet remaining to the entire disclosure of the secret purposes of God?) there was (there became, there came on, supervened, from a state very different, viz. the choral songs of the great multitude, re-echoed by the angelic host) silence in the heaven about (*see reff.* There is no ellipsis in the ὥς: the duration is contained in the ἡμίωρον) half an hour (in enquiring into the meaning of this silence, let us first see whether we have any indication by analogy in the book itself, which may guide us. In ch. x. 4, when the Apostle is about to write down the voices of the seven thunders, he is commanded to abstain, and not to write them down. And though neither the manner nor the place of that withholding exactly corresponds to this half-hour's si-

lence, yet it holds a place related to the sounding of the seventh trumpet, quite sufficiently near to that of this, with regard to the seventh seal, to be brought into comparison with it. It imports 1) a passing over and withholding, as far as the Apostle is concerned, of that which the seventh seal revealed: i.e. of that complete unrolling of God's book of His eternal purposes, of the times and seasons which He holds in His own power. For this unrolling, every thing has been prepared: even to the taking off of the last seal which bound the mysterious roll. But as to what the roll itself contains, there is silence. 2) But it also imports, as Victorinus beautifully says, "semihora, initium quietis æternæ:" the beginning of that blessed sabbatical state of rest, during which the people of God shall be in full possession of those things which ear hath not heard nor eye seen. With equal truth and beauty does the same, our earliest apocalyptic expositor, proceed: "sed partem intellexit, quia interruptio eadem per ordinem repetit. Nam si esset jube silentium, hic finis narrandi fieret." So that the vexed question, whether what follows belongs, or not, to the seventh seal, is, in fact, a question not worth seriously answering. Out of the completion of the former vision rise up a new series of visions, bearing a different character, but distinguished by the same number, indicating perfection, and shewing us that though evolved out of the completion of the former series, they do not belong to the last particular member of that series, any further than as it leads the way to them. Even more marked is this again below in ch. xi.—xvi., where the pouring out of the seven vials can in no way be said to belong to or form part of the blowing of the seventh trumpet. It will be seen then that I believe all interpretation to be wrong, which regards the blowing of the seven trumpets as forming a portion of the vision accompanying the seventh seal in particular; and again that I place in the same category all that which regards it as taking up and going over the same ground again. In the seven seals, we had revealed, as was fitting, the opening of the great Revelation, the progress and fortunes of God's Church and people in relation to the world, and of the world in relation to the church.

δ τω ου- ἐγένετο ^d σιγῇ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ^e ὥς ^f ἡμίωρον. ² καὶ εἶδον ^{d Acts xxi. 40.}
 ρανω... only τ. Wiscd.
 ACPN B e = Mark v. 13. Luke viii. 42. John i. 40. vi. 19. xi. 18. xviii. 14 only.
 a to n, 1. f here only τ.
 2. 4. 6. 9. rec ημωριον, with [P] B rel: ημωριον 1: εμωριον N: txt AC j.
 10-3. 16
 to 19.
 26-7. 30.
 32 to 38.
 40-1-2.
 47 to 51.
 90 Br.

With regard to the trumpets themselves, we may observe, 1) that they repeat again the same mystic number *seven*, indicating that the course of events (see below) represented by this sounding is complete in itself, as was that indicated before by the breaking of the seals, and as is also that afterwards to be indicated by the pouring out of the vials: 2) that as in the case of the seals, there is a distinction made between the first four and the following three. Cf. below, ver. 13. 3) that as also in the case of the seals, there is an interval, with two episodal visions, between the sixth and the seventh trumpet. Cf. ch. x., and ch. xi. 1—14. 4) that of the trumpets, six only announce visions partaking of the common character of judgments, whereas the seventh forms, as we also saw in the case of the seventh seal, the solemn close to the rest. 5) and further, that as regards this seventh trumpet, the matters imported by it as being ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη (ch. xi. 14) are not given, but merely indicated by ἦλθεν . . . ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι, κ.τ.λ. (ch. xi. 18): just as we saw that the things imported by the opening of the seventh seal were not detailed, but only indicated by the episodal visions, and by the nature of the similitude used. 6) that before the sounding of the seventh trumpet, the mystery of God is finished, as far as relates to the subject of this course of visions. This is indicated by the great Angel in ch. x. 7; and again by implication in ch. xi. 15—19, both by the purport of the voices in heaven, ver. 15, and by the ascriptions of praise, vv. 16—18. This is the same again at the pouring out of the seventh vial, where the great voice from the throne announces γέγονεν, ch. xvi. 17: as we saw that it was at the opening of the seventh seal, as indicated by the silence of half an hour. Each course of visions is complete in itself: each course of visions ends in the accomplishment of that series of divine actions which it sets forth. 7) that as, when the preparation for the seven angels to sound their trumpets is evolved out of the opening of the seventh seal, the vision of the seals is solemnly closed in by ἐγένοντο βρονταὶ καὶ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ σεισμοί, so the vision of the trumpets is solemnly closed in by ἐγένοντο ἀστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ καὶ χάλασα μεγάλη. That the similar occurrence, ch. xvi. 18,

does not close the series of the vials, seems to be owing to special circumstances belonging to the outpouring of the seventh vial: see there (ch. xvi. 21). 8) that as in vv. 3—5, which form the close of the vision of the seals, and the opening of that of the trumpets, the offering of the prayers of the saints is the prominent feature (see notes below), so in the close of the series of the trumpets we have a prominent disclosure of the ark of the covenant of God, declaring and sealing His faithfulness to His church. Similarly again at the beginning of the series of the vials, we have the temple of the tabernacle of witness opened. Why we have not a similar appearance at the close of that series, is to be accounted for as above. 9) that, seeing that this course of visions opens and closes as last noticed, it (to say nothing at present of the following series of the vials) is to be regarded as embracing a course of judgments (for such evidently is every one of its six visions) inflicted in answer to those prayers, and forming a portion of that ἐκδίκησις invoked by the souls of the martyrs in ch. vi. 10. 10) If this be so, then, as this series of visions is manifestly to be regarded as extending to the end of the whole period of time (cf. ch. x. 7, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ἐβδόμου ἀγγέλου, ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν, καὶ ἐτελέσθῃ τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.), we may fairly say that it takes up the great world-wide vision of the seals at the point where it was said to the vengeance-invoking martyrs ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἐπὶ χρόνον: and that the judgments of this series of visions occur during the time of waiting. This view is confirmed by finding that οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, upon whom the vengeance is invoked in ch. vi. 10, are the objects of vengeance during this series of judgments, cf. ver. 13. 11) In reference to this last remark, we may observe that no one portion especially of the earth's inhabitants is pointed out as objects of this series of judgments, but all the ungodly, as usurpers of the kingdom of Christ. This is plain, by the expressions in the ascription of praise with which it closes, I mean, ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία κ.τ.λ. Earthly domination is cast down, and the Lord's Kingdom is brought in. And it is also plain, from the expression used in that same ascription of praise, καὶ διαφθεῖραι τοὺς διαφθείροντας τὴν γῆν, of what character have been these ungodly—the

g ch. vii. 9 xi.
4. see Luke
1. 19.
2 Chron.
xxix 11.
h see ch. iii. 20.
i = ch. vi. 9.
ix 13. xi 1.
xiv. 18. xvi. 7.

τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλους οὓς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἑστήκασιν, καὶ
ἐδόθησαν αὐτοῖς ἑπτὰ σάλπιγγες. ³ καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος
ἦλθεν καὶ ἐστάθη ^h ἐπὶ τοῦ ⁱ θυσιαστηρίου, ἔχων ^k λιβανω-

ACPN B
a to D, 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3 16
to 19.
26-7, 30.
32 to 38.
40 1-2.
47 to 51.
90 Br.

k here bis only ‡ (1 Chron. ix. 29 only.) (-vos, ch. xviii. 13.)

2. om τους επτα 1.

for εδοθησαν, εδοθη A a g h k m 30. 51. 90.

3. rec το θυσιαστηριον (bef εχων), with A[P] 1. 17. 36 (d 27. 49, e sil): txt CN B rel

corrupters of the earth—the tainters and wasters of the means and accessories of life. 12) Whatever be the interpretation which follows from the foregoing considerations, two canons must not be violated. a) As in the case of the seals, so it is manifest here, from ch. xi. 18, ἦλθεν . . . ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι, κ.τ.λ., that the series of visions reaches forward to the time of the end, and is only terminated by the great events indicated in those words. And b) as yet, no particular city, no especial people is designated as the subject of the apocalyptic vision. All is general. The earth, the trees, the grass, the sea, the waters, the lights of heaven, mankind,—these are at present the objects in our field of view. There is as yet no *θρόνος τοῦ θηρίου*, as in the outpouring of the vials, ch. xvi. 10. The prophecy goes on becoming more specific as it advances: and it is not for us to anticipate its course, nor to localize and individualize where it is as yet general and undefined. The further details will be treated as we go on).

2.] *First appearance of the seven trumpet angels.* And I saw (viz. during the symbolic silence, at the end of the half-hour. What now follows is not to be considered as in the interpretation chronologically consequent upon that which was indicated by the seals, but merely as in the vision chronologically consequent on that course of visions. The evolution of the courses of visions out of one another does not legitimately lead to the conclusion that the events represented by them are consecutive in order of time. There are other and more important sequences than that of time: they may be independent of it, or they may concur with it) the seven angels which stand before God (cf. Tobit xii. 15, ἐγὼ εἰμι Ῥαφαήλ, εἷς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἁγίων ἀγγέλων οἱ προσαναφέρουσι τὰς προσευχὰς τῶν ἁγίων καὶ εἰσπορεύονται ἐνώπιον τῆς δόξης τοῦ ἁγίου. The agreement is not entire, inasmuch as here another angel, and not one of the seven, presently offers the prayers of the saints. These are not the archangels, as De W. and Stern, nor are they the seven spirits of ch. iv. 5, as Aret. and Ewald: nor again

are they merely seven angels selected on account of the seven trumpets, as Hengstb. and Ebrard: this is entirely precluded by the article *τοὺς*. It is clear that the passage in Tobit and the words here refer to the same matter, and that the fact was part of that revelation with regard to the order and employments of the holy angels, which seems to have taken place during the captivity, and there were given to them seven trumpets (understand, with intent that they themselves should blow them). And another angel (not to be identified with *Christ*, as is done by Bede, Vitranga, Calov., al., and recently by Elliott: for thus confusion is introduced into the whole imagery of the vision. In ch. v. 8, we have the twenty-four elders falling down with vials containing the prayers of the saints: here we have an angel offering incense that it may mingle with the prayers on the heavenly altar. Any theological difficulty which belongs to the one belongs also to the other; and it is a canon which we must strictly observe in interpretation, that we are not, on account of any supposed doctrinal propriety, to depart from the plain meaning of words. In ch. vii. 2 we have ἄλλος ἄγγελος in the sense of a created angel (see note there): and would it be probable that St. John would after this, and I may add with his constant usage of ἄγγελος throughout the book for angel in its ordinary sense, designate our Lord by this title? There is something to me far more revolting from theological propriety in such a supposition, than in an angel being seen in the heavenly ministrations offering incense to mix with the prayers of the saints. It ought really to be needless to remark, in thus advocating consistency of verbal interpretation, that no countenance is hereby given to the invocation of angels: the whole truth of their being and ministration protesting against such an inference. They are simply λειτουργικὰ πνεύματα, and the action here described is a portion of that their ministry. Through Whom the prayers are offered, we all know. He is our only Mediator and channel of grace) came and stood over (ἐπὶ with gen., not simply *juxta*, nor *ante*, but *super*; so that his

τὸν χρυσοῦν, καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ¹θυμιάματα πολλά, ^m ἵνα ¹ ch. v. 8 reff. ^l ch. vi. 9 reff. ² δώσει ^o ταῖς προσευχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων πάντων ἐπὶ τὸ ^{ip} θυ- ² Πα. cxi. 2. ³ σιαστήριον τὸ ² χρυσοῦν τὸ ^a ἐνώπιον τοῦ ^a θρόνου. ⁴ καὶ ³ m const. ch. ⁴ ἀνέβη ^o ὁ ¹⁵ καπνὸς τῶν ¹ θυμιαμάτων ^o ταῖς προσευχαῖς ^o d at. = here ⁵ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκ χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ. ⁵ καὶ ⁵ bis only? ⁶ p Exod xl 26. ⁷ q ch. i. 4 reff. ⁸ r ch. ix. 2. xiv. ⁹ 11. xix. 3. ¹⁰ Exod xix. 18. ¹¹ s Rev (ch. ix. ¹² 2. &c. xv. 8 al³) only, exc. Acts ii. 19, from Joel ii. 30.

...θεου
C

APB v a
to n. 1.

2. 4. 6. 9.

10-3 16.

to 19.

26-7. 30.

32 to 38.

40-1-2.

47 to 51.

90 Br.

Andr Areth. for λιβανωτων, λιβανον το C.

rec δωση, with [P] B (rel?) Andr-

p-coisl² Areth: δω f 36: txt ACN b e g h m n 1. 34-5.

om last το N.

4. αναβη and om o N¹.

form appeared above it; the altar being between the Apostle and him) the altar (viz. the altar named ch. vi. 9, as the repetition of the word with the art. shews: see below on ver. 5), having a golden censer (the word λιβανωτός is elsewhere the *frankincense itself*: so ref. 1 Chron.: so also Schol. on Aristoph. Nub., cited by Grot., λίβανος . . . αὐτὸ τὸ δένδρον: λιβανωτός δὲ ὁ καρπὸς τοῦ δένδρου: and Ammonius (ib.), λίβανος μὲν γὰρ κοινῶς καὶ τὸ δένδρον καὶ τὸ θυμώμενον: λιβανωτός δὲ μόνον τὸ θυμώμενον. But here it unquestionably means a *censer*: cf. below, ver. 5, ἐλθὼν τὸν λ. καὶ ἐγένετο αὐτὸν κ.τ.λ. No argument can be derived from the censer being a *golden* one, as Elliott, partly after Sir I. Newton. The spirit of the heavenly imagery will account for this without going farther: we have, throughout, crowns (ch. iv. 4), incense-vials (v. 8), vengeance-vials (xv. 7), girdles (xv. 6), a measuring-reed (xxi. 15), &c., all of the same costly metal). **And there was given to him** (viz. by divine appointment, through those ministering: not, by the saints who offered the prayers (Ell.), for two reasons: 1) because the incense is mentioned as something distinct from the prayers of the saints; see below: 2) because no forcing of ἐδόθη will extract this meaning from it. It is a frequent apocalyptic formula in reference to those things or instruments with which, or actions by which, the ministrations necessary to the progress of the visions are performed: cf. ver. 2, ch. vi. 2, 4 bis, 8, 11, vii. 2, ix. 1, &c.) **much incense** (see ch. v. 8, and on the difference of the imagery, below), **that he might** (if we read δώσει, which after all is not really a various reading,—η, and η, being in the MSS. perpetually confused with ε, —we must remember that the fut. with ἵνα is a mixed construction, made up of ἵνα δώσῃ and ἀδώσει. We are compelled in English to choose *one* of these) **give it to** (various renderings and supplyings of the construction have been devised: but the simple dative after δώσει appears the only legitimate

one: and the sense as expressed by Calov., “ut daret *ταῖς πρ.*, orationibus sanctorum, eadem, i.e., ut redderet eas boni odoris preces.” This object was, to *incense* the prayers of the Saints: on the import, see below) **the prayers of all the saints** (not only now of those martyred ones in ch. vi. 9: the trumpets which follow are in answer to the whole prayers of God’s church. The martyrs’ cry for vengeance is the loudest note, but all join) **upon** (the ἐπὶ with accus. carrying *motion*; which thus incensed were offered on the golden altar, &c. From what follows it would seem that the prayers were already before God: see below) **the altar of gold which was before the throne** (this may be a different altar from that over which the angel was standing; or it may be the same further specified. The latter alternative seems the more probable. We must not imagine that we have in these visions a counterpart of the Jewish tabernacle, or attempt to force the details into accordance with its arrangements. No such correspondence has been satisfactorily made out: indeed to assume such here would perhaps be inconsistent with ch. xi. 19, where first the temple of God in heaven is opened. A general analogy, in the use and character of the heavenly furniture, is all that we can look for). **And the smoke of the incense ascended to** (such again seems to be the only legitimate rendering of the dative. The common one, “*with*,” cannot be justified: see Winer, edn. 6, § 31. 6. The prayers, being already offered, received the smoke of the incense. The whole imagery introduces the fact that those prayers are about to be answered in the following judgments) **the prayers of the saints out of the hand of the angel, before God** (these latter words belong to ἀνέβη, or rather to ἀνέβη *ταῖς πρ. τ. ἁγ.* Notice, that no countenance is given by this vision to the idea of angelic intercession. The angel is simply a minister. The incense (importing here, we may perhaps say, acceptability owing to the ripeness of the season in the

¹perf. as aor.,
²ch. v. 7 ¹eff.
³Mark iv.
⁴37 xv. 36
⁵Luke xiv. 23
⁶xv. 16. John
⁷ii. 7 (bis).
⁸vi. 13 ch.
⁹xv. 8 only.
¹⁰Gen. xiv. 17
¹¹only.
¹²v see ch. xiv. 18.
¹³w ch. xii. 4, 9,
¹⁴13 xiv. 19 al
¹⁵(Ezek. x. 2)
¹⁶x (Exod. xix. 16) ch. xi. 19 xvi. 18.
¹⁷23. ch. ix. 15.
¹⁸52. Num. x. 3.
¹⁹y ch. iv. 5 ²⁰reff
²¹a Rev. (here, &c., 6 times. ch. ix. 1, 13. x. 7. xi. 15) only, exc. Matt. vi. 2. 1 Cor. xv.
²²z Mark xiv. 12. Luke xxii. 8 Acts xxi.
²³Acts xxi.
²⁴1 Cor. xv.

5. Steph (for τον . . αυτον) το . . αυτο, with 1 33(-4, e sil) : το . . αυτον 36. 40. 50 :
 txt A[P] N B rel. for εβαλεν, ελαβον A. rec places φωναι bef βρονται,
 with [P] h n 1. 10-7-8-9. 36 (37. 49 B^r, e sil) : om και φωνα j : φω. κ. αστρ. κ. βρ. l : βρ.
 κ. αστρ. κ. φ. A a b c d e f g k m 16. 38 syr-dd copt : txt N B rel vulg Primas.
 6. om 1st oi 1. rec om 2nd oi, with N 16 (34-5-6. 47, e sil) Andr-b (Del) :
 ins A[P] B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth. for εαυτους, αυτους N¹, επ αυτους f.

divine purposes, so that the prayers, lying unanswered before, become, by the fulness of the time, acceptable as regards an immediate reply) is *given* to him : he merely wafts the incense up, so that it mingles with the prayers. Düsterd. well remarks, that the angel, in performing sacerdotal offices, is but a fellow-servant of the saints (ch. xix. 10) who are themselves priests (ch. i. 6, v. 10, vii. 15). 5.] **And the angel took** (it is quite impossible to maintain a perfect sense : an aorist (ἐγέμισεν) is indeed coupled to εἰληφεν) **the censer** (after having used it as above, i. e. shaken from it the incense on the altar) **and filled it** (while the smoke was ascending) **from the fire of the altar** (i. e. from the ashes which were on the altar), **and cast it** (i. e. the fire with which the censer was filled : the hot ashes) **towards the earth** (to signify that the answer to the prayers was about to descend in the fire of God's vengeance : see below, and compare Ezekiel in ref.) : **and there took place thunders and voices and lightnings and an earthquake** ("per orationes sanctorum," says Corn.-a-lap, "... precantium vindictam de impiis suisque persecutoribus, ignis vindictæ, i. e. tonitrua, fulgura et plagæ sequentes vii. angelorum et tubarum in impios sunt demissa." All these immediate consequences of the casting down of the hot ashes on the earth are the symbolic precursors of the divine judgments about to be inflicted).

One point must here be noticed : the intimate connexion between the act of this incense-offering angel and the seven trumpets which follow. It belongs to them all : it takes place when now the seven angels have had their trumpets given them, and this series of visions is introduced. So that every interpretation must take this into account : remembering that the judg-

ments which follow are answers to the prayers of the saints, and are inflicted on the enemies of the church.

6.] **And the seven angels which had the seven trumpets prepared themselves that they might blow** (raised their trumpets to their mouths, and stood in attitude to blow them).

7-12.] *The first four trumpets.* It has been before observed, that as in the case of the seals, so here, the first four are marked off from the last three. The distinction is here made, not only, as there, by an intrinsic feature running through the four, but by the voice of the eagle in ver. 13, introducing those latter trumpets and giving them also a distinguishing feature. And as we there maintained (see note on ch. vi. 8) that any interpretation, to be right, must take into account this difference between the four and the three, so here also. But in order to the taking into account of this difference, we must gain some approximate idea of its import. Does the intrinsic feature, common to these four plagues, bear a general interpretation which will suit their character as distinguished from the other three? I imagine it does. For, whereas each of those three (or rather of the former two of them, for, as has been observed, the seventh forms the solemn conclusion to the whole) evolves a course of plagues including separate and independent details, these four are connected and interdependent. Their common feature is destruction and corruption : not total, it is true, but partial : in each case to the amount expressed by τὸ τρίτον : but this fractional extent of action appears again under the sixth trumpet, ch. ix. 15, 18, and therefore clearly must not be pressed as carrying the distinctive character of the first four (on its import see note below, ver. 7). It is in the *kind* of

7 Καὶ ὁ πρῶτος ^a ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἐγένετο ^{bc} χάλαζα ^{b ch. xi 19.}
καὶ ^{cd} πῦρ ^e μεμιγμένα ἐν ^d αἵματι, καὶ ^w ἐβλήθη ^w εἰς τὴν ^{c Exod. ix. 24.}
^{e w. ἐν, here only (but see Exod. i. c.). Ps. cv. 34. μετά, Matt. xxvii. 34. Luke xiii. 1. dat., ch. xv. 2}
^{only. Prov. xiv. 16.}

7. rec aft ο πρῶτος ins αγγελος, with k n 1. 36-8 vulg copt Andr Primas : om A[P]N
B rel harl¹ tol syr-dd Areth. ^{μεμιγμενον} [P]N 12. 37-8. 46. rec om ἐν, with
1. 33(-4-5-6, e sil) demid syr-dd Tich : ins A[P]N B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas.

exercise which their agency finds, that these four trumpets are especially distinguished. The plagues indicated by them are entirely inflicted on *natural objects* : the earth, trees, grass, sea, rivers, lights of heaven : whereas those indicated by the two latter are expressly said to be inflicted on *men*, and *not* on natural objects : cf. ch. ix. 4, 15. Surely, however these natural objects are in each case to be understood, this is a point not lightly to be passed over. Nor can it fail to strike every unprejudiced student, that we must not, as is done by many expositors, interpret the γῆ and χόρτος and δένδρα as signifying nations and men in the former portion of the series of visions, and then, when the distinction between these and men is made in the latter part, be content with the literal meaning. With every allowance for the indisputable intermixture, in many places, of literal and allegorical meanings, all analogy requires that in the same series of visions, when one judgment is to destroy earth, trees, and grass, and another not to injure earth, trees, or grass, but men only, the earth, trees, and grass should bear the same meaning in the two cases. We may fairly say then, that the plagues of the four former trumpets affect the accessories of life—the earth, the trees, the green grass, the waters as means of transit and of subsistence, the lights of heaven :—whereas those of the last two affect life itself, the former by the infliction of pain, the latter of death.

A certain analogy may be noticed, but not a very close one, between these plagues and those in Egypt of old. The analogy is not close, for the order is not the same, nor are all particulars contained in the one series which are contained in the other : but the resemblance is far too striking to pass without remark. We have the hail and fire, the water turned to blood, the darkness, the locusts (the infliction of death) : five, in fact, if not six, out of the ten. The Egyptian plagues are beyond doubt remembered in the sacred imagery, if they are not reproduced.

The secret of interpretation here I believe to be this : The whole seven trumpets bring before us the punishment of the

enemies of God during the period indicated by their course. These punishments are not merely direct inflictions of plagues, but consist in great part of that judicial retribution on them that know not God, which arises from their own depravity, and in which their own sins are made to punish themselves. This kind of punishment comes before us especially in the four first trumpet-visions. The various natural accessories of life are ravaged, or are turned to poison. In the first, the earth and its produce are ravaged with fire : in the second, the sea is mingled with blood, and ships, which should have been for men's convenience, are destroyed. In the third, the waters and springs, the essential refreshments of life, are poisoned, and death is occasioned by drinking of them. In the fourth, the natural lights of heaven are darkened. So that I regard these first four trumpets as setting forth the gradual subjugation of the earth to Him whose kingdom it is in the end to become, by judgments inflicted on the ungodly, as regards the vitiating and destroying the ordinary means of subsistence, and comfort, and knowledge. In the details of these judgments, as also of the two following, there are many particulars which I cannot interpret, and with regard to which it may be a question whether they are to be considered as other than belonging to the requisite symbolic machinery of the prophecy. But in confessing this I must also say, that I have never seen, in any apocalyptic Commentator, an interpretation of these details at all approaching to verisimilitude : never any which is not obliged to force the plain sense of words, or the certain course of history, to make them fit the requisite theory. Many examples of these will be found in the history of apocalyptic interpretation given by Mr. Elliott in vol. iv. of his *Horæ Apocalypticae*.

7.] And the first blew his trumpet, and there took place hail and fire mingled in blood (i.e. the hail and the fire were mingled together (plur.) in blood, as their flux or vehicle ; the stones of hail and the balls of fire (not lightning, as Ebr.) fell in a shower of blood, just as hail and fireballs commonly fall in a shower of rain. There is here manifestly an allusion to the plague

f ch xvii. 16. γῆν· καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς γῆς ^fκατεκάη, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν APN B a
 λviii. 8. δένδρων ^fκατεκάη, καὶ πᾶς ^{gh}χόρτος ^{hi}χλωρὸς ^fκατεκάη. to n, 1.
 Ezek xx. 47. 2. 4. 6. 9.
 form also, see 10-3. 16
 1 Cor iii 15. to 19.
 2 Pet iii. 10. 26-7. 30.
 Isa xlviii. 14. 32 to 38.
 g ch ix 4. 40-1-2.
 Matt vi 30. 47 to 51.
 1 Cor vi 12 90 B.
 James i. 10, 11 al. h Mark vi 39 only. Isa. xv 6
 k = ch. i. 10 al. fr 1 ch. xxi. 8. Heb. xii 18 Deut iv 11.

rec om και το τριτον της γης κατακαη, with m 1. 35 (B^r, e sil) copt: ins A[P]N B rel
 vulg syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth lat-ff. om και το τριτον των δένδρων κατακαη

B¹ f j k 10. 30-2-3. 90 æth.

8. om αγγελος N.

om πυρι B rel Areth: ins A[P]N m n 17¹. 34-5-6 (1. 18. 38,

of hail in Egypt, of which it is said that "the fire ran along upon the ground:" ἦν δὲ ἡ χάλασα καὶ τὸ πῦρ φλογίζον ἐν τῇ χαλᾷ, ref. Exod.: but with the addition of the blood. With regard to this latter, we may remark, that both here and under the vials, where the earth, seas, and rivers are again the objects of the first three judgments, *blood* is a feature common to all three. It appears rather to indicate a general character of the judgments, than to require any special interpretation in each particular case. In blood is life: in the shedding, or in the appearing, of blood, is implied the destruction of life, with which, as a consequence, all these judgments must be accompanied), and it was cast into the earth (towards the surface of the earth): and the third part (this expression first occurring here, it will be well once for all to enquire into its meaning in these prophecies. I may first say, that all *special* interpretations seem to me utterly to have failed, and of these none so signally as that of Mr. Elliott, who would understand it of a tripartite division of the Roman Empire at the time to which he assigns this judgment. It is fatal to this whole class of interpretations, that it is not said the hail, &c. were cast on a *third part*, but that the destruction occasioned by them *extended* to a third part of the earth on which they were cast. And this is most expressly declared to be so in this first case, by *all green grass* being also destroyed, not a third part: a fact of which Elliott takes no notice. It is this mixture of the fractional third with other designations of extent of mischief, which will lead us, I believe, to the right interpretation. We find it again under the third trumpet, where the star Wormwood is cast ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὕδατων: the result being that τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων was embittered. This lax usage would of itself lead us to suppose that we are not to look for strict definiteness in the interpretation. And if we refer to the prophecy in Zech. xiii. 8 f,

where the import is to announce judgment on a greater part and the escape of a remnant, we find the same tripartite division: καὶ ἔσται ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ, λέγει κύριος, τὰ δύο μέρη αὐτῆς ἐξολοθρευθήσεται, καὶ ἐκλείψει, τὸ δὲ τρίτον ὑπολειφθήσεται ἐν αὐτῇ. Nay, in the Apocalypse itself, we have τὸ τρίτον used where the sense can hardly but be similarly indefinite: e.g., under the sixth trumpet, ch. ix. 15, 18, and xii. 4, where it is said that the dragon's tail σύρει τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ: the use of the *present* shewing that it is rather a general power, than a particular event which is designated. Compare again the use of τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς in ch. vi. 8, and of τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως in ch. xi. 13. All these seem to shew, that such prophetic expressions are to be taken rather in their import as to amount, than in any strict fractional division. Here, for instance, I would take the pervading τὸ τρίτον as signifying, that though the judgment is undoubtedly, as to extent, fearful and sweeping, yet that God in inflicting it, spares more than he smites: two thirds escape in each case, while one is smitten) of the earth (i.e. plainly of the surface of the earth, and that, of the cultivated soil, which admitted of such a devastation) was burnt up (so that the *fire* prevails in the plague, not the hail nor the blood), and the third part of the trees (in all the earth, not in the third part) was burnt up, and all green grass (upon earth: no longer a third part: possibly because green grass would first and unavoidably every where scorch up at the approach of such a plague, whereas the hardier crops and trees might partially escape) was burnt up.

8.] And the second angel blew his trumpet: and as it were a great mountain burning with fire was cast into the sea (first, by the ὄς, that which was cast into the sea was *not* a mountain, but only a burning mass so large as to look like one. Then, it was *this mass itself*, not any thing proceeding from it, which was

νετο τὸ τρίτον τῆς θαλάσσης αἷμα, ⁹ καὶ ἀπέθανεν τὸ ^m τρίτον τῶν ^m κτισμάτων τῶν ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ τὰ ἔχοντα ⁿ ψυχάς, καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν πλοίων ^o διεφθάρησαν.

¹⁰ Καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἄγγελος ^a ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ^p ἔπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ ^p οὐρανοῦ ^p ἄστὴρ μέγας ^a καιόμενος ὡς ^a λαμπάς, καὶ ^r ἔπεσεν ^r ἐπὶ τὸ τρίτον τῶν ποταμῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς πηγὰς τῶν ὑδάτων. ¹¹ καὶ τὸ ^s ὄνομα τοῦ ἀστέρος ^s λέγεται ὁ ^t ἄψινθος, καὶ ^u ἐγένετο τὸ τρίτον τῶν ὑδάτων ^u εἰς ^t ἄψιν-

r ch. vii. 16 reff.

s here only.

t here bis only +. (-θίον, Prov. v. 4 Aq.)

xvi. 19. John xvi. 20 (Matt. xxi. 42, from Ps. cxviii 22. Luke xlii. 19) al.

m 1 Tim. iv 4.
James i. 18.
ch. v. 13
only +. Wisd.
xiii. 5 al
n = ch. xvi. 3.
Gen. i. 30.
o Luke xii.
33. 2 Cor.
iv. 16.
1 Tim. vi. 5.
ch. xi. 16 bis
only. 1 Kings
xxiii. 10.
plur., ch. i.
19 reff
p ch. ix. 1.
q Sir. xlviii. 1.
see ch. iv. 5
reff.

u = ch.

e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr lat-ff.

εγενηθη Ν.

9. aft 1st *τρίτον* ins *μερος* Ν 34-5-6.om 2nd *των* B rel Andr-p Areth: om *των*εν τη θαλάσῃ 1: ins A[P]Ν m 33-8. 40. 51 (27. 34-5-6, e sil) Ath Andr. *ψυχην*Ν. rec (for *διεφθάρησαν*) *διεφθαρη*, with B rel Andr Areth: txt A[P]Ν h n 1(-*ρισαν*) 10-3-7. 37. 49. 51 B^r Andr-a.10. om *και επι τας πηγας των υδρων* A.rec om 2nd *των* (with 4. 17-8-9. 26-7.

30, e sil): ins [P]Ν B rel Andr Areth.

11. rec om *δ*, with Ν f l 1. 33-8 (32-4-6, e sil) Andr: ins A[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth.*αψινθον* a b c j: *αψινθιον* and adds *και λεγεται* Ν¹. (homœotel k, *αψινθ*. 1st to 2nd.) rec (for *εγενετο*) *γινεται*, with 1. 17¹(appy) 36: txt A[P]Ν B rel Andr Areth.

cast down. So that the introduction of a *volcano* into the imagery is quite unjustifiable. In the language (hardly in the sense) there seems to be a reminiscence of Jer. xxviii. (li.) 25, *δῶσω σε ὡς ὕδρος ἐμπεπυρισμένον*. It is remarkable that there the *ὑδρος* should be characterized as *τὸ διεφθαρμένον τὸ διαφθεῖρον πάσαν τὴν γῆν*: cf. our ch. xi. 18), and the third part of the sea became blood (so in the Egyptian plague the Nile and all the Egyptian waters. By the *non-consequence* of the result of the fiery mass falling into the sea (so De W., “eine Zerstörung ohne Analogie”) is again represented to us that in the infliction of this plague from above, the instrument of it is merely described as it appeared (ὡς), not as it really was. So that all ideas imported into the interpretation which take the *mountain*, or the *fiery* character of it, as elements in the symbolism, are departures from the real intent of the description): and the third part of the creatures (reff.) (that were) in the sea (not, as Elliott, “in the third part of the sea,” but in the whole. Nor again must we stretch ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ to mean the maritime coasts, nor the islands, nor the transmarine provinces: a usage not even shewn to exist by the examples cited by him, vol. i. p. 344 note: nor by Tacitus’s “*plenum exsiliis mare*,” any more than, if we were to say “the sea is full of emigrants from Ireland,” we should by “*the sea*” mean “*the ships*”) died (cf. Exod. vii. 17—21)

those which have life (animal souls: see reff.: and for the appositional nominative, ch. ii. 20 reff.), and the third part of the ships were destroyed (another inconsequent result, and teaching us as before.

We may remark, at the end of this second trumpet, that the judgments inflicted by these first two are distinctly those which in ch. vii. 3 were held back until the servants of God were sealed: *μὴ ἀδικήσῃτε τὴν γῆν μήτε τὴν θάλασσαν μήτε τὰ δένδρα, ἕχρι σφραγίσωμεν* κ.τ.λ. So that, as before generally remarked, the place of these trumpet-plagues must be sought *after* that sealing: and consequently (see there) in very close conjunction with the day of the Lord itself).

10.] And the third angel blew his trumpet, and there fell from heaven a great star burning as a lamp, and it fell upon the third part of the rivers and upon the fountains of the waters (it can hardly be said, as Düsterd., that we are here as matter of course to understand, on the *third part* of the fountains, any more than we are to limit the *πᾶς χόρτος χλωρός* in ver. 7 to all the grass within the third part of the earth). And the name of the star is called Wormwood (the more usual forms are *τὸ ἄψινθιον*, or ἡ *ἄψινθος*. The masc. seems to be chosen on account of its conformity to *ὁ ἄστὴρ*. There is a river in Thrace so called. See on the plant, and its medicinal use by the ancients, Winer, Realw. art. *Bermyth*: and Pliny, xxvii. 28), and the third part of

v eh ix. 2, 18.
xvi. 10, 11,
21. xviii. 1.
Rom. i. 4
Num. xxxv.
18. Josh. xx.
9 A.

w Col. iii. 19
ch x. 9, 10.
only (Exod.
xvi. 20 al
Ruth i. 13, 20
al, but met.)
x here only.
Isa. i. 5 ix.
13. (= πα-
τάσσω,
Elocl vii. 25.)
ix. 2 v. r only. Isa. xiii. 10
18. Dan. vii. 3.

θον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέθανον ἕκ τῶν ὑδά-
των, ὅτι ἔπικράνθησαν.

12 Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἔπληγγ τὸ
τρίτον τοῦ ἡλίου καὶ τὸ τρίτον τῆς σελήνης καὶ τὸ τρί-
τον τῶν ἁστέρων, ἵνα σκοτισθῇ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡ
ἡμέρα μὴ φανῇ τὸ τρίτον αὐτῆς, καὶ ἡ νύξ ὁμοίως.

13 Καὶ εἶδον καὶ ἤκουσα ἐνὸς αἰετοῦ πετομένου ἐν

γ ch. xii. 4.

a = ch. xxi. 28 ref

z Matt. xxiv. 29 || Mk.

Luke xxiii. 4, 5. Rom. i. 21. xi. 10 ch.
b = ch. ix. 13. xvii. 21. Matt. vii.

APN va
to n. 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19.
26. 7. 30.
32 to 38.
40-1-2.
47 to 51.
90 B.

Steph om των υδατων appy by mistake. αἰψὺθιον N d l n 48. rec om των
(bef ανθρ.): ins A[P]N B 33 (sic, Del) rel Andr Areth. for εκ, επι A: απο e.

12. for ἐπληγγ, πληγγ 1. το τρίτον αὐτῆς μὴ φανῇ ἡ ἡμέρα B rel vulg copt: om
το τρ. αὐτῶν precedg 33: for αὐτῆς, αὐτῶν retaining αὐτῶν precedg (30. 40) 90: μὴ
φανῇ ἡ ἡμέρα, omg το τρίτον αὐτῆς, j 18. 38: txt A[P]N h (m) 10-7-9. (34.) 47 (but
αὐτῶν). 49 (37 Br, e sil).—rec φανῇ, with [P(φενῇ)] h 1. 10-7. 49 (37 Br, e sil): txt
AN B rel.—for μὴ φανῇ, οὐκ ἐφαίνεν m 34 (35) Andr-coisl: ινα μὴ φανῇ n 47.—ἡ ἡμέρα
οὐκ ἐφαίνεν αὐτῶν (or αὐτῆς), omg το τρίτον αὐτῆς, 35.—καὶ ἡμέρα μὴ φαίνει το φῶς
αὐτῆς καὶ ἡ νύξ ὁμοίως το τρίτον αὐτῆς 36.—for τρίτον, τέταρτον A.—om η bef ημ. B
(Tischdf, not Mai).

13. om εἰς N. rec (for αἰετοῦ) ἀγγελοῦ, with [P] l n 1. 16. (17¹?) 34-5-6. 47 arm-
txt Andr: ἀγγελοῦ ως αἰετοῦ 13: txt AN B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth.
rec πετωμενου, with B l¹ 1. (32-7. 40-1-2, e sil): txt A[P]N rel Andr Areth. om εν N.

the waters became (*was turned into*, see
reff.) wormwood: and many of the men
(who dwelt by these waters: such may be
the force of the article. But τῶν ἀνθρ.
may be general. It is the only place where
the expression πολλὰ τῶν ἀνθρ. occurs)
died from (ἐκ of the source whence a result
springs, see Winer, edn. 6, § 47, sub voce)
the waters, because they were embitter-
ed (compare the converse history, Exod.
xv. 23 ff., of the bitter waters being
made sweet by casting a certain tree
into them: see also 2 Kings ii. 19 ff.
The question whether wormwood was a
deadly poison or not, is out of place
here. It is not said that all who drank,
died. And the effect of any bitter drug,
however medicinally valuable, being mixed
with the water ordinarily used, would be
to occasion sickness and death. It is
hardly possible to read of this third
plague, and not to think of the deadly
effect of those strong spirituous drinks
which are in fact water turned into poi-
son. The very name *absinthe* is not un-
known in their nomenclature: and there
is no effect which could be so aptly de-
scribed by the falling of fire into water, as
this, which results in ardent spirit,—in
that which the simple islanders of the
South Sea call *firewater*. That this
plague may go on to destroy even this
fearful proportion of the ungodly in the
latter days, is far from impossible, con-
sidering its prevalence even now in some
parts of the civilized world. But I men-

tion this rather as an illustration, than as
an interpretation).

And the fourth
angel blew his trumpet: and the third
part of the sun was struck (it is not said,
as in the case of the former three trum-
pets, *with what*. And this absence of an in-
strument in the fourth of these correlative
visions perhaps teaches us not to attribute
too much import to the instruments by
which the previous judgments are brought
about. It is the πληγγῇ itself, not its in-
strument, on which attention should be
directed) and the third part of the moon
and the third part of the stars, that the
third part of them might be darkened,
and the day might not shine during the
third part of it (the limitation of the τὸ
τρίτον is now manifestly to time, not to
brightness. So E. V. rightly, "for a
third part of it." That this consequence
is no natural one following upon the ob-
scuration of a third portion of the sun, &c.,
is not to be alleged as any objection, but
belongs to the altogether supernatural
region in which these visions are situated.
Thus we have a globe of fire turning sea-
water to blood—a burning star embitter-
ing the waters: &c.), and the night in
like manner (i. e. the night as far as she
is, by virtue of the moon and stars, a time
of light. And this is far more so under
the glorious Eastern moon and stars, than
in our mist-laden climate).

13.] Introduction of the three remain-
ing trumpets by three woes. And I saw
and heard (the construction is zeugmatic)

^a μεσουρανήματι λέγοντος φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ^d ch. xiv. 6
^e τοὺς ^f κατοικοῦντας ^f ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ^g ἐκ τῶν λοιπῶν ^h φων- ^{xix} 17 only +
 νῶν τῆς ^h σάλπιγγος τῶν τριῶν ἀγγέλων τῶν μελλόντων ⁱ ch. iii. 10 reff.
 σαλπίζειν. ^g = ver. 11.
^h ch. i. 10.
ⁱ Exod. xix.
 16.
^j ch. viii. 10.
^k ch. i. 18 reff.

IX. ¹ Καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ εἶδον ^k = here 4
ⁱ ἀστέρα ἐκ τοῦ ⁱ οὐρανοῦ ⁱ πεπτωκότα εἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ^{times} (Luke
 ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ^j ἡ ^j κλεῖς τοῦ ^k φρέατος τῆς ¹ ἀβύσσου, ² καὶ ^{xiv} 5. John
 iv 11, 12)
 only. Ps.
 119 23. ¹ (=) here bis. ver. 11. ch. xi. 7. xvii. 8. xx. 1, 3. Luke viii. 31. Rom. x. 7 only. (Gen. 1. 2)

μεσουρανισματι 1. οὐαι twice only 1. rec τοις κατοικοουσιν, with
 A[P] h l n 1. 10-7-8. 34-6 (16. 37. 47-9 B^r, e sil) Andr Areth : txt N b rel Andr-coisl.
 σαλπίζειν 1.

CHAP. IX. 1. ἀστερας and πεπτωκotas N¹.

[for eis, επι P (38, w. gen) : προς e.]

an (ένός indefinite, as in reff. : see Winer, edn. 6, § 18. 9. Or it may carry meaning—a single or solitary eagle,—as might also be the case in one of the reff., ch. xviii. 21, see there) eagle (hardly to be identified with the eagles of Matt. xxiv. 28 : for 1) that saying is more proverbial than prophetic : and 2) any application of that saying would be far more aptly reserved for our ch. xix. 17. Nor again is the eagle a bird of ill omen, as Ewald : nor a contrast to the dove in John i. 32, as Hengstb. : but far more probably the symbol of judgment and vengeance rushing to its prey, as in Deut. xxviii. 49 ; Hos. viii. 1 ; Hab. i. 8. Nor again is it to be understood as an angel in eagle's shape : but a veritable eagle in the vision. Thus we have the altar speaking, ch. xvi. 7) flying in mid-heaven (i. e. in the south or noon-day sky where the sun reaches the meridian, for which μεσουρανεῖν is the word. Wetst. cites from Eustath. on Il. θ. 68, αἰξήσις ἡμέρας λέγεται καθ' Ὀμηρον τὸ ἀπὸ πρώτας μέχρις ἡλιακοῦ μεσουρανήματος, τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν φθίνειν ἡμέρα δοκεῖ. See his many other examples. So that the word does not signify the space intermediate between heaven and earth, but as above. And the eagle flies there, to be seen and heard of all. I may also notice that the whole expression favours the true reading αἰτοῦ as against the substituted ἀγγέλου) saying with a loud voice, Woe, woe, woe, to those that dwell (the government of an accus. after οὐαὶ is also found in ch. xii. 12) upon the earth (the objects of the vengeance invoked in the prayers of the martyrs, ch. vi. 10 : the ungodly world, as distinguished from the church) by reason of (so E. V., well : ἐκ denoting, as in ver. 11, the source whence the woe springs) the remaining voices of the trumpet (the sing. is used generically : the three voices all having this common to

them, that they are the sound of a trumpet) of the three angels who are about to blow.

CH. IX.—XI.] *The last three, or woe-trumpets.* These, as well as the first four, have a character of their own, corresponding in some measure to that of the visions at the opening of the three last seals. The particulars related under them are separate and detailed, not symmetrical and correspondent. And as in the seals, so here, the seventh forms rather the solemn conclusion to the whole, than a distinct judgment of itself. Here also, as there, it is introduced by two episcopal passages, having reference to the visions which are to follow, and which take up the thread of prophecy again at a period previous to things detailed before.

1—12.] *The fifth, or first Woe trumpet.* And the fifth angel blew his trumpet, and I saw a star fallen (not, as E. V. *fall*, which gives an entirely wrong view of the transactions of the vision. The star had fallen before, and is first seen as thus fallen) out of heaven to the earth (the reader will at once think on Isa. xiv. 12, "How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning!" And on Luke x. 18, "I beheld Satan as lightning fall from heaven." And, doubtless, as the personal import of this star is made clear in the following words, such is the reference here. We may also notice that this expression forms a connecting link to another place, ch. xii. 9, in this book, where Satan is represented as cast out of heaven to the earth : see notes there. It is hardly possible with Andr., Ribera, Bengel, and De W., to understand a *good angel* by this fallen star. His description, as well as his work, corresponds only to an agent of evil. Andreas is obliged to distort words to bring in this view : ἐπὶ γῆν δὲ καταβάνας, τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ πεπτωκέναι σημαίνει, is enough to condemn any interpretation),

mech. viii. 4 reff. ἤνοιξεν τὸ ^k φρέαρ τῆς ^l ἀβύσσου. καὶ ^m ἀνέβη ^m καπνὸς ^{APN} B a
 exod xix 18 A (not F) B ^{no} καπνὸς ^{no} καμίνου μεγάλης, καὶ ^{APN} B a
 o ch. i. 15 reff. ἐκ τοῦ ^k φρέατος ὡς ^{mn} καπνὸς ^{no} καμίνου μεγάλης, καὶ ^{APN} B a
 Gen. xix. 28. * ^p ἔσκοτώθη ὁ ἥλιος καὶ ὁ ^a ἄηρ ^r ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ τοῦ
 p ch. xvi. 10. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 Eph. iv. 18 ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 only. Jer. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 xiv. 2. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 q Acts xxii. 23. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 1 Cor. ix. 26. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 xiv. 9. Eph ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 ii. 2. 1 Thess. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 iv. 17. ch. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 xvi. 17 only. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 Ps. xvii. 11. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 r = ch. viii. 11, ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 13. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 s here bis. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 Matt. iii. 4. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 Mk only. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 Exod. x. 13 ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 ff. Joel u. 25. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 v so Acts x. 12. xi. 6. Gen. i. 25. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 in. 9 reff. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς
 c constr., ch. xxi. 27. ³ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ^m καπνοῦ ἐξῆλθον ^s ἀκρίδες εἰς

2. om και ηνοιξεν το φρεαρ της αυσσου (homæotel?) ^N B rel am (with harl¹ tol) copt
 æth arm-zoh Areth : ins A[P] h l m n 10-7-8. 34-6. 41²-7-9 (16. 37-8 B^r, e sil) vulg-ed
 (with fuld lipss &c) syr-dd Andr Tich. om εκ του φρεατος ως καπνος (homæotel)
 m 1. 35. 41. for εκ, επι N¹. for 2nd καπνος, καμινος (but corrd) N¹.
 for μεγάλης, καιομενης B rel : καιομενης μεγάλης 37. 40-1-2 : μεγάλης καιομενης 36 :
 μεγάλου καιομενης 38 : txt A[P] N n (1, e sil) 17 vulg copt Andr Tich. * rec
 ἔσκοτ(σ)θη, with [P] N B rel Andr Areth : ἐσκοτώθη A f 12. om καπνου
 το καπνου ver 3 N¹.

4. ἐρρηθῇ B m 34-5. 50 Andr-coisl, ἐρριθῇ n. αυτοις N (so ver 3) B f m 90.
 rec αδικησωσι, with [P] N B rel Andr Areth : txt A 36. om ουδε
 παν χλωρον N¹ (N² began to write χλωρ. above δενδ.). for 2nd ουδε, ουδῃ
 (sic, Tab. xv.) N. rec aft ανθρωπους ins μονους, with h 10. 49 B^r (37, e sil) :
 om A[P] N B rel syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth Tich. σφραγιδαν (sic) N¹-3a. om
 του θεου n 1. 12. (17?) 43. om αυτων (homæotel?) A[P] N n 1. 12 am (with harl,
 tol, agst demid fuld lipss) Andr-a : ins B rel vss Andr Areth Cassiod.

and there was given to him (ἐδόθη, as usual, for the purpose of the part which he is to bear in the vision) the key of the pit of the abyss (viz. of hell, which in the vision is a vast profundity opening by a pit or shaft upon the surface of the earth, imagined as shut down by a cover, and locked. This abyss is in the Apocalypse the habitation of the devil and his angels: cf. ver. 11, ch. xx. 1, 3: see also ch. xi. 7, xvii. 8), and he opened the pit of the abyss, and there went up smoke from the pit as smoke of a great furnace (see ref. Gen.), and the sun was darkened and the air (not, as Bengel, a hendiadys, "aer, quatenus per solem illuminatur:" for the sun may be obscured, as by a cloud, without the air being darkened) by reason of the smoke of the pit. And out of the smoke (which therefore was their vehicle or envelope) came forth locusts into (towards, over, so as to spread over: eis gives more the sense of distribution than ἐπί would) the earth, and there was given to them power as the scorpions of the earth (τῆς γῆς, not as noting any distinction between land-scorpions and water-scorpions, as Ewald, but because the scorpions are natural and of the earth, whereas these locusts are infer-

nal and not of nature) have power (viz. to sting, as below explained): and it was commanded them that they shall not hurt (for construction, see reff.) the grass of the earth, nor yet every (i.e. any) green thing, nor yet every (any) tree (the usual objects on which locusts prey: cf. Exod. x. 13, 15), but only (lit. except: the former sentence being regarded as if it had run, "that they should hurt nothing,"—and then "except" follows naturally) the men, the which (οἷτινες designates the class or kind: see reff.) have not the seal of God upon their foreheads (this, as before noticed, fixes this fifth trumpet to the time following the sealing in ch. vii. It denotes a plague which falls on the unbelieving inhabitants of the earth after the servants of God have been marked out among them, and of which the saints are not partakers. Either then it denotes something purely spiritual, some misery from which those are exempt who have peace with God,—which can hardly be, consistently with vv. 5, 6,—or it takes place in a state totally different from this present one, in which the wheat and tares are mingled together. One or other of these considerations will at once dismiss by far the greater number of inter-

ἐδόθη αὐταῖς ^x ἵνα μὴ ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτούς, ἀλλ' ^x ἵνα ^ε βασανισθῶσιν αὐτὰς πέντε· καὶ ὁ ^h βασανισμὸς αὐτῶν ὡς ^h βασανισμὸς ⁱ σκορπίου ὅταν ⁱ παίσῃ ἄνθρωπον. ⁶ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ζητήσουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι τὸν θάνατον, καὶ οὐ μὴ εὕρῃσουσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ^k ἐπιθυμήσουσιν ἀποθανεῖν, καὶ φεύγει ὁ θάνατος ἀπ' αὐτῶν. ⁷ καὶ τὰ ^l ὁμοιω-

28 al.
lit. 20, 21.

k constr., Matt. xiii. 17. Luke xv. 16. xvi. 21. 1 Pet. i. 12. Prov. xxiv 1. see Job i. Rom. i. 23. v. 14. vi. 5. viii. 3. Phil. ii. 7 only. Ezek. i. 16 B F (A def.). x. 22 A.

5. αὐτοῖς A [P(Tischdf, prolegg)] N 1. 12: αὐτοὺς f (αὐτας f¹, perhaps). rec βασανισθῶσιν, with B rel Andr Areth: βασανισθῶσιν 1: txt A[P]N 1. 12. 36-8. [πείση (itacism) P b k l m: πληξή h² 37. 41-2.]

6. rec (for ου μη) ουχ, with 33: txt A[P]N B rel Andr Areth. for ευρησουσιν, ευρωσιν A[P] m n 12-7. 34-5. 49: ευρησωσιν 1. 19-corr: txt N B rel Andr-p Areth. rec (for φεύγει) φευζεται, with B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Ambr: txt A[P]N (φυγη) 1. 12-7. 36-8 Andr-b. απ' αυτων bef ο θανατος B rel vulg-ed (with lipss) arm Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N 1 n 1. 17. 36-8 am (with demid; mors fug. ab eis fult) syr-dd Andr.

pretations. That of Elliott, the fact of Mahomet's mission being avowedly against corrupt Christianity as idolatry, does not in the remotest degree answer the conditions. In the very midst of this corrupt Christianity were at that time God's elect scattered up and down: and it is surely too much to say that every such person escaped scathless from the Turkish sword). And it was given to them (allotted to them by God as the limit of their appointed work and office: here the ἐδόθη expresses rather the limitation than the extension of the grant) that they should not kill them (the unsealed), but that they (the unsealed: the subject is changed) shall be (fut. aft. ἵνα, see above, ver. 4) tormented five months (the reason seems to be correct, which several Commentators have given for this number being chosen: viz., that five months is the ordinary time in the year during which locusts commit their ravages: so Calov., Vittr., Eich., Ewald, De W., Düsterd., al. At all events we are thus in some measure delivered from the endless perplexities of capricious fancy in which the historical interpreters involve us): and their torment (i. e. that of the sufferers: against Düsterd.) is as the torment of (arising from: notice the same construction in two senses) a scorpion, when it has smitten (παίσῃ, the regular futurum exactus: "whenever it shall have . . ." παίω and πατάσσω (Jon. iv. 7. Achill. Tat. ii. 7, ἡ μέλιττα ἐπάταξε τὴν χεῖρα), as in the Latin *ictus* (Pliny, H. N. vi. 28), are used of the bite or sting of an animal) a man. And in those days men shall seek death (observe the transition of the style from the descriptive to the prophetic. For the first time the Apostle ceases to be

the exponent of what he saw, and becomes the direct organ of the Spirit), and shall not (the οὐ μὴ, with a subjunctive (its ordinary construction), is a more certain and definite negation than even the future itself. The latter expresses fact; whereas the former states that the fact cannot be otherwise: οὐ μὴ with the future, as in text, seems to be a later and lax way of expressing the same) find it: and they shall vehemently desire (*desire* alone is not strong enough: ἐπιθυμέω, -ία, express the direction of the θύμος (itself from θύω, ferveo—ἀπὸ τῆς θύσεως καὶ ζήσεως τῆς ψυχῆς, Plato, Cratyl. 419 E) upon an object. As *desire* is too strong for θέλω, so is it too weak for ἐπιθυμέω) to die (notice what Düsterd. well calls "ἐν ἀντιθέσει Gegenstück," to the Apostle's saying in Phil. i. 23, ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχων εἰς τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν χριστῷ εἶναι), and death fleeth (the pres., of the *habitual* avoidance in those days) from them (the longing to die arises from the excruciating pain of the sting. Cf. Jer. viii. 3. I cannot forbear noticing as we pass, the caprice of historical interpreters. On the command *not to kill* the men, &c., in ver. 5, Elliott says, "i. e. not to annihilate them as a political Christian body." If then the same rule of interpretation is to hold, the present verse must mean that the "political Christian body" will be so sorely beset by these Mahometan locusts, that it will vehemently desire to be annihilated, and not find any way. For it surely cannot be allowed that the *killing of men* should be said of their annihilation as a political body in one verse, and their *desiring to die* in the next should be said of something totally different, and applicable to their individual misery. Is it in conse-

^m JOEL. ii. 4. ^{ch vi. 2 ref} ⁿ ver. 16. ^{2 Tim. ii. 21.} ^{1 Macc. xii. 27.} ^o JOEL i. 6. ^p ch iv. 7. ^{1 cf} ^q here bis. ver. ^{17.} ^r Eph. vi. ^{14.} ^s 1 Thess. ^{v. 8 only.} ^{1 Kings xvii. 5.}

ματα τῶν ^s ἀκρίδων ὅμοια ^m ἵπποις ⁿ ἡτοιμασμένοις ⁿ εἰς ^{APN B a} πόλεμον, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν ὡς ^{so n, 1} στέφανοι ὅμοιοι ^{2 4 6. 9.} χρυσῷ, καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα αὐτῶν ὡς ^{10-3, 16} πρόσωπα ἀνθρώπων, ^{26 7. 30.} ^{32 to 38.} ^{40-1-2.} ^{47 to 51.} ^{80 B.} καὶ εἶχαν ⁸ τρίχας ὡς ⁹ τρίχας γυναικῶν, καὶ οἱ ^o ὀδόντες αὐτῶν ὡς ^p λεόντων ἦσαν, ⁹ καὶ εἶχον ^a θώρακας ὡς ^a θῶ-

7. for ομοία, ομοιωματα A: ομοιωματα e: ομοιοι N: txt [P] B rel. for ομοιοι χρυσω, χρυσοι B rel Areth: txt A[P]N m n (1, e sil) 17. 34-5-6 vulg syr-dd (copt) Andr Tich.

8. (εἶχαν, so AN.)

quence of foreseeing this difficulty, that Mr. Elliott has, as in the case of many important details in other places, omitted all consideration of this verse?).

7.] The Apostle now returns to the description of the locusts themselves. And the shapes (so E. V., rightly: not, the likenesses. *ὁμοίωμα* is the product of *ὁμοίω*: the finished form of any thing which is made like (*ὁμοιον*) to any pattern. See Winer, edn. 6, § 16. A. 2, a) of the locusts (were) like horses made ready for war (this resemblance,—cf. ref. Joel, *ἡ θραξ αὐτῶν ὡς θραξ ἵππων*,—has been noticed by travellers. Winer, Realw. art. *Heupferden*, refers to Niebuhr, Beschreibung, 173. Ewald gives other references, and says, “refert omnino animal equini corporis quædam similia, unde nostris etiam *Heupferd* dici notum est.” And especially does it hold good when the horse is equipped for war; the plates of the horse’s armour being represented by the hard laminæ of the outer shell of the locust: see below, ver. 9), and on their heads as it were crowns like unto gold (it is not easy to say what this part of the description imports. Elliott tries to apply it to the turban: but granting some latitude to *στέφανοι*, the *ὅμοιοι χρυσῷ* will hardly bear this. The appearance of a turban, even when ornamented with gold, is hardly *golden*. I should understand the words, of the head actually ending in a crown-shaped fillet which resembled gold in its material, just as the wings of some of the beetle tribe might be said to blaze with gold and gems. So we have below *εἶχον θώρακας ὡς θ. σιδηροῦς*: the material not being metallic, but only quasi-metallic. Eichhorn and Heinr. understand these crowns of soldiers’ helmets: but this is quite arbitrary and gratuitous): and their faces (were) as the faces of men (Düsterdieck well observes, that we must not suppose them actually to have had human faces, but that the face of the locust, which under ordinary circumstances has a distant resemblance to the human countenance, bore this resemblance even more notably

in the case of these supernatural locusts. It is not *τὰ πρ. αὐτῶν πρόσωπα ἀνθρ.* but *ὡς πρόσωπα ἀνθρ.* Nor again can we agree with Mr. Elliott’s idea that *ἀνθρώπων* is here used to designate the male sex: an interpretation recommended to him by his wish to introduce the moustache of the Arabs. Wherever the general term *ἄνθρωπος* is used for the particular sex, it must, as in the case of our “*man*,” be necessarily so interpreted by the context, as is the case in every one of the passages cited by Mr. E. in support of his view, viz. Matt. xix. 3, 5, 10; 1 Cor. vii. 1; Gen. ii. 18; Exod. xiii. 2; Lev. xx. 10; Esth. iv. 10 (*ἄνθρωπος ἡ γυνή*); Eccl. vii. 28; Isa. iv. 1. But here there is no such necessity in the context: nay, it is much more natural to take *ἀνθρώπων* as the general term, their faces were like human faces, and then comes the limitation, not in the face, but in another particular), and they had hair as the hair of women (i. e. long and flowing, 1 Cor. xi. 14 f. De Weite quotes from Niebuhr an Arabic proverb in which the antlers of locusts are compared to the hair of girls. But perhaps we must regard the comparison as rather belonging to the supernatural portion of our description. Ewald would understand the hair on the legs, or on the bodies, of the locusts, to be meant, referring to *ῥῥῥ ῥῥ*, rough locusts, Jer. li. (xxviii.) 27, where the LXX have merely *ἀκρίδων*, and the E. V. “rough caterpillars.”

To infer, from this feature, licentiousness as a characteristic in the interpretation, is entirely beside the purpose): and their teeth were as the teeth of lions (so also of the locust in Joel i. 6, *οἱ ὀδόντες αὐτοῦ ὀδόντες λέοντος*. Ewald rightly designates as very doubtful a fancied resemblance to a lion in the under jaw. We may observe that this, as some other features in the description, is purely graphic, and does not in any way apply to the plague to be inflicted by these mystic locusts), and they had breastplates as iron breastplates (the plate which forms the thorax of the natural locust, was in their case as if of iron), and the sound of

ρακάς ὁ σιδηροῦς, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ τῶν ἁπτερυγίων αὐτῶν ὡς
 ὁ φωνὴ ὁ ἁρμάτων ἵππων πολλῶν τρεχόντων εἰς πόλεμον.
 10 καὶ ἔχουσιν οὐράς ὁμοίας ἰσχορπίοις καὶ κέντρα,
 καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι
 τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μῆνας πέντε. 11 ἔχουσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶν
 βασιλέα ἄγγελον τῆς ἀβύσσου, ὄνομα αὐτοῦ
 Ἐβραῖστὶ Ἀβαδδὼν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἑλληνικῇ ὄνομα ἔχει
 Ἀπολλύων. 12 Ἡ οὐαὶ ἡ μία ἀπῆλθεν ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται
 ἔτι δύο οὐαὶ μετὰ ταῦτα.

a = vv 1, 2. b ch. vi. 8 reff. c ch xvi. 18. John v. 2. xix. 13, 17, 20. xx. 18 only. d see
 Acts xxi. 40. 4 Kings xvi. 26. e here only. f = here bis. ch. xi. 14 bis only. see Ezek. vii. 26. n 10. g = Matt. xxviii. 1 al. Gen. i. 5.
 h = ch. xi. 14. xxi. 1, 4 only.

9. καὶ ἡ φωνὴ των πτ. αυτων is written twice in 1.

10. ομοιοις AN. rec (for 3rd και) ην, with (35, e sil) vulg-ed (with some mss):
 om l m n 1. 30-2-4-6-8. 40-6-7. 90 am (with tol) Andr Tich: txt A[P]N B 33 (sic, Del)
 rel vulg-ms syr-dd copt Areth. rec aft αυτων ins και, with 1. 37. 47 vulg-ed (with
 a few mss) Andr: om A[P]N B rel vulg-mss Andr-coisl Areth Tich. for η εξουσια
 αυτων, εξουσιαν εχουσι B rel Andr-a Areth: om l: txt A[P]N m 1. 17. 34-5-6 vulg
 syr-dd copt Andr Tich. ins του bef αδικησαι B rel: om A[P]N m n 1. 17. 32-4-6.
 48. 51 Andr Areth.

11. rec at beg ins και, with [P] m n 1. 34. 40-1. 51 fuld syr-dd Andr: om AN B rel.
 for εχουσιν, εχουσαι B rel Areth Tich: εχουν vulg Andr-p Primas: txt A[P]N m
 n 1. 26-7. 33-4-6 (26-7. 35 Br, e sil) fuld syr-dd (copt?) Andr. βασιλεα bef επ'
 αυτων B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth, βασιλεα υπ' αυτων 16, β. επ' αυτους l: [om επ'
 αυτων P:] txt A f n 1. 17, επ' αυτων βασιλεις 36, εαυτων τον βασιλεα (omg επ') N.—rec
 εφ': txt A B rel. rec ins τον bef αγγελον, with A (see below) [P]N (see above) f l
 n 1. 9. 16. 33-5-6 (38?) 47-8-9. 50. 90 Andr: om B rel Andr-coisl Areth.—αρχοντα της
 αβυσσου τον αγγελον A. ins ω bef 1st ονομα N 18. αββαδων B (a d) g m
 35 (Del) Andr-c. for και εν, εν δε B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas: txt A[P]N
 1. 17. 33 (26-7. 36, e sil) aeth.—ελληνιδι N.—ελληνιστι δε 9.—εν τη ελληνικη δε 13-6.
 εχει bef 2nd ονομα N 36: om ονομα 40.

12. om η (twice) N (ins 2nd η N^{3a}). rec ερχονται, with [P]N^{3a} B m n 1. 18.
 34-5-8. 49² (6. 26. 32-7. 47 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: txt AN¹ rel. om ετι j 1: for
 ετι, α 36.

12, 13. και bef μετα ταυτα B f, και μετα ταυτα και 2. 4. 10-8-9. 40: om και (in both
 places) N: txt A[P] rel.

their wings (was) as a sound of chariots
 of many horses (by the two genitives the
 sound of both, the chariots and the horses,
 is included. The chariots are regarded as
 an appendage to the horses) as they run
 to war. And they have tails like to
 scorpions (i. e. to the tails of scorpions:
 the construction called the comparatio
 compendiaria: see reff.), and stings (viz.
 in their tails: this is the particular espe-
 cially in which the comparison finds its
 aptitude): and in their tails is their
 power to hurt men five months (see above
 on ver. 5). They have as king over
 them (or, "they have a king over them,
 viz." . . . the two accusatives being in
 apposition. It favours this last alterna-
 tive, that in this particular, of having a
 king, they are distinguished from natural
 locusts: for Prov. xxx. 27, ἀβασιλευτόν
 ἐστὶν ἡ ἀκρίς) the angel of the abyss (we

can hardly with Luther, render "an angel
 from the abyss:" ἄγγελος, though anar-
 throus, is necessarily defined by the ge-
 nitive τῆς ἀβύσσου; his name is in He-
 brew Abaddon (אַבְדּוֹן, perdition, from אָבַד, *perit*,
 is used in the O. T. for the place of
 perdition, Orcus, in Job xxvi. 6; Prov.
 xxvii. 20 (Keri: Chetib has אֲבַדּוֹן), in
 both of which places it is joined with
 מָוֶת, —Ps. lxxviii. 12; Job xxviii. 22.
 In all these places the LXX express it by
 ἀπώλεια. So that this is the local name
 personified: or rather perhaps that ab-
 stract name personified, from which the
 local import itself is derived), and in the
 Greek (scil. γλώσση) he has for his name
 Apollyon (the name ἀπολλών seems
 chosen from the LXX ἀπώλεια, see above.

It is a question, who this angel of the
 abyss is. Perhaps, for accurate distinc-
 tion's sake, we must not identify him with

ich vi. 6.
k ch. viii. 13
reff.
l here only.
Levit. iv 7.
Ezek. xliii.
20.
m Exod. xl. 26
al.
n constr., ch.
i v. 1 al. fr.

¹³ Καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἤκουσα ¹ φωνὴν APN va
to n, 1.
2 4 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19.
26-7 30.
32 to 38,
40 1-2.
47 to 51,
90 Br.
^k μίαν ἐκ τῶν [τεσσάρων] ¹ κεράτων τοῦ ¹ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ
^m χρυσοῦ τοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ¹⁴ * ⁿ λέγοντα τῷ ἑκτῷ
ἀγγέλῳ ὁ ὅ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα Λύσον τοὺς τέσσαρας
o constr., ch. ii. 20 reff.

¹³ φωνῆς μίας ^N^{3a}. om τεσσαρων ^{AN}^{3a} n am (with fuld harl lips-5 tol agst demid lipss) syr copt Bede: ins [P] b rel Andr Areth Cypr Primas Tich.—om μίαν ἐκ τῶν (τεσσ.) κερ. ^N¹.—μίαν φωνὴν ἐκ τ. θυσιαστηρίου ἐνώπιον τ. θῷ, omg all the rest, f.

¹⁴ rec λεγουσαν, with [P] h l m n 1. 10-7. 84-5-6-8 (6. 13. 26. 37. 49 B^c, e sil): λεγουσης ^N^{3a}: λεγων 40: * λέγοντος b rel: λεγοντα ^{AN}¹. om ἐκτω A.
rec (for ο εχων) os ειχε, with 6(e sil) Areth: τω εχοντι m 34 Andr-coisl: txt ^{AN} b rel

Satan himself,—cf. ch. xii. 3, 9,—but must regard him as one of the principal of the bad angels). The one (first) woe hath passed: behold, there cometh (singular, the verb applying simply to that which is future, without reference as yet to its plurality) two woes after these things. There is an endless Babel of allegorical and historical interpretation of these *locusts from the pit*. The most that we can say of their import is, that they belong to a series of judgments on the ungodly which will immediately precede the second advent of our Lord: that the various and mysterious particulars of the vision will no doubt clear themselves up to the church of God, when the time of its fulfilment arrives: but that no such clearing up has yet taken place, a very few hours of research among histories of apocalyptic interpretation will serve to convince any reader who is not himself the servant of a preconceived system.

¹³—²¹.] *The sixth Trumpet. And the sixth angel blew his trumpet, and I heard a* (it is doubtful, in the uncertain authenticity of *τεσσάρων*, whether any stress is to be laid on this *μίαν* or not. Vitringa gives it the emphasis,—“quatuor hæc cornua simul edidisse vocem, non diversam, sed unam eandemque:” and so Hengstb. The allegorical interpreters give it various imports—the agreement of the four Gospels (Zeger, Calov., al.),—that of the prayers of exiled Jews (Grot.), &c.) *voice out of the [four] horns of the golden altar which was before God* (the same altar as that previously mentioned in ch. viii. 3 and vi. 9, where see notes. From ch. xvi. 7 it would appear that the voice probably proceeded from the altar itself, represented as uttering the cry of vengeance for the blood shed on it; cf. ch. vi. 9, with which cry of the martyred saints the whole series of retributive judgments is connected. The reading in the Codex Sinaiticus (see digest) is very remarkable,

and may represent the original text. To suppose, as Elliott, that the cry from the altar is indicative of an altar having been the scene of some special sin on the part of the men of Roman Christendom, and so to apply it to the perversions of Christian rites in the Romish Church, is surely to confuse the whole imagery of the vision. For it is not of *any altar* in the abstract that we are reading, but of *the golden altar which was before God*, where the prayers of the saints had been offered by the angel, ch. viii. 3, 5: and the voice is the result of those prayers, in accordance with which those judgments are inflicted. The horns again, representing the enceinte of the altar, not any special rites with which the horns of an altar were concerned, cannot be pressed into the service of the above-noticed interpretation, but simply belong to the propriety of that heard and seen. The voice proceeded from the surface of the altar, on which the prayers had been offered: and that surface was bounded by the *κέρατα* saying (the noun to which the participle, in this broken construction, is to be referred, may be either *φωνή*, which is most probable, or *κεράτων*, in which latter case an emphasis would naturally fall on the foregoing *μίαν*, or, if *λέγοντος* be read, *θυσιαστηρίου*) to the sixth angel, who had (construction, see reff. It is far better to take *ὁ ἔχων* as the appositional nom., so common in this book, than, as Tregelles, to understand it as vocative. It is natural that the word *ἐκτω* should be further specified by adding the class to which the angel belonged, *ὁ ἔχων τὴν σάλπιγγα*: but hardly, that he should be singled out by the address, “Thou that hast the trumpet,” from the whole seven who had trumpets) the trumpet (*τὴν*, as being that one now before us,—belonging to the present vision), *Loose* (it is too much to say that the angel himself is made the active minister of this loosing: we do not read *καὶ πορευθεὶς ἔλυσεν* following, but simply *καὶ ἐλύθησαν*. We

ἀγγέλους τοὺς δεδεμένους ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ τῷ μεγάλῳ ^{p ch. xvi. 12} ^{Gen. x. 18 al.} ^{q constr. 7 reff. xi. 31.} ^{r ch. viii. 6 reff.}
 Εὐφράτῃ. ¹⁵ καὶ ἐλύθησαν οἱ τέσσαρες ἄγγελοι οἱ ἦτοι-
 μασμένοι ⁹ εἰς τὴν ὥραν καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ μῆνα καὶ ἐνιαυτόν,
 ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων. ¹⁶ καὶ ὁ

Andr. ¹⁵ τέσσαρες ¹⁶ m, -οεις 136.

[ins ποταμῷ bef ευφρ. P.]

εφρατη B.

15. for ἐλυθησαν, ἐλυπηθησαν A.

om 2nd οἱ (homæotel) ¹⁶ N 41. 51. 90.

ins

eis τὴν bef ἡμεραν B rel Andr-coisl Areth; τὴν h n 10. 38. 49 B: om A[P] 17-8. 33 (6.

26. 35-6-7. 40-1-2, e sil) vulg copt Andr Cyp Primas Tich.—om καὶ ἡμεραν N 1.

aft ινα ins μη N.

must therefore believe that the command is given to him only in so far as he is the representative and herald of all that takes place under his trumpet-blowing) the four angels which are bound (so E. V. rightly: "are bound" is the true perfect passive, not "have been bound") on (not "in," as E. V.: ἐπὶ with the dat. denotes close adherence or juxtaposition: so our Lord sat ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ, John iv. 6) the great river Euphrates (the whole imagery here has been a crux interpretum: as to who these angels are, and what is indicated by the locality here described. I will only venture to point out, amidst the surging tumult of controversy, one or two points of apparent refuge to which we must not betake ourselves. First, we must not yield to the temptation, so attractive at first sight, of identifying these four angels with the four angels standing on the four corners of the earth and holding in the four winds, in ch. vii. 1 ff. For the mission of these angels is totally distinct from theirs, as the locality is also. There is not a syllable of winds here, nor any hurting of earth, sea, or trees. Secondly, the question need not perplex us here, whether these are good or bad angels: for it does not enter in any way into consideration. They simply appear, as in other parts of this book, as ministers of the divine purposes, and pass out of view as soon as mentioned. Here, it would almost seem as if the angelic persons were little more than personifications; for they are immediately resolved into the host of cavalry. Thirdly, that there is nothing in the text to prevent "the great river Euphrates" from being meant literally. Düsterd. maintains, that because the rest of the vision has a mystical meaning, therefore this local designation must have one also: and that if we are to take the Euphrates literally and the rest mystically, endless confusion would be introduced. But this is quite a mistake, as the slightest consideration will shew. It is a common feature of Scripture allegory to intermingling with its mystic language literal designa-

tions of time and place. Take for instance the allegory in Ps. lxxx. 8, 11, "Thou hast brought a vine out of Egypt . . . she sent out her boughs unto the sea, and her branches unto the river:" where, though the vine and her boughs and branches are mystical, Egypt, the sea, and the river, are all literal. See some good remarks on this in Mr. Elliott's 1st vol., p. 331 ff., where the above example is cited among others). And the four angels were loosed, which had been prepared (the perf. part. in conjunction with an aor. verb is necessarily pluperf. in sense) for (in the ordinary sense of eis after ἐτοιμάζω and its kindred words—viz. "in reference to," "in reservation for," "with a view to:" see ver. 7; 2 Tim. ii. 21; and πρὸς, 1 Pet. iii. 15) the hour and day and month and year (viz. which had been appointed by God: the appointed hour occurring in the appointed day, and that in the appointed month, and that in the appointed year. The art., prefixed, and not repeated, seems to make this meaning imperative. Had the art. been repeated before each, the ideas of the appointed hour, day, month, and year would have been separated, not, as now, united: had there been no art., we might have understood that the four were to be added together to make up the time, though even thus the eis occurring once only would have made some difficulty. The natural way of expressing this latter meaning would be, εἰς ὥραν κ. εἰς ἡμέραν κ. εἰς μῆνα κ. εἰς ἐνιαυτόν. The only way in which it can be extracted from the words as they now stand, is by understanding the τὴν to designate some previously well-known period, "for the (well-known) hour and day and month and year." But as no such notoriety of the period named can be recognized, we must I conceive adhere to the sense above given), that (ἵνα belongs to ἡτοιμασμένοι more naturally than to ἐλύθησαν) they should kill the third part of men (on τὸ τρίτον, see above, ch. viii. 7. It seems necessary, that in τῶν ἀνθρώπων we are to include only the κατοικοῦντες

^s Matt. xxii. 7. ¹¹ Luke xxiii. 11. Acts xxiii. 10, 27. ^{ch xix. 14} 19 bis only +. ^{1 Macc ix. 34} 34 al. ^{t here only +.} 1 Macc. xv 38. ^u Psa lxxvii. 17. DAN vii 10. ^v Heb. xii 23 reff. ^{w = Acts ii. 17} (ch iv 3) only. ^z Eccl. x. 2. DAN ix. 21 Theod. ^x ch iv 2 reff. & note ^y ver 9. ^z here only. ^{Ezek xxviii. 14, 16.} Sir xlvi. 9 only. ^{Aist. de Anima iii. 13. 1.} ^{xxi. 14 al.} (-605, ch. xxi 20) ^b here only +. see below (e). ^a here only. ^{Ezek xxii 6.} Exod. ^{ch x. 16 reff.} ^e ch viii 4 reff. ^f Rev (here bis. ch xiv. 10, xix 20. x. 10. xxi 8) only, exc Luke ^{vii. 29, from Gen xix 24} Ps. x. 7 see above (b). ^{g = ch. xii 6 reff.} ^{h = Rev only, here} ^{first, ch. xi 6 (xiii 32, 12, 14.)} ^{1 al} (elsw. = stripes, Luke x. 30. xii 48. Acts xvi. 23, 33. 2 Cor. vi. 5. xl. 23 only) ^{Num. xiv 37.} ^{i = ch viii. 11 reff.} ^j vv. 8, 10.

ἀριθμὸς τῶν ^s στρατευμάτων τοῦ ^t ἵππικοῦ ^u δις μυριάδες
^v μυριάδων ἤκουσα τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτῶν. ¹⁷ καὶ οὕτως
εἶδον τοὺς ἵππους ἐν τῇ ^w ὁράσει καὶ τοὺς ^x καθημένους ^x ἐπ’
αὐτῶν ἔχοντας ^y θώρακας ^z πυρίνους καὶ ^a ὑακινθίνους καὶ
^b θειώδεις· καὶ αἱ κεφαλαὶ τῶν ἵππων ὡς ^c κεφαλαὶ ^c λεόν-
των, καὶ ^d ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν ^d ἐκπορεύεται πῦρ καὶ
^e καπνὸς καὶ ^f θεῖον. ¹⁸ ἀπὸ τῶν τριῶν ^h πληγῶν τού-
των ἀπεκτάνθησαν τὸ τρίτον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ⁱ ἐκ τοῦ
πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ ^e καπνοῦ καὶ τοῦ ^f θείου τοῦ ^d ἐκπορευομένου
^d ἐκ τῶν στομάτων αὐτῶν. ¹⁹ ἡ γὰρ ^j ἐξουσία τῶν ἵππων

C καὶ οὕτως...
ACFN n
a 60 n, 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30. 32
to 38
40-1. 2.
47 to 51.
90 B^r.

16. rec om των (with 6 B^r, e sil) : ins A[P]N B rel Andr Areth. for τ. ἵππικου,
τ. ἵππου rel Andr-coisl: τῶν ἵππων b 3: txt A[P]N B c l n 36. 49¹-marg (f 1. 6. 17. 38,
e sil) Andr Areth. rec δυο μυριάδες, with (N) n (4. 6, e sil) Areth: μυριάδες (omg
dis-) b rel Andr: txt A[P] c 1 (but with dis erased) 11-2. 36, δις μυριων 18, δυο μυριάδων
μυριάδας(sic) N. rec ins και bef ηκουσα, with (6. 27. 42 B^r, e sil) vulg-ed(with
lips-4) Epiph Areth: om A[P]N B 33(sic, Del) rel am(with fuld &c) syr-dd copt arm
Andr Cyp^r Primas.

17. for ἵππους, ἵππικους B f. επαγω N. for θειῶδεις, θυῶδεις (but corrd) N.

18. rec (for απο) υπο, with 1: txt AC[P]N B rel. om τριαν N. rec om
πληγῶν, with 1 (37, e sil): ins AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff. for 1st εκ, απο B rel
Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N h n 10-7-8. 36 (1. 37-8. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr-a. rec ins εκ
bef του καπνου, with C[P] c 1. 17 syr-dd Andr-a: om AN B rel am(with demid fuld &c)
copt Andr Areth Cyp^r. rec ins εκ bef του θειου, with [P] c 1. 17¹ syr-dd Andr-a:
om ACN B rel vulg copt Andr Areth Cyp^r.

19. rec αι γαρ εξουσαι αυτων εν τω στοματι αυτων εισιν, with 1 (but εστιν) 27;
omg και εν ταις ουραις αυτων, with 36: txt AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.—for ἵππων, τοπων

ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς of ch. viii. 13, not any of the servants of God): and the number of the armies of the cavalry was twice myriads of myriads (i.e. 20,000 × 10,000 = 200,000,000, two hundred millions. The number seems to be founded on those in the reff.);—I heard the number of them. And after this manner (i.e. according to the following description) saw I the horses in my vision (Düsterd. suggests, and it seems likely enough, that this express reference to *sight* is inserted on account of the *ἤκουσα* which preceded) and those who sat upon them, having (*ἔχοντας* most naturally refers to both horses and riders, not to riders only. The armour of both was uniform) breastplates fiery-red (the three epithets express the colours of the breastplates, and are to be separated, as belonging each to one portion of the host, and corresponding to the fire, smoke, and brimstone which proceeded out of the horses' mouths below) and fuliginous (answering to *καπνός* below. *υακινθίνος* is used for any dark dull

colour; Homer calls dark hair *υακινθίνω* *ἔνθει ὁμοίως*, Od. ζ. 231, ψ. 158. The hyacinth of the Greeks is supposed to have been our dark blue iris: see Palm and Rost, sub voce) and sulphureous (light yellow: such a colour as would be produced by the settling fumes of brimstone): and the heads of the horses (τῶν ἵππων takes up the horses again, both horses and riders having been treated of in the preceding sentence) (were) as heads of lions, and out of their mouths goeth forth fire and smoke and brimstone (i.e. separately, one of these out of the mouths of each division of the host. It is remarkable, that these divisions are *three*, though the angels were *four*). From (ἀπό indicates not directly the instrumentality, but the *direction from which* the result comes) these three plagues were killed the third part of men, by (ἐκ, the source out of which the result springs) the fire and the smoke and the brimstone which went forth (the participle agrees with the last noun only, but applies to all) out of

ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν ἐστὶν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ^k οὐραῖς αὐτῶν αἱ γὰρ ^k οὐραὶ αὐτῶν ὅμοιαι ὄφεσιν, ἔχουσαι κεφαλὰς, καὶ ¹ ἐν αὐταῖς ^m ἀδικοῦσιν. ²⁰ καὶ οἱ ⁿ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων οὐ οὐκ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ¹ ἐν ταῖς ^h πληγαῖς ταύταις οὐδέ ^o μετενόησαν ^o ἐκ τῶν ἔργων τῶν χειρῶν αὐτῶν, ^p ἵνα μὴ ^q προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ ^r δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ ^q εἰδῶλα τὰ χρυσᾶ καὶ τὰ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ τὰ ^t χαλκᾶ καὶ τὰ ^u λίθινα καὶ τὰ ^v ξύλινα, ^w ἃ

r = 1 Cor x 20. 1 Tim. iv 1. Deut. xxxii 17. s 1 John v. 21 1 Thess. i. 9 al. fr.
only Num xxi. 9 Dan v 4 Theod (-κόσ), ch. xviii. 12 u John ii 6. 2 Cor. iii. 3 only Exod. t here
xxxii 18. v 2 Tim. ii 20 only. Dan. v 4, 23 Theod. Ep. Jer. 30. q Num xxv. 2.
(13—15). Dan. v. 23 Theod. w Psa. cxiii. 5—7

A.—ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς καὶ ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτῶν ἦν 38. ομοιοι 1 : om C¹. οφεων
B rel Andr-coisl Areth : txt AC[P]N 10-7-8. 36 (1. 30-7-8. 40-9 Br, e sil) Andr.
for ἔχουσαι, ἐχουσιν C : ἐχουσας N¹ : ἐχουσας [P]N^{3a} 36 : txt A B rel.
20. aft πληγαῖς ins αὐτῶν N. rec ουτε, with A[P] 1. 17. 33. (34-6, e sil) vulg
syr-dd copt Andr-a : ου C rel Andr : txt N B f 38. 92. om μη ¹ (ins above the
line 12). rec προσκυνήσωσι, with [P] B rel Andr Areth : txt ACN ¹ 36. 42.
rec om τα (bef εἰδῶλα), with Br(e sil) : ins AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth. χρυσαια (i. e.
χρυσεα) and χαλκα N. transp λιθινα and ξυλινα N.

their mouths. For the power of the horses is in their mouths (principally; seeing that by what proceeded from their mouths their mission, to slay the third part of men, was accomplished) and in their tails: for their tails were like serpents, having heads, and with (ἐν is the prep. of investiture, used of that in which clad or armed a man does any thing) them they hurt (i. e. inflict pain: viz. with the bites of the serpent heads in which they terminate. I cannot but mention, in no unfriendly spirit, but because, both being friends, Truth is the dearer, that which may be designated the culminating instance of incongruous interpretation in Mr. Elliott's historical exposition of these prophecies. These tails are, according to him, the horsetails, borne as symbols of authority by the Turkish Pachas. Well may Mr. Barker say (Friendly Strictures, p. 32), "an interpretation so wild, if it refutes not itself, seems scarcely capable of refutation." Happily, it does refute itself. For it is convicted, by altogether leaving out of view the power in the mouths, which is the principal feature in the original vision: by making no reference to the serpent-like character of these tails, but being wholly inconsistent with it: by distorting the canon of symmetrical interpretation in making the heads attached to the tails to mean that the tails are symbols of authority: and by being compelled to render ἀδικοῦσι "they commit injustice," a meaning which, in this reference, it surely will not bear. When it is said of fire- and smoke- and brimstone-

breathing horses which kill the third part of men, that besides having power in their mouths they have it in their tails, which are like serpents, ending in heads, it would be a strange anti-climax to end, "and with these they do injustice." I will venture to say, that a more self-condemnatory interpretation was never broached than this of the horsetails of the Pachas). And the rest of men (this specification which follows clearly shews what sort of men are meant; viz. the ungodly alone) who were not killed in (the course of: the ἐν again of that in which, as its vehicle or investiture, their death would come, if it had come) these plagues, did not even (the force of οὐδέ, which on the whole seems likely to have been the original reading) repent of (ἐκ, so as to come out from: see reff.) the works of their hands (i. e. as the context here necessitates, not, the whole course of their lives, but the idols which their hands had made. This will at once appear on comparing our passage with Deut. iv. 28, λατρεύετε ἐκεῖ θεοὺς ἑτέροις, ἔργοις χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων, ξύλοις καὶ λίθοις, οὗ οὐκ ὁψονται, κ.τ.λ., and Ps. cxxxiv. 15, τὰ εἰδῶλα τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀργύριον κ. χρυσίον, ἔργα χειρῶν ἀνθρώπων στόμα ἔχουσι καὶ οὐ λαλήσουσιν, κ.τ.λ. See also Acts vii. 41) that they should not (in order not to: the final purpose, explaining the οὐ μετεν. ἐκ preceding: cf. Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 6) worship (for ἵνα with indic. fut. see above, ch. iii. 9 reff.) devils (see reff, 1 Cor.; 1 Tim., and notes there. The objects of worship of the heathen, and of semi-heathen Christians, are in fact

x Rev., here only. οὔτε βλέπειν δύνανται οὔτε ἀκούειν οὔτε περιπατεῖν, ²¹ καὶ ACPS B
y see [Gal. v. 19, 20, 21] ch. 21. οὐ ὁ μετενόησαν ὁ ἐκ τῶν ^{xyz} φόνων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῶν
xxi 6. xxii. 15 ya φαρμάκων αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ τῆς ^{yz} πορνείας αὐτῶν οὔτε ἐκ
z Matt. xv 19 11 Mk see Hos. iv 2. τῶν ^b κλεμμάτων αὐτῶν.
a here only. = 4 Kings ix 22. X. 1 Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλον ὁ ἄγγελον ὁ ἰσχυρὸν καταβαί-
Mic v. 12 Noh. iii. 4 bis (Wisd. i. 14. Sir vi. 16. xxviii 4) only. (-κεία, or -κία, Gal v. 20. ch. xviii. 23 only) b here
only. Gen. xxxi. 39 bis. Exod. xxiii. 3, 4 only. c ch. v. 2 xviii 21. 90 Br.

rec (for δύνανται) δυνάται, with B¹-corr rel: txt AC[P]N^B 1 m n 34-5-6-8. 47-9. 50-90.
21. rec φαρμακείων, with B rel, -κίων A[P] 1 17: txt CN a b c f g m 2. 4. 6. 9. 13-6-
9. 27. 30-3(-4-5-6, e sil) 42-8. 50-1. 90. for πορνείας, πορνείας AN¹: πορνίας
N^{3a} or c.

CHAR. X. 1. omi αλλον [P] B rel Andr-a: ins ACN m (l 16) 33 (34-5-6-8, e sil) vss

devils, by whatever name they may be called), and images of gold (lit. the images which are, &c. But this we idiomatically express as above) and of silver and of brass and of stone and of wood, which can neither see nor hear nor walk: and they did not repent of their murders nor of their witchcrafts (lit. their drugs: concrete in sense of abstract, as in all the places in the canonical LXX in reff. On the sense, see note on Gal. v. 20) nor of their fornication (Bengel remarks on πορνείας being in the sing., whereas the rest are plural, "Alia scelera ab hominibus per intervalla patrantur: una perpetua πορνεία est apud eos qui munditie cordis carent." But perhaps this is too refined) nor of their thefts. The character of these sins points out very plainly who are the sufferers by this sixth, or second woe trumpet, and the survivors who do not repent. We are taught by St. Paul that the heathen are without excuse for degrading the majesty of God into an image made like unto corruptible things, and for degenerating into gross immoralities in spite of God's testimony given through the natural conscience. And even thus will the heathen world continue in the main until the second advent of our Lord, of which these judgments are to be the immediate precursors. Nor will these terrible inflictions themselves bring those to repentance, who shall ultimately reject the Gospel which shall be preached among all nations. Whether, or how far, those Christians who have fallen back into these sins of the heathen, are here included, is a question not easy to decide. That they are not formally in the Apostle's view, seems clear. We are not yet dealing with the apostasy and fornication within the church herself. But that they, having become as the κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, even so far as to inherit their character of persecutors of the saints, may by the

very nature of the case, be individually included in the suffering of these plagues,—just as we believe and trust that many individually belonging to Babylon may be found among God's elect,—it is of course impossible to deny.

CH. X. 1—XI. 14.] EPISODICAL AND ANTICIPATORY. As after the sixth seal, so here after the sixth trumpet, we have a passage interposed, containing two episodes, completing that which has been already detailed, and introducing the final member of the current series. But it is not so easy here as there, to ascertain the relevance and force of the episodes. Their subjects here seem further off: their action more complicated. In order to appreciate them, it will be necessary to lay down clearly the point at which we have arrived, and to observe what is at that point required.

The last vision witnessed the destruction of a third part of the ungodly by the horsemen from the East, and left the remainder in a state of impenitent idolatry and sin. Manifestly then the prayers of the saints are not yet answered, however near the time may be for that answer. If then this Episode contains some assurance of the approach of that answer in its completeness, it will be what we might expect at this point in the series of visions. At the same time, looking onwards to the rest of the book, we see, that as out of the more general series of visions at the opening of the seals, affecting both the church and the world, there sprung a new and more particular series of the trumpets, having reference to one incident in the former vision, and affecting especially the "inhabiters of the earth," so if now the gaze of prophecy once more turns to the church and her fortunes, and the Apostle receives a new commission to utter a second series of prophecies, mainly on that subject, it will

νοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ^d περιβεβλημένον νεφέλην, καὶ ἡ ^{d constr., ch. vi. 3 ref.}
^e ἱρις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς ^{e ch. iv 3 only.}

Andr Areth Tich.—αγγελον bef αλλον l 16.

(35-6. 41, e sil) Andr: ins ACN¹ B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec om ἡ, with [P]N^{3a} k l 1. 32-3-8

της κεφαλῆς, with [P]N B rel Andr Areth: txt AC (d ?) 9. 12. for ιρις, θριξ N¹. rec

ins ACN B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff. rec om 1st αουτου:

also be no more than what we might fairly look for.

Again: if the episcodical vision in its character and hue partakes of the complexion of the whole series of trumpet-visions, and, as regards the church, carries a tinge of persecution, and of the still crying prayer for vengeance, not yet fully answered,—while at the same time it contains expressions and allusions which can only be explained by reference onward to the visions yet to come; this complex character is just that which would suit the point of transition at which we are now standing, when the series of visions immediately dependent on one feature in the opening of the seals is just at its end, and a new one evolving the other great subject of that general series is about to begin.

Now each one of these particulars is found as described above. For 1) the angel of ch. x. declares, with reference to the great vengeance-burden of the whole series of the trumpet-visions, respecting which the souls of the martyrs had been commanded *ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἔτι χρόνον μικρόν*, ch. vi. 11,—that *χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται*, but that in the days of the seventh angel, when he is about to blow, the whole mystery of prophecy will be fulfilled.

2) The same angel gives to the Seer the open little book, with a distinct announcement that he is to begin a new series of prophecies, and that series, by what immediately follows, ch. xi. 1 ff., evidently relating to the church of God in an especial manner.

3) The whole complexion of the episcodical vision of the two witnesses, ch. xi. 3 ff., is tinged with the hue which has pervaded the series of trumpet-visions, from their source in ch. vi. 9—11, viz. that of vengeance for the sufferings of the saints: while at the same time allusions occur in it which are at present inexplicable, but will receive light hereafter, when the new series of visions is unfolded. Such are the allusions to τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου, ch. xi. 7, and to ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, ib. ver. 8.

With these preliminary considerations, we may, I think, approach these episcodical visions with less uncertainty.

1—11.] THE VISION OF THE LITTLE BOOK. 1—4. *Introductory.* And I saw

another strong angel (ἄλλον, perhaps in allusion to the many which have been mentioned: but seeing that the epithet *ἰσχυρόν* occurs in the mention of the angel who cried out in reference to the sealed book, ch. v. 2, and that the present angel's errand also regards a book, we can hardly help taking ἄλλον with both substantive and adjective, and referring it to that first ἄγγελος *ἰσχυρός* in ch. v. 2. And this consideration may serve to introduce the assertion, to me hardly admitting of a doubt, that this angel is not, and cannot be, our Lord himself. Such a supposition would, it seems to me, entirely break through the consistency of apocalyptic analogy. Throughout the book, as before observed, on ch. viii. 3, angels are the ministers of the divine purposes, and the carriers out of the apocalyptic course of procedure, but are every where distinct from the divine Persons themselves. In order to this their ministry, they are invested with such symbols and such delegated attributes as beseeem in each case the particular object in view: but no apparent fitness of such symbolical investiture to the divine character should induce us to break through the distinction, and introduce indistinctness and confusion into the book. When St. John means to indicate the Son of God, he indicates Him plainly: none more so: when these plain indications are absent, and I find the name ἄγγελος used, I must take leave to regard the agent as distinct from Him,—however clothed, for the purposes of the particular vision, with His delegated power and attributes) descending out of heaven (the place of the Seer yet continues in heaven: see below, vv. 8, 9), clothed with a cloud (as a messenger of divine judgment: see ch. i. 7), and the rainbow upon his head (ἡ the well-known, ordinary, rainbow: indicating, agreeably with its first origin, God's covenant of mercy. See note on ch. iv. 3. On the accus. after ἐπὶ at the first mention of superposition, see note, ch. iv. 2), and his face as the sun (indicating the divine glory with which he was invested: see ch. i. 16, xviii. 1: and compare Luke ix.

† Gal. ii. 9. ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ οἱ πόδες αὐτοῦ ὡς ¹ στύλοι πυρός, ² καὶ ³ ἔχων ACFN B
 1 Tim. iii. 15 ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ^h βιβλαρίδιον ἠνεωγμένον, καὶ ἔθηκεν a lo n, 1
 ch. iii. 12 only, = Exod. 2 4. 6. 9.
 xiii. 21. xix. 10. 3. 16
 9. τὸν πόδα αὐτοῦ τὸν ⁱ δεξιὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης, τὸν δὲ 7 30. 32
 g constr., ch. iv. 1 al. ⁱ εὐώνυμον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ³ καὶ ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὥσπερ 2 38.
 h vv. 9, 10 only τ. to 19 26-
 1 Matt. xx. 21. λέων ^k μυκάται. καὶ ὅτε ἔκραξεν, ¹ ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτά 40-1. 2.
 k here only τ. βρονταὶ τὰς ἐαυτῶν ¹ φωνάς. ⁴ καὶ ὅτε ἐλάλησαν αἱ ἐπτά 47 to 51.
 Symm. βρονταί, ἡμελλον γράφειν καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῇ ἐκ τοῦ 90 B.
 (μύκημα λεοίνης Theoc. Id. xxvi. 21)
 1 so Mark ii. 2 al. m = (Matt xxvii. 66.) ch xxii. 10. Dan. vii 26 Theod. xii 4, 9.

στύλος 38 am(with fuld al) syr-dd Tich.

2. rec ειχεν, with h l n 1. 10. 35-6 (37. 47-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr Areth Primas: εχει
 17: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr-coisl. (κατεχων 38.) βιβλιδαριον C¹ f h l n 10-7. 36-

7-8. 47-9 Br¹ Andr-a: βιβλιον B rel Andr-coisl: txt AC²[P]N 1 (18, e sil) Andr-p Areth.

rec ανεωγμενον, with B rel Andr-a Areth: om A copt: txt C[P]N c l m Andr,
 ηνεωγμενων 1. rec την θαλασσαν and την γην, with 1: της θαλασσης but την γην

b d: την θ. and της γ. Andr-a: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth.

3. ins ως bef ελαλησαν N¹. om αι N¹ l 1. for βρονται, φωναι N¹. τας
 εαυτων φωναις N 1: om 34-5-6.—om τας εαυτων το βρονται next ver (homœotel)
 b e n 33.

4. for οτε, οσα N 37. om 1st αι 1. rec aft βρονται ins τας φωνας εαυτων:
 τας εαυ. φω. m: om AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff. (ημελλον, so AC B b f j 33-8. 42.

50.) rec aft λεγουσαν ins μοι (with 4. 17-8-9. 40, e sil): om AC[P]N B rel harl
 (and tol) syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth Primas Tich. for α, οσα N. om 2nd
 επτα C.

26), and his feet as pillars of fire (see ch. i. 15. The symbols with which this angel is accompanied, as those which surrounded the throne of God in ch. iv. 2 ff., betoken judgment tempered with mercy, the character of his ministration, which, at the same time that it proclaims the near approach of the completion of God's judgments, furnishes to the Seer the book of his subsequent prophecy, the following out of God's purposes of mercy), and having in his hand (his left hand, by what follows, ver. 5) a little book (the diminutive has been taken by some to point to the subsequent eating of the book by the Apostle: so Eichhorn: but Düsterd. remarks that if so, even the βιβλαρίδιον would be too large:—by others, to the size relatively to the angel: so Bengel. But the most natural reason for its use is to be found by comparison with the βιβλίον of ch. v. ff. That was the great sealed roll of God's purposes: this (see below) but one portion of those purposes, which was to be made the Seer's own for his future prophesying. The form βιβλαρίδιον is not found in Greek writers: the diminutive is βιβλιδαριον, used by Aristoph. frag. (in Julius Pollux, vii. 210. See also Phot. Bibl. p. 142). On the signification, &c., of this little book or roll, see below ver. 8, notes) open. And he placed his right foot on the sea,

and his left on the earth, and cried with a loud voice as a lion roareth (the whole imagery represents the glory and majesty of Him whose messenger this angel is: and is to be taken literally in the vision, the earth meaning the earth; the sea, the sea: and the description of the loudness of the voice being simply thus descriptive). And when he cried, the seven thunders (it is probable that the art. αι is prefixed because, like the seven stars, churches, seals, trumpets, and vials, these seven thunders form a complete portion of the apocalyptic machinery: and having no other designation, for the very reason that their meaning is not revealed, they are thus designated, as "the seven thunders") spoke their (no further stress on εαυτῶν, than as it belongs to the peculiar character of the utterances of these thunders. They were to be concealed, remaining unwritten: and this fact, I conceive, reflects back a tinge on the possessive genitive, making it so far emphatic: the voices were, and remained, εαυτῶν: not shared by being perpetuated) voices. And when the seven thunders spoke, I was about to write (in obedience to the command in ch. i. 19): and (not, "but:" as I was about to write, a new circumstance arose) I heard a voice out of heaven (from which it does not follow that the Seer is on earth, any more than in ver. 1) saying,

βρονταί, καὶ μὴ αὐτὰ γράψῃς. ⁵ καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ὃν εἶδον ⁿ δευτ. xxxii. 40. ^o Matt. v. 34. 36. xiii. 16. &c. Ps. lxi. 11. Jer v. 7. ⁿ χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τὴν δεξιάν ⁿ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ⁶ καὶ ^o ὥμοσεν ^p ch. iv. 9, 10. Dan. xii. 7. ^q Gen. xiv. 19. ^r = (see note) John always. John v. 6. vii. 33 xii. 35. xiv. 9. ch. ii. 21. vi. 11 xx. 3. (never = καίρος John.

rec (for αὐτα) ταυτα, with h 1. 10-7. 33-7. 49 Br (35-6. 40, e sil) : txt AC[P]N B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth.—καὶ μετὰ ταυτα γραφεις h 1. 10-7. 37. 49 Br Andr-a.

5. rec om την δεξιαν, with A 1. 17. 36 vulg: ins C[P]N B rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Primas.

6. om 1st εν (homœotel?) N¹ B rel copt Andr-coisl: ins AC[P]N^{3c} c l n 1. 10-7. 36. 49 (h 6. 32-7 Br, e sil) Andr Areth, per viventem vulg Primas. om των αιωνων 1.

om και την γην και τα εν αυτη A 1. 12 copt. om και την θαλασσαν και τα εν αυτη AN¹ c k 30-2-8. 40-9 arm: ins C[P]N^{3a} B rel.

Seal up the things which the seven thunders spoke, and do not write them (cf. the contrary command, ch. xxii. 10. Many speculations have been raised as to the purport of the utterances of the seven thunders, and the reason for concealing them. From the very nature of the case, these must be utterly in vain. The wisdom of Him who signified this Revelation to His servant John, has not seen fit to reveal these things to us. But the very nature of the case also convicts some of these speculations of error. The thunders, e. g., did not speak "humanum excidentia captum" as Ewald, seeing that not only did St. John understand their utterances, but he was about to write them down for others to read, as intelligible to them also. Again, they were not any utterances of mere human device. They were spoken by command of the great angel, as ver. 3 necessarily implies: they in common with the seals, trumpets, and vials, form part of the divinely-arranged machinery of the Apocalypse. It is matter of surprise and grief therefore, when we find historical interpreters of our day explaining them of the papal anathemas of the time of the Reformation. Elliott, vol. ii. p. 100 ff. It seems to me that no interpretation could be more unfortunate—none more thoroughly condemnatory of the system which is compelled to have recourse to it. For, merely to insist upon one point,—if it were so, then the Apostle sealed the utterances in vain, for all know what those thunders have uttered: then the command should have run σφράγισον . . . έως καιρου συντελειας, as in Dan. xii. 4, instead of an absolute command as here. Thus much we may infer; from the very character of thunder,—that the

utterances were of fearful import: from the place which they hold, that they related to the church. from the command to conceal them, first, encouragement, that God in His tender mercy to His own does not reveal all His terrors: secondly, godly fear, seeing that the arrows of His quiver are not exhausted, but besides things expressly foretold, there are more behind not revealed to us). 5—7.]

The oath of the strong angel, that the time of fulfilment of all prophecy was close at hand. In this portion of the vision, the reminiscences of Dan. xii. 7 are very frequent:—καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τοῦ ἐνδευκμένου τὰ βαδδίν, ὃς ἦν ἐπάνω τοῦ ὕδατος τοῦ ποταμοῦ, καὶ ὕψωσε τὴν δεξιάν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ἄριστεράν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ὥμοσεν ἐν τῷ ὥντι εἰς τὸν αἶωνα, ὅτι εἰς καιρὸν καιρῶν καὶ ἡμῶν καιροῦ, ἐν τῷ συντελεσθῆναι διασκορπισμὸν γνώσονται πάντα ταῦτα. And the angel whom I saw standing upon the sea and upon the earth, lifted his right hand (not both hands, as in Daniel above, seeing that the little book lay open on his left. On the practice of lifting the hand in swearing, cf. ref. and Gen. xiv. 22 (Exod. vi. 8 and Num. xiv. 30, marg. and LXX)) towards heaven (as God's dwelling-place, Isa. lvii. 15) and swore by (construction, see ref.) Him that liveth to the ages of the ages (cf. Dan. above), who created the heaven and the things in it, and the earth and the things in it, and the sea and the things in it (this full and formal designation of God as Creator of all is given, because the subject of the angel's oath is, the mystery of God, which necessarily rests in His power alone who made all things.

We may observe, that the fact as well as

so Luke i. 25.
 τ. Math. xiii.
 41 L Jer.
 xxxvi
 (xxxix) 10
 u so καὶ, ch.
 vi. 1, 12
 v τ. John xix
 30, ch xv 1. Luke xii 50 xxi. 37.
 ii. 29, see ch. i 20 xvi 5. 7.

w Mark iv 11. Rom xvi 25 Eph i. 9 iii 3, 4 9 vi 19 al Dan.
 x constr w acc., Acts xiii 32

rec (for ουκετι εσται) ουκ εσται ετι, with 1 Andr-a, non erit amplius vulg-ed; ουκετι εστιν N¹: txt AC[P]N^{3a} B rel syr-dd Andr Areth, *amplius non erit* an(with fuld lipss al).

7 (αλλ', so AC[P]N B a to e, g to n 1. 4. 10-3-7-8-9. 30-6-8 Br Andr Areth. (Wetst Beh &c silent.)) του αγγελου του εβδμου N. rec (for ετελ.) τελεσθη, with B h l n 1. 10. 17-corr 36. 49. 51 (37 Br, e sil) Andr. τελεσθηναι 17¹: txt AC [P(appy)] N rel syr-dd copt Andr-coisl. rec τοις (ε)αυτ. δουλοις τοις προφηταις, with j n 1. 18

the form of this oath is against the supposition, that this strong angel is the Lord Himself. Considering St. John's own declarations respecting the Son of God, it is utterly inconceivable that he should have related as spoken *by* Him an oath couched in these terms), that time (see below) should no longer be (i. e. should no more intervene: in allusion to the answer given to the cry of the souls of the martyrs, ch. vi. 11, καὶ ἐβρέθη αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἀναπαύσωνται ἐν χρόνῳ μικρῷ. This whole series of trumpet-judgments has been an answer to the prayers of the saints, and now the vengeance is about to receive its entire fulfilment: χρόνος οὐκέτι ἔσται: the appointed delay is at an end. That this is the meaning is shewn by the ἀλλ' ἐν τ. ἡμ. which follows. Several erroneous views have been taken of this saying: e. g., 1) that of Bede "mutabilis sæcularium temporum varietas in novissima tuba cessabit," al., and apparently the E. V. ("that there should be time no longer")—that it imports the ending of the state of time, and the beginning of eternity: 2) the *chronological* one of Bengel, who allots a definite length, viz. 1111½ years (?) to a chronus, and then interprets, "there shall not elapse a chronus:" bringing the end, on his successive-historical system, to the year 1836, which is self-refuted: 3) the view of Vitringa and Hengstenb., which grounds an error on the right understanding of these words themselves,—"*moram nullam temporis esse intercessuram inter clangorem septimæ tubæ et oraculorum prophetarum implementum*:" for the assertion of ver. 7, which is the carrying out of this denial, expressly identifies the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound, with the immediate fulfilment of all prophecy): but (ἀλλὰ is not = εἰ μή, but bears its proper meaning of strong contrast) in the days of the voice of the seventh angel (i. e. the days indicated, in the fulfilment of the vision,

by the sounding of the seventh angel's trumpet. De W. well observes, that there is in the diction of this clause a mingling of the fulfilment with the prophecy), **when he is about to blow his trumpet** (these words **ὅταν μέλλῃ** are used, as in ref., in their strictest propriety. For when the seventh angel *does* sound, the completed time of the fulfilment is simultaneous with his blowing: cf. ch. xi. 18: so that it is properly said that the fulfilment comes in *the days* when he is about to blow. Elliott's version, "at what time soever he may have to sound," can hardly be the rendering of **ὅταν μέλλῃ σαλπίζειν**. For 1) **ὅταν** will not in the LXX and N. T. bear this emphatic uncertainty, but is simply "when," in contingent clauses: and 2) **μέλλῃ**, in a sentence spoken strictly of time, must be kept to its temporal signification. Of course, the E. V., "when he shall begin to sound," is inadmissible), **then** (this **καὶ** in apodosis is in fact the token of a mixed construction: which resolved would be ἀλλ' ὅτι ἤξουσιν αἱ ἡμέραι κ.τ.λ., καὶ κ.τ.λ. So also in ref. See Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 3, f) **the mystery of God** (this expression will be best understood by ref. Rom., connected as it is here with the verb *εὐαγγέλισεν* (see below). It is the mystery of the *kingdom*, as unfolded in the course of the Gospel dispensation, as is clearly shewn by the thanksgiving after the blowing of the seventh trumpet in ch. xi. 15 ff.) **is fulfilled** (lit., *was fulfilled*,—the speaker looking back, in prophetic anticipation, on the days spoken of, from a point when they should have become a thing past), **as He evangelized** (it is impossible to give the force of *εὐαγγέλισεν* with the accus. by a periphrasis, without losing its force. It expresses that God *informed them of the glad tidings*: it being left to be understood by their office of *προφήτης*, that they *published* the *εὐαγγέλιον*. See Gal. iii. 8, where the sense, though not the con-

ὑ δούλους τοὺς ὑ προφήτας. ⁸ καὶ ἡ φωνὴ ἦν ἤκουσα ἐκ ^γ ch. xi. 18
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πάλιν ² λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ λέγουσαν ^{Jer. vi. 25 al.}
"Ἦπαγε λάβε τὸ βιβλίον τὸ ἠνεωγμένον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ τοῦ ^{12 al. fr. in}
ἀγγέλου τοῦ ἐστῶτος ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. ^{Rev}
⁹ καὶ ^a ἀπῆλθον ^a πρὸς τὸν ἀγγελον ^b λέγων αὐτῷ ^b δοῦναι ^{a - Matt. xii}
μοι τὸ ^c βιβλαρίδιον. καὶ λέγει μοι Λάβε καὶ ^d κατάφαγε ^{25. Markii}
αὐτό, καὶ ^e πικρανεῖ σου τὴν ^f κοιλίαν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ στόματι ^{15. Gen.}
σου ἔσται ^g γλυκὺ ὡς ^h μέλι. ^{xxiv. 56}
¹⁰ καὶ ἔλαβον τὸ ⁱ βιβλα- ^{b constr. Matt.}
ρίδιον ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ ἀγγέλου καὶ ^d κατέφαγον αὐτό, ^{i. 34, 39.}
καὶ ἦν ἐν τῷ στοματί μου ὡς ^h μέλι ^g γλυκὺ καὶ ὅτε ^{c ver 2.}
¹³ ^{Phil iii 19. 2 Kings xx 10.} ^{g here bis. James iii 11, 12 only. Judg. xiv 14. Sir.}
^{xxiv 20} ^{h here bis. Matt iii 4 Mk only. Ezek. iii 3}

Andr Areth: txt AC [P(appy)] N B rel Andr-coisl.—for εαυτου, αυτ. B rel: om k: txt AC [P(appy)] N 1. 17. 38.—ins και bef τ. προφ. N.

8. rec λαουσα and λεγουσα, with rel lps-5 syr-dd copt Andr Areth: txt AC [P(appy)] N B f l 36 vulg. rec βιβλαριδιον, with [P(appy)] N g 1. 16-8 Andr-p: βιβλιαριον B rel Andr Areth: txt AC f. ανεωγμενον B rel Andr-a Areth: txt AC [P(appy)] N m c 33 (c 1. 2. 16. 34-5-6, e sil) Andr. om εν τη χειρ. C: εκ χειρος 36: om εν c 6. 11. rec om του (bef αγγελου) (with d 6. 34-5. 51 Bf, e sil): ins AC [P(appy)] B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth. om θαλασσης και επι της N'(ins N^{3a}): transp θαλ. and γης 37.

9. απηλθα A j 16. 27. 50. rec (for δουναι) dos, with [P] h n 1. 10-7. 33-7-8. 40-9 (34. 51 Bf, e sil) copt Andr: txt AC N B rel vulg Andr-coisl Areth. βιβλιαριον B rel Andr Areth: βιβλιαριον A¹: βιβλιον N f: txt A(as corrd by origl scribe) C[P] 1 (13-8. 51, e sil). αυτο bef και καταφαγε N'(in both places N^{3a}). for κοιλιαν, καρδιαν A. αλλα N.

10. βιβλιον [for βιβλαρ.] N B rel Andr-coisl Areth: βιβλιαριον d f h n 10-7. 32-6-7. 49 B Andr-a: txt AC [P] 1. 18 Andr-p. ην το στοματι(sic) 1. γλυκυ bef ως μελι (from ver 9) A B 36: txt C[P] N rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth. om οτε

struction, is much the same) His servants the prophets.

8—11.] *The delivery of the little book to John, and announcement of a further work of prophecy to be carried on by him. And the voice which I heard out of heaven, (I) again (heard) talking with me and saying (the sentence is a curious instance of mixed construction. One of its simple forms would be κ. ἡ φωνὴ ἦν ἤκ. ἐκ τ. οὐρ. πάλιν ἐλάλει μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγουσα: the other, κ. τὴν φωνὴν ἤκουσα ἐκ τ. οὐρ. πάλ. λαλοῦσαν μετ' ἐμοῦ κ. λέγουσαν. The former member of the first of these, and the latter member of the second, are united in the text), Go take the book which lieth open in the hand of the angel which standeth upon the sea and upon the earth. And I went away (from my former place as a spectator in heaven: from which, however, the Seer does not seem wholly to remove, cf. ch. xi. 16; xix. 1 ff., although his principal spot of observation is henceforth the earth: cf. ch. xi. 1, xiv. 1, xvii. 3, &c.) to the angel telling him (the pres. part. contains the reason of the ἀπῆλθον) to give me the little book. And he saith to me,*

Take and eat it up (cf. Ezek. iii. 1 ff.; Jer. xv. 16; Ps. xl. 9): and it shall embitter thy belly, but in thy mouth shall be sweet as honey. And I took the book out of the hand of the angel and ate it up: and it was in my mouth as honey, sweet; and when I had eaten it up, my belly was embittered (there is the difference between Ezekiel's roll and this, that, in the prophet's case, only the sweetness in the mouth is mentioned. The Angel, dwelling most on the most important thing, the working of the contents of the book, puts the bitterness first: the Evangelist, in relating what happened, follows the order of time. The text itself will guard us against some misinterpretations of this bitterness and sweetness. It is plain that we must understand these to belong, not to differing characters of different portions of the contents of the book (as Heinr., Ewald), but to different sensations of the Evangelist in different parts of his body respecting one and the same content of the book. Nor again must we invert the order, imagining (as Herder and Rinck) that the first bitterness leads afterwards to sweetness and joy, or (as

1 see John xii. 16 ἔχη-
σθηράζοντο
έν Δεληφού-
σιν ἐπὶ
πάσῃ τῇ
Ἀρκάδιον χώρῃ, Herod 1 66. k ch v. 9 reff. 1 plur., ch. vii. 9 reff

ἔφαγον αὐτό, ὁ ἐπικράνθη ἡ κοιλία μου. 11 καὶ λέγου-
σίν μοι Δεῖ σε πάλιν προφητεῦσαι ἰ ἐπὶ κ¹ λαοῖς καὶ κ² ἔθνε-
σιν καὶ κ³ γλώσσαις καὶ βασιλευσιν πολλοῖς. ... ε[φ]α-
γου] C
A P N B 3
to n, 1
2. 4 6, 9
10-3, 16
to 19 26,
7. 30. 32
to 38
40-1, 2,
47 to 51.
90 B^r.

εφαγον αυτο m 35 Andr-c.

for επικρανθη, γεμισθη N.

aft μου ins πικρίας N3a.

11. rec (for λεγουσιν) λεγει, with [P] c h n 1. 10-7-8. 36-8 (6. 37. 47-9. 51 B^r, e sil)
vss Andr Primas: λεγουσα 13: txt AN B rel am (with harl) Andr-coisl Areth.
επι bef εθνεσι B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas: om A[P]N c 1. 17-8. 36 (26. 38.
42-7, e sil) Andr. γλωτταις 1.

Bede, Aretius, al.) that the bitterness in the belly indicates the reception by the Evangelist, but the sweetness in the mouth, the declaration to others; proceeding on a misunderstanding of ver. 11. For further particulars, see below). And they say (λέγουσιν leaves the speakers quite indefinite; amounting in fact to no more than "it was said") to me, Thou must (i. e. it is God's will that thou shouldst: a command is laid upon thee so to do) again prophesy (as thou hast done before in writing the former part of the ἀποκάλυψις: see in the interpretation below) concerning (not, as E. V. "before:" nor can ἐπὶ with a dat. bear such a meaning. The substantives which follow the preposition are the objects of the προφητεῦσαι. So in reff. See Winer, edn. 6, § 48, c. c) peoples and nations and languages and many kings (i. e. concerning the inhabitants of the earth, as before: cf. ch. v. 9, where the Lamb's worthiness to open the former βιβλίον is connected with His having redeemed ἐκ πάσης φυλῆς κ. γλώσσης κ. λαοῦ κ. ἔθνους).

I have postponed till this point the question, what we are to understand by the βιβλαρίδιον, and the Seer's concern with it. And I will at once say, before discussing the various differing interpretations, that I conceive the simple acceptance of the description and symbolism here can lead but to one conclusion; viz. that it represents the μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ above spoken of, the subject of the remainder of the apocalyptic prophecies. So far, many of the principal Commentators are at one. Indeed it is difficult to conceive how any other interpretation can have been thought of, except as made necessary by some previous self-committal of the Expositor regarding the sealed book of ch. v., or by the exigencies of some historical system. But within the limits of this agreed meaning, there are many different views as to the extent of the reference of the "little book" to that which follows, and as to its relation to the seven-sealed book of ch. v. As regards

these points, we may remark, 1) that the contents of the "little book" cannot well be confined to ch. xi. 1—13, or we should not have had so solemn an inauguration of it, nor so wide-reaching an announcement of the duty of the Apostle consequent on the receipt of it: 2) that the oath of the Angel must necessarily be connected with his bearing of the open book on his hand, and if so, makes it necessary to infer that the contents of the book are identical with the mystery, respecting which he swears: 3) that the episode which follows, containing the first work of the Apostle under this his new prophetic commission, inchoates an entirely new matter—the things which befall the Church of God and the holy city, which new character of incidents continues to prevail until the very end of the book: 4) that the relation of this "little book" to the sealed book of ch. v. can hardly be doubtful to the readers of this Commentary, seeing that we have maintained that book to be the sum of the divine purposes, which is not opened at all within the limits of the apocalyptic vision, but only prepared to be opened by the removal of its seven seals. That this is not that complete record of the divine purposes, nor, technically speaking, any portion of it, must be evident to us. For it forms a small detached roll or volume, lying open on the angel's hand: it is destined for the especial individual behoof of the Seer, into whom it passes, and becomes assimilated with himself, to be given forth as he should be directed to utter it. 5) That it contained more than we possess in the remaining portion of this book, is probable. St. John doubtless knew more than he has told us. Previously to this, he knew what the seven thunders uttered: and subsequently to this, we can hardly imagine that he was ignorant of the name of the wild beast, whose number he has given us.

It remains that we say something on the circumstances accompanying the Apostle's reception of the mysterious book.

XI. ¹ Καὶ ἐδόθη μοι ^m κάλαμος ὅμοιος ῥάβδῳ, ⁿ λέγων ^{m = ch. xxi.}

7. 2 John 12 al.) ΕΞΕΚ. xi. 3. see ΖΕΧ. ii. 1, 2.

^{15, 16}
(Matt. xi.
n constr., ch. iv. 1 al.

CHAP. XI. 1. elz ins και ο αγγελος ειστηκει bef λεγων, with 36; και ειστηκει ο αγγελος N³: v flz m 10. 34-5-7. 49 B¹ syr-dd arm Andr-coisl Vict: και φωνη n 79 Andr-a(Del): και(only) c: om A[P¹N¹ rel vulg copt æth Andr Areth. λεγει N¹: λεγουσα n 79 Andr-a(Del).

Its *sweetness*, when he tasted it, allusive as it is to the same circumstance in Ezekiel's eating the roll which was all lamentation, mourning, and woe, doubtless represents present satisfaction at being informed of, and admitted to know, a portion of God's holy will: of those words of which the Psalmist said, Ps. cxix. 103, "How sweet are thy words unto my taste, yea sweeter than honey unto my mouth!" But when the roll came to be not only tasted, but digested,—the nature of its contents felt within the man,—bitterness took the place of sweetness: the persecutions, the apostasies, the judgments, of the church and people of the Lord, saddened the spirit of the Seer, and dashed his joy at the first reception of the mystery of God.

CH. XI. 1—14.] *The measurement of the temple of God. The two witnesses: their testimony, death, resurrection, and assumption into heaven: the earthquake, and its consequences.*

This passage may well be called, even more than that previous one, ch. x. 1 ff., the *crux interpretum*; as it is undoubtedly one of the most difficult in the whole Apocalypse. Referring to the histories of apocalyptic exegesis for an account of the various interpretations, I will, as I have done in similar cases, endeavour to lay down a few landmarks, which may serve for guidance at least to avoid inconsistency, if we cannot do more. And I will remark, 1) that we are not bound to the hard "wooden" literal sense so insisted on in our day by some of the modern German Expositors. I would strongly recommend any one who takes that view, who will have Jerusalem = nothing but Jerusalem, and confine the two witnesses to two persons bodily appearing there, to read through the very unsatisfactory and shuffling comment of Dusterdieck here: the result of which is, that finding, as he of course does, many discrepancies between this and our Lord's prophecy of the same destruction of Jerusalem, he is driven to the refuge that while our Lord describes matters of fact, St. John *idealizes* the catastrophe, setting it forth not as it really took place, but according to its inner connexion with the final accomplishment of the mystery of God, and corre-

spondently to the hope which God's Old Testament people possessed as contrasted with the heathen power of this world, which abides in "Babylon." But really, if we have come thus far by fighting for the literal interpretation, why not a little further? Or rather why *so far*? If "Babylon" is the abode of the world, why not "Jerusalem" of the church? If our interpreter, maintaining the literal sense, is allowed so far to "idealize," as to exempt the temple of God itself (ver. 1) from a destruction which we know overtook it, and nine-tenths of the city (ver. 13) from an overthrow which destroyed it all, surely there is an end to the meaning of words. If Jerusalem here is simply Jerusalem, and the prophecy regards her overthrow by the Romans, and especially if this passage is to be made such use of as to set aside the testimony of Irenæus as to the date of the Apocalypse by the stronger testimony of the Apocalypse itself (so Dusterd. from Lücke), then must every particular be shewn to tally with known history; or if this cannot be done, at least it must be shewn that none contradicts it. If *this* cannot be done, then we may fairly infer that the prophecy has no such reference, or only remotely, here and there, and not as its principal subject. 2) Into whatever difficulty we may be led by the remark, it is no less true, that the πόλις ἡ ἁγία of ver. 2 cannot be the same as the πόλις ἡ μεγάλη of ver. 8. This has been felt by the literal interpreters, and they have devised ingenious reasons why the holy city should afterwards be called the great city: so De Wette, "he named Jerusalem the great city, because he can no more call her holy after her desecration" (but he need not therefore call her *great*, by which epithet she is never called)—Dusterd., "because it is impossible in one breath to call a city 'holy,' and 'Sodom and Egypt'" (most true: then must we not look for some other city than one which this very prophecy has called holy?). So far Joachim says well, "Veruntamen quod ait in plateis civitatis magnæ, non satis videtur facere pro eodem intellectu (the literal). Nunquam enim magna civitas forte legitur, sed magis Nineve et Babylon magnæ civitates dictæ sunt: nimirum quia multi sunt vocati,

ο = Mark iii. 3 ο Ἐγείρε καὶ ῥ μέτρησον τὸν ῥ ναὸν τοῦ ῥ θεοῦ καὶ τὸ ῥ θυ- APN B a
 al 1 Chion. do n, 1.
 xxii 19. σιαστήριον καὶ τοὺς ῥ προσκυνούντας ῥ ἐν αὐτῷ ῥ καὶ τὴν 2 4. 6. 9.
 p hete bis. ch. 10-3. 16
 xxi 15, 16. 10-3. 16
 17. Matt vii. 2 bis. Mark iv. 24 bis. Luke vi. 38. 2 Cor. x. 12 only. Num. xxxv. 5. q ver 19. ch
 in 12. (vii. 15.) Matt xxvi. 61. 1 Cor iii. 16. 17 bis. 2 Cor. vi 16 bis. 2 Thess. ii 4. Dan . 3 Theod.
 r - ch. vi. 9. viii. 3.5 s John iv 20, 21. Ps. xxviii. 2. 7. 30. 32
 to 38
 40-1 2.
 47 to 51.
 90 B*.

rec *εγείραι* (*itacism* ?), with rel Andr Areth: *εγῆραι* 1: *εγείρον* 10-8: txt A[P]N B a d
 f k l m 6. 9. 13. 30-2-6. 41-2. 50. 90 B* Andr-a1. for *μετρ-, μερίσον* 41: *μερίσε* B. 90 B*.

pauci vero electi." His other reason see in the interpretation below. 3) We are compelled, if I am not mistaken, to carry the above considerations somewhat further, by the very conditions of the prophecy itself. For it is manifestly and undeniably of an *anticipatory* character. It is not, and cannot be, complete in itself. The words of ver. 7, τὸ θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου, bear no meaning where they stand, but require, in order to be understood at all, to be carried on into the succeeding visions of ch. xiii. ff. And if into those visions, then into a period when this wild-beast has received power from the dragon,—when, as in ch. xiii. 7, he makes war with the saints and conquers them, and all on earth except the elect are worshipping him. 4) Let us observe the result as affecting our interpretation. We are necessarily carried on by the very terms of our present compendious prophecy, into the midst of another prophecy, far more detailed and full of persons and incidents: of one which has its μεγάλη πόλις, its ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, its προσκυνούντες ἐν αὐτῷ, its μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, and other coincident particulars. What inference does a sound principle of interpretation force upon us? What, if not this—that our present compendious prophecy, as in the particular of the beast that comes out of the abyss, so in its other features, must be understood as giving in summary, and introducing, that larger one? and consequently, that its terms are to be understood by those of that larger one, not servilely and literally where they stand? And observe, this is deduced from the very necessity of the case itself, as shewn in ver. 7, not from any system throwing its attraction forward and biasing our views. *We cannot understand this prophecy at all, except in the light of those that follow: for it introduces by anticipation their dramatis personæ.* 5) If I mistake not, we thus gain much light on the difficulties of this prophecy. If it is a compendium of the more detailed prophecies which follow, opening the great series regarding God's church, and reaching forward to the time of the seventh trumpet, then its separate parts, so hard to assign on any other view, at once fall

into their places. Then, e. g. we at once know what is meant by the temple and its worshippers, viz. that these expressions are identical in reference with those others in the subsequent prophecy which point out an elect remnant, a Goshen in Egypt, a Zoar from Sodom, a number who do not worship the wild-beast and his image, who are not defiled with women, &c. And so of the rest. 6) It will then be on this principle that I shall attempt the exposition of this difficult prophecy. Regarding it as a summary of the more detailed one which follows, I shall endeavour to make the two cast light on one another: searching for the meaning of the symbols here used in their fuller explanation there, and gaining perhaps some further insight into meanings there from expressions occurring here.

1, 2.] *Command to measure the temple, but not the outer court, which is given to the Gentiles. And there was given to me* (by whom, is not said, but it is left indefinite, as at ch. vi. 11, viii. 2) *a reed like to a staff* (see *reff.*) *saying* (λέγων is out of the construction, and indefinite: as in ch. iv. 1. Andr., in Catena, imagines that it is the reed that speaks, and builds an allegorical interpretation on the idea: πῶς γὰρ ὁ κλάμος ἄψυχος ὦν ἔλεγεν Ἐγείραι κ.τ.λ.; ἐκ τούτου οὖν δείκνυται, ἀγγελικῇ συνείσει μετρεῖσθαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ. And so in our own time, remarkably enough, Bp. Wordsworth: "The Reed speaks: it is inspired: the Spirit is in it: it is the Word of God. And it measures the Church: that is, the Canon of Scripture is the rule of faith." (Thus in his Lectures on the Apocalypse. In his notes ad loc., he treats λέγων as absolute.)), *Arise* (ἐγείρε does not necessarily imply that the Apostle was kneeling before: see *reff.*) *and measure the temple of God and the altar* (apparently, the altar of incense: as that alone stood in the ναὸς. But perhaps we must not be too minute in particularizing), *and them that worship in it* (see the previous remarks on this prophecy. The *measuring* here is evidently for the purpose of taking account of, understanding the bearing and dimensions of, that which is to be measured; see ch. xxi. 15, where the heavenly Jerusalem is

^t αὐλήν τὴν ^u ἔξωθεν τοῦ ναοῦ ^v ἔκβαλε ^v ἔξω καὶ μὴ αὐτὴν ^t see 4 Kings
^p μετρήσῃς, ὅτι ἐδόθη τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, καὶ τὴν ^w πόλιν τὴν ^{u w} art., Matt.
^w ἁγίαν ^x πατήσουσιν μῆνας τεσσεράκοντα καὶ δύο. ³ καὶ ^{xiii. 25}
^{u w} art., Matt. 39,
^{40.} 1 Tim.
ⁱⁱⁱ 7. 1 Pet. iii. 8 only. Ezek. xli. 17. ^v = Acts ix. 40. see James ii. 25 ^w Matt. iv.
^{5.} xxvii. 53. ch. xxi. 2, 10. xxii. 19. Isa. xlviii. 2. Dan. ix. 24 Theod. ^x Luke xxi. 24. x. 19. ch.
^{xiv.} 20. xix. 15 only Isa. xlii. 5. (Dan. viii. 13. 1 Macc. iii. 45.)

2. τῆς αὐλῆς τῆς Ν'. Steph *εσωθεν*, with N m 1. 12. 32 Andr-coisl Vict:
ανωθεν 41: txt A[P] B rel. for *ναου*, *λαου* καὶ Ν' (but corrd). for *εξω*, *εξωθεν*
 ΑΝ^{3a} f h m n 1. 12. 26. 37 Br Andr: [*εσωθεν* P:] *εσω* Ν': txt B rel Andr-p Areth.
 aft *εδοθη* ins καὶ Ν'. for *πατήσουσιν*, *μετρησουσιν* A. rec om last καὶ,
 with [P]N f 34 (m 2. 13. 30-7-8. 41-2-9, e sil) Andr Areth, and (but μβ') h n (κβ')
 10-7-8. 36 Br: ins A B rel Andr-p.—(μ' καὶ β' B.)

measured by the angel. But here two questions arise: 1) What is that which is measured? and 2) when does the measuring take place? 1) I have no doubt that, as above hinted, the *ναὸς τ. θεοῦ* and its *θυσαστήριον* are to be here taken symbolically, as the other principal features of the prophecy: and to one believing this, there can be but little further doubt as to what meaning he shall assign to the terms. Thus understood, they can only bear one meaning: viz., that of the Church of the elect servants of God, every where in this book symbolized by Jews in deed and truth. The society of these, as a whole, is the *ναὸς*, agreeably to Scripture symbolism elsewhere, e. g. 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17, and is symbolized by the inner or holy place of the Jerusalem temple, in and among which they as true Israelites and priests unto God, have a right to worship and minister. These are they who, properly speaking, alone are *measured*: estimated again and again in this book by tale and number—partakers in the first resurrection,—the Church of the first-born. Then as to our question 2), it is one which, so far as I know, has not engaged the attention of expositors. When a command is elsewhere in this book given to the Seer, we may observe that his fulfilment of it is commonly indicated. He is commanded to write, and the writing before us proves his obedience. He is ordered to take the little book, *καὶ ἀπῆλθον κ.τ.λ.* But of the fulfilment by him of this command, *ἔγρειπ καὶ μέτρησον*, no hint appears to be given. The voice goes on continuously, until it melts imperceptibly into the narrative of the vision. After this, we hear no more of the measuring, till another and more glorious building is measured in ch. xxi. This being so, either 1) which is inconceivable, the measurement does not take place at all, or, 2) which is hardly probable, it takes place and no result is communicated to us, or 3) the result of it is found in the subsequent prophecies: in the minute and careful distinctions between the ser-

vants of God and those who receive the mark of the wild-beast—in all those indications which point out to us the length and breadth and depth and height, both of faith, and of unfaithfulness). And the court which is outside the temple (i. e. apparently, every thing except the *ναὸς* itself: not merely the outer court or court of the Gentiles. That only the *ναὸς* itself, in the strictest sense, is to be measured, is significant for the meaning above maintained) cast out (of thy measurement. But these strong words, conveying so slight a meaning, doubtless bear in them a tinge also of the stronger meaning, “reckon as profane,” “account not as included in the sacred precinct”), and measure not it (*αὐτήν* has a slight emphasis: otherwise it need not have been expressed), because it was given (viz. at the time when the state of things subsisting in the vision came in: or, in God’s apportionment) to the Gentiles (if the *ναὸς* and the *προσκυνοῦντες* represent the elect church of the first-born, the *ἔθνη* will correspond to those who are outside this sacred enclosure: those over whom eventually the millennial reign of ch. xx. shall be exercised: those from among whom shall spring the enmity against God’s church, but among whom also shall be many who shall fear, and give God glory, cf. ver. 13. Of these is formed the outward seeming church, mixed up with the world; in them, though not in each case commensurate with them, is Babylon, is the reign of the wild-beast, the agency of the false prophet: they are the *κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν* or *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, the material on which judgment and mercy are severally exercised in the rest of this book (cf. especially ver. 18), as contrasted with God’s own people, gathered and to be gathered out from among them), and they shall tread down (i. e. trample as conquerors, the outer church being in subjection to them: see ref. The other meaning, *shall tread*, merely, is of course included; but must not be made the preva-

γ = Joh 111
27 v 36, vi.
65 xi 22.
xv 16 xvi
23, xvii 4 al.
z ch. u. 13 reff.

γ δώσω τοῖς δυσὶν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα ἂ περιβεβλημένοι ὁ σάκ- C χιλίας

a ch. vii. 9 reff. b ch. vi. 12 reff.

3. aft ἐξήκοντα ins πεντε ^{35c*} f. περιβεβλημενους A[P]^h N¹ B h l n 4. 48: περι-
βεβλημενος(sic) 17¹: txt CN^{3a} rel Hip Andr Areth. [σακουσ P.]

ACPN B
a lo n. 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19 22
7. 30. 32
to 35.
40 1-2.
47 to 51.
90 B^r.

lent one. The period named shall be one during which ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν βιάζεται, καὶ βιασταὶ ἀρπάξουσιν αὐτήν, Matt. xi. 12) the holy city (Jerusalem, in the literal sense of the prophecy: the whole temple except the ναὸς itself being counted with the city outside) forty and two months (this period occurs in three forms in this book: 1) as forty-two months; see ch. xiii. 5: 2) as 1260 days = 42 months × 30, see ver. 3, ch. xii. 6: 3) as time, times, and half a time = 3½ years, 3 × 360 + 180 = 1260 days, see ch. xii. 14. This latter designation is also found in Dan. vii. 25, xii. 7. With respect to these periods, I may say that, *equal* as they certainly seem to be, we have no right to suppose them, in any two given cases, to be *identical*, unless the context requires such a supposition. For instance, in these two verses, 2 and 3, there is strong temptation to regard the two equal periods as coincident and identical: but it is plain that such a view is not required by the context; the prophecy contains no note of such coincidence, but may be very simply read without it, on the view that the two periods are equal in duration, but independent of one another: and the rather, that this prophecy, as has been already shewn, is of a compendious character, hereafter to be stated at large. I will further remark, and the reader will find this abundantly borne out by research into histories of apocalyptic exegesis, that no solution at all approaching to a satisfactory one has ever yet been given of any one of these periods. This being so, my principle is to regard them as being still among the things unknown to the Church, and awaiting their elucidation by the event. It is our duty to feel our way by all the indications which Scripture furnishes, and by the light which history, in its main and obvious salient events, has thrown on Scripture: and, when those fail us, to be content to confess our ignorance. An apocalyptic commentary which explains every thing, is self-convicted of error).

3—13.] THE TWO WITNESSES: *their testimony, death, resurrection, ascension: consequences on the beholders*. The remarks just made are here especially applicable. No solution has ever been given of this portion of the prophecy. Either the

two witnesses are literal,—two individual men,—or they are symbolical,—two individuals taken as the concentration of principles and characteristics, and this either in themselves, or as representing men who embodied those principles and characteristics. In the following notes I shall point out how far one, how far another of these views, is favoured by the text, and leave the reader to judge. And I will give to my two witnesses (the heavenly voice is still speaking in the name of Chrst. That we must not press the *μου* to the inference that Chrst himself speaks, is plain by *θπου καὶ ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη* below. The art. *τοῖς* seems as if the two witnesses were well known, and distinct in their individuality. The *δυσὶν* is essential to the prophecy, and is not to be explained away. No interpretation can be right which does not, either in individuals, or in characteristic lines of testimony, retain and bring out this dualism. See further below. As regards the construction, δώσω is followed, not by an infin., but by the less usual apodosis, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν κ.τ.λ. Nothing need be supplied after δώσω, as is done by Lyra and Corn.-a-lap. ("constantiam et sapientiam") and Beza ("sanctam civitatem," which is decidedly wrong, seeing it is given to the Gentiles)), and they shall prophesy (προφητεύσουσιν here has generally been taken to mean, *shall preach repentance*. It may be so: but in ch. x. 11, the verb is used in its later and stricter sense of foretelling events, as in 1 Pet. i. 10; Jude 14. If their testimony consisted in denouncing judgment, the other would necessarily be combined with it) a thousand two hundred and sixty days (Dusterd. remarks that the fact of a period of the same length as the forty-two months being now expressed in *days*, implies that they will prophesy day by day throughout it. The reader will of course see, that the two questions, of these days being *days* or *years*, and of the individuality or the symbolical character of the witnesses, are mutually connected together. He will also bear in mind that it is a pure assumption that the two periods, the forty-two months and the 1260 days, coincide over the same space of time. The duration of time is that during which the power of Elijah's

κους. ⁴ οὗτοί εἰσιν αἱ δύο ^c ἐλαῖαι καὶ αἱ δύο ^d λυχναίαι ^c Rev, here only. Rom. xi. 17 al. Zech. iv. 3, 11, 14. d ch. i. 12 al. Zech. 1 c. e ch. vi. 2 reff. f = ch. vi. 6 reff. g ch. i. 16 iv. 5 al fr. h Mark xiii. 40 || 2 Cor. xi. 20. Gal. v. 15 only (see ch. x. 9, 10 reff) Joel ii. 5. 74 Kings i. 10, 12, 14. Jer. v. 14. Num. xvi. 35.)
¹ = 1 Thess iv 11. k Luke iv. 25. see Sir. xlviii. 3.

4. for 1st αἱ, οἱ **N**¹. for ελαιαι, αυλαιαι A: αλαιαι C: txt [P]**N** B rel.—om δυο ελαιαι και 1 (but adds in margin και β ελαιαι) Andr-b. rec om [2nd] αἱ, with **N**¹ (1-marg) 18. 33(-4-5, e sil): ins AC[P]**N**^{3a} B rel Hip Andr. om 3rd αἱ **N** c f g l m 6. 32-4-5. 47-8 Areth: αἱ b. om του A B. ins C[P]**N** rel. rec (for κυριου) θεου, with n 1. 17. 36 Andr-a: txt AC[P]**N** B rel vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr Areth Vict Primas. rec εστωσαι, with [P]**N**^{3c} e g l n 1. 10-7-8. 36-8 (h 37 B⁷, e sil) Hip Andr: txt AC**N**¹ B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

5. 1st θελει bef αυτους **N** m 34: θελ. αδικ. αυτους f. rec (for 1st θελ.) θελη, with l 30-3-6: εθελει 42: txt AC[P]**N** B rel Andr Areth. for 2nd εἰ, η **CN**¹ 1. rec (for 2nd θελ.) θελη, with l 33: om 40: * θελήσῃ A**N** 38: θελει C[P] B rel Andr Areth. rec 2nd αυτους bef 2nd θελ., with 1. 36. 47 (51, e sil) Andr Primas: αδικησαι bef αυτους **N**: txt AC[P] B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth Tich. om ουτως A.

6. τον ουρανον bef [την] εξουσιαν κλεισαι B rel Andr-coisl Areth: τον ουρανον κλεισαι εξουσιαν 33: εξουσιαν τον ουρανον κλεισαι f j 38: txt AC[P]**N** h n 1. 10-7 (16. 37. 49 B⁷, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr.—rec om την, with **N** B rel: ins ACP.

prophecy shut up the heaven: viz. three years and six months: see Luke iv. 25, and more on ver. 6 below) clothed in sackcloth (in token of need of repentance and of approaching judgment: see Isa. xxii. 12; Jer. iv. 8, vi. 26; Jonah iii. 5. Certainly this portion of the prophetic description strongly favours the individual interpretation. For first, it is hard to conceive how whole bodies of men and churches could be thus described: and secondly, the principal symbolical interpreters have left out, or passed very slightly, this important particular. One does not see how bodies of men who lived like other men (their being the victims of persecution is another matter), can be said to have prophesied *clothed in sackcloth*. It is to be observed that such was the garment of Elijah: see 2 Kings i. 8, and cf. Matt. iii. 4). These are the two olive trees and the two candlesticks which stand before the Lord of the earth (the whole from ref. Zech., to which the art. αἱ refers. But it is to be observed that while in Zech. we have the two ἐλαῖαι, and spoken of in the same terms as here, there is but one λυχναία, with its seven lights, which very seven lights, as there interpreted in ver. 10, are referred to in our ch. iv. 5, v. 6. So that it is somewhat difficult to say, whence αἱ δύο λυχναίαι has come. The most probable view is that St. John has taken up and amplified the prophetic symbolism of Zechariah, carrying it on by the well-known figure of

lights, as representing God's testifying servants. Who the two "sons of oil" in the prophet were, whether Zerubbabel and Joshua, or the prophets Zechariah and Haggai, is of no import to our text here): and if any one be minded to harm them, fire goeth forth (the pres., of that which is habitual and settled, though yet future: see also on ver. 7 below) out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies (so Elijah, 2 Kings i. 10 ff.; and so ran the word of promise to Jeremiah (ref.), ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ δέδοκα τοὺς λόγους μου εἰς τὸ στόμα σου πῦρ, καὶ τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον ξύλα, καὶ καταφάγεται αὐτούς: the two being here combined together. Cf. also Sir. xlviii. 1, ἀνέστη Ἡλίας προφήτης ὡς πῦρ, καὶ ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ὡς λαμπρὰς ἐκαίετο); and if any one be minded to harm them, after this manner (see Sir. xlviii. 3) he must be killed (this whole description is most difficult to apply, on the allegorical interpretation; as is that which follows. And as might have been expected, the allegorists halt and are perplexed exceedingly. The double announcement here seems to stamp the literal sense, and the εἴ τις and δεῖ αὐτὸν ἀποκτανθῆναι are decisive against any mere *national* application of the words (as Elliott). *Individuality* could not be more strongly indicated). These have (see on the pres. above) [the] power to shut the heaven, that the rain may not rain during the days of their prophecy (as did Elijah: the

1 Acts xiv. 17. ^{xxviii. 2.} ^{Heb. vi. 7.} ^{James v. 18 only.} ^{3 Kings xvii. 1.} ^{m James v. 17 bis.} ^{Matt. v. 45.} ^{Luke vii. 36, 44.} ^{xvii. 29 only.} ^{isa. vi. 6.} ^{n = here only.} ^(ch. i. 3 reff.) ^{o ch. ii. 26 reff.} ^{p = here only.} ^{Exod. vii. 15} ^{Jer xxxviii. (xxxix) 13.} ^{(Exod. vii. 20} ^{19 only.} ^{DAN. vii. 21} ^{Theod.} ^{Psa. civ. 29)} ^{t 1 Cor. xi. 25, 26 only t.} ^{w ch. ix. 1, 2 reff.} ^{y here 3ce.} ^{q = Acts xii. 23.} ^{r ch. xix. 15.} ^{1 Kings xiv. 1.} ^{2. 4. 6. 9.} ^{10-3. 16} ^{to 19. 26-} ^{7. 30. 32} ^{to 38.} ^{40-1-2.} ^{47 to 51.} ^{90 B^r.}

ἵνα μὴ ¹ ὑετὸς ^m βρέχῃ τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ⁿ προφητείας ^{ACPⁿ B} αὐτῶν, καὶ ^o ἐξουσίαν ἔχουσιν ^o ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων ^p στρέφειν ^{a lo n, 1.} αὐτὰ εἰς αἷμα καὶ ^q πατάξαι τὴν γῆν ^r ἐν πάσῃ ^s πληγῇ ^{10-3. 16} ὅσακις ἐὰν θελήσωσιν. ⁷ καὶ ὅταν τελέσωσιν τὴν ^u μαρ- ^{to 19. 26-} τυρίαν αὐτῶν, τὸ ^v θηρίον τὸ ἀναβαῖνον ἐκ τῆς ^w ἀβύσσου ^{7. 30. 32} ^{to 38.} ^{40-1-2.} ^{47 to 51.} ^{90 B^r.} ποιήσῃ μετ' αὐτῶν ^x πόλεμον, καὶ νικήσῃ αὐτοὺς καὶ ^y ἀποκτενεῖ αὐτούς. ⁸ καὶ τὸ ^z πτώμα αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῆς

rec βρεχῃ bef νετος, with 1 copt Andr: txt AC[P]N B rel syr-dd Hip Andr-coisl Areth Primas Promiss. rec (for τας ημερας) εν ημεραις, with 33(-6, e sil) vulg Andr-a: εν ταις ημεραις 1: txt AC[P]N B rel Hip Andr Areth. rec αυτων bef της προφη- της, with 1: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg copt arm Hip Andr Areth. om αυτα 1. om και (bef παταξαι) N¹. rec om εν, with B (26-7. 51 B^r, e sil) vulg syr-dd: ins AC[P]N rel copt Hip Andr Areth lat-ff.—οσακις εαν θελ. bef [εν] παση πληγη B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om εν παση πληγη g: om οσακις εαν θελ. 19: txt AC[P]N h n (1, e sil) 10-6-7. 36-7-8. 49. 51 B^r Andr-coisl Areth.—αν C 38.—θελησουσιν C: θελωσιν f j 36: ελθωσιν k.

7. οτε τελεσωσιν 1. aft το θηριον ins το τεταρτον A. το αναβαινων A 1: τοτε αναβαινον N¹. rec πολεμον bef μετ' αυτων, with 1. 36 (41, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd arm Hip Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. om και αποκτενει αυτους j m 1. 12. 36. 41 Andr-b.

8. rec (for το πτωμα) τα πτωματα, with [P]N m n 1. 10-7-8. 34-5-6-8 (h 37. 49 B^r, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas Vict: txt AC B rel copt Areth. aft αυτων ins εσται N^{3o}: εασει(adding αταφα aft μεγαλης) n 37. 79.

duration of the time also corresponding: see reff.): and they have power over the waters to turn them into blood (as had Moses, ref.), and to smite the earth with (the ἐν of investiture. See ref. 1 Kings, from which, applying to the plagues in Egypt, the expression is taken) every plague as often as they shall be minded (all this points out the spirit and power of Moses, combined with that of Elias. And undoubtedly, it is in these two directions that we must look for the two witnesses, or lines of witnesses. The one impersonates the law, the other the prophets. The one reminds us of the prophet whom God should raise up like unto Moses; the other of Elias the prophet, who should come before the great and terrible day of the Lord; ὁ καταγραφὴς ἐν ἐλεγμοῖς εἰς καιροῦς, κοπάσαι ὄργην πρὸ θυμοῦ, Sir. xlviii. 10. But whether we are to regard these prophecies as to be fulfilled by individuals, or by lines of testimony, must depend entirely on the indications here given). And when they had finished (τελέσωσιν is a futurus exactus, implying, as plainly as words can imply it, that the whole period of their testimony will be at an end when that which is next said shall happen. All attempts of the allegorical

expositors to escape this plain meaning of the words are in vain. Such is that of Mede, "when they shall be about finishing:" of Daubuz, "whilst they shall perform:" of Elliott, "when they shall have completed their testimony," meaning thereby not the whole course of it, but any one complete delivery of it which others might have followed) their testimony, the wild-beast that cometh up out of the abyss (this is the first mention of the wild-beast; and the whole description, as remarked above, is anticipatory. The pres. part. ἀναβαῖνον gives simply designation, as so often: and is not to be interpreted future, as Elliott, "that is to ascend." The character of the beast is that he ascendeth out of the abyss; just as the tempter of our Lord is called ὁ πειράζων, Matt. iv. 3, though the narrative is in the past tense.

This wild-beast is evidently identical with that mentioned in ch. xvii. 8, of which the same term is used, ὁ μέλλει ἀναβαίνειν ἐκ τῆς ἀβύσσου: and if so, with that also which is introduced ch. xiii. 1 ff., as ἐκ τῆς θαλάσσης θηρίον ἀναβαῖνον, seeing that the same details, of the seven heads and ten horns, are ascribed to the two. But, though the appellation is anticipa-

^z πλατείας τῆς ^a πόλεως τῆς ^a μεγάλης, ^b ἥτις καλεῖται ^z ch. xxi. 21
^c πνευματικῶς ^d Σόδομα καὶ ^d Αἴγυπτος, ὅπου καὶ ὁ κύριος ^a ch. xvi. 19
 αὐτῶν ἐσταυρώθη. ⁹ καὶ βλέπουσιν ^e ἐκ τῶν ^g λαῶν καὶ ^b = ^h John 1 2
 only t. Clem. Rom. i. 47. ^d see note. ^e ch. v. 9. 2 John 4 see 1 John iv. 13. ^c 1 Cor. ii. 14. ^f plur.,
 ch. vii. 9 reff. ^g ch. v. 9 reff.

rec om [2nd] τῆς (with 35. 41. 51, e sil) : ins AC[P]N B 33(sic, Del) rel Andr Areth.—
 (τῆς μεγ. πολ. 36.) aft σόδομα ins και εγγυς ο ποταμος N^{3a}. om και (bef o
 κυριος) N^{3a} f l m 1. 12. 34-5-6 copt Orig. rec (for αυτων) ημων, with 1. 33 (26.
 34-5. 51, e sil) : om N¹ : txt AC[P]N^{3a} B rel vss Orig Andr Areth Primas Promiss.
 9. rec βλέψουσιν, with (34-5, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Primas : txt AC[P]N B 33(sic,
 Del) rel Andr Areth Tich. των φυλων και λαων N. aft 2nd και ins των B.

tory as far as this book is concerned, the beast spoken of was already familiar to its readers from Dan. vii. : see below) shall make war with them (see ref. Dan.), and shall conquer them and kill them. And their corpse (πτῶμα, das Gefallene berfel= ben, as Düsterd. gives it : "their wreck." The singular is used, not for any mystical reason, as Wordsw. imagines (who interprets the two witnesses of the Old and New Testaments, and says, "The two witnesses have but one body. They twain are one flesh. The two Testaments are one"), but simply as above, because πτῶμα does not properly signify a dead body, but that which has fallen, be it of one, or of many. Below, where the context requires the separate corpses to be specified, the less proper meaning of πτῶμα is adopted, and we have the plural) (is) (the present is best to supply, on account of the verbs following, which are in the present, until we come to πέμψουσιν : and with which the portion relating to the corpses is bound up) upon the street (reff.) of the great city (not Jerusalem (see above), which is never called by this name : but the ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη of the succeeding visions, of which this is anticipatory and compendious), namely, that which (ἥτις, not = ἡ, but specifying and particularizing) is called spiritually (i. e. allegorically ; in a sense higher than the literal and obvious one. The only other place in which we find this usage of the word is in ref. 1 Cor., which see, and notes there) Sodom and Egypt (those Commentators who maintain that the literal Jerusalem is here meant, allege Isa. i. 9 ff., and Ezek. xvi. 48, as places where she is called Sodom. But the latter place is no example : for there Jerusalem is compared, in point of sinfulness, with her sisters, Samaria and Sodom, and is not called Sodom at all. And in Isaiah i. 9 ff., 1) it is not Jerusalem, but the Jewish people in general (see also Isa. iii. 9) that are called by this name : and that 2) not so much in respect of depravity, as of the

desolation of Judæa, which (vv. 7—9) almost equalled that of the devoted cities. And even supposing this to be a case in point, no instance can be alleged of Jerusalem being called Egypt, or any thing bearing such an interpretation. Whereas in the subsequent prophecy both these comparisons are naturally suggested with regard to the great city there mentioned : viz. that of Sodom by ch. xix. 3, ὁ καπνὸς αὐτῆς ἀναβαίνει εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων, compared with Gen. xix. 28, and that of Egypt, and indeed Sodom also, by ch. xviii. 4 ff., ἐξέλθατε ἐξ αὐτῆς ὁ λαὸς μου, κ.τ.λ.), where their Lord also (as well as they : not the specific term ἐσταυρώθη, but the general fact of death by persecution, underlying it, being in the Writer's mind) was crucified (these words have principally led those who hold the literal Jerusalem to be meant. But if, as I believe I have shewn, such an interpretation is forbidden by the previous words, then we must not fall back on an erroneous view on account of the apparent requirements of these words, but enquire whether by the light of the subsequent prophecy, which is an expansion of this, we may find some meaning for them in accordance with the preceding conditions. And this is surely not difficult to discover. If we compare ch. xviii. 24, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ αἷμα προφητῶν κ. ἀγίων εὐρέθη κ. πάντων τῶν ἐσφαγμένων ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, with Matt. xxiii. 35, ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δικαίων ἐκχυνόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, we shall find a wider ground than the mere literal Jerusalem on which to place the Lord's own martyrdom and that of His saints. It is true, He was crucified at Jerusalem : but it is also true that He was crucified not in, but outside the city, and by the hands, not of Jews, but of Romans. The fact is that the literal Jerusalem, in whom was found the blood of all the saints who had been slain on earth, has been superseded by that wider and greater city, of which this prophecy speaks : and as the temple, in pro-

h Mark vi. 23. ^εφυλῶν καὶ ^εγλωσσῶν καὶ ^εἐθνῶν τὸ ^υπτῶμα αὐτῶν AC^{PN} B
 ch. xii 14
 (from Dan. 2. 4. 6. 9.
 vii. 25. xii. 7)
 only.
 (-σειον,
 Luke xix.
 18.)
 i = John xi.
 44. xviii 8.
 Gen xx 6.
 k Luke xxiii.
 53 Acts vii. 16.
 30 Ald.
 xiv. 11 alia.
 19. (Micah vii. 8.)
 μερίδας; Neh. viii 10, 12. Esth. ix 19, 22.
 1 so (but ἐν) Matt. xxvii. 60. Mark vi 29. Luke xxiii. 55 3 Kings xiii.
 m as above (k). Mark v. 3, 5. Luke viii 27 xxiii 53 xxiv 1 Acts ii. 29 only. Ex.
 n ch. iii 10 reff. o Matt xxvii. 13. Luke i. 14. Acts xv. 31 al. P¹⁰on xxiv.
 p ch. xii. 12. xxvii. 20. Luke xv. 23 al. Deut. xiv 26. q = ἀποστελλ.
 40-1-2.
 47 to 51.
 90 B⁷.

for καὶ ἐθ. το πτ. αὐτ., τα πτωματα αυτων και οι εκ των εθνων 1. rec (for το
 πτωμα) τα πτωματα, with [P] 1. 10-7-8. 33-8 (g h n 34-5-7. 49 B⁷, e sil) vulg syr-dd
 Andr Primas: txt AC^N B rel copt Andr-coisl Areth Tich. om και (bef ημισυ) B rel
 Andr Areth Cassiod: ins AC[P]^N g n 2. 17. 30²-3. 51 (36-7. 49, e sil) vulg Primas.
 om from και τα πτωματα to end k 30. for τα πτωματα, το σωμα f: τα
 στοματα n. rec (for αφιουσιν) αφησουσι, with r rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas:
 αφισι g: αφουσιν 36: txt AC[P]^N n 1. 12 am(with fuld harl lips-5 tol) Andr-a Tich.
 rec μνηματα, with N^a 33 vulg Primas: μνημειον C 36: txt [P]^N 1 B rel syr-dd
 copt Andr Areth Tich. (A def.)—for eis μνημα, εν μνηματι 40.
 10. rec (for χαρ.) χαρουσιν, with vulg syr-dd copt æth Primas: χαρησονται 38
 Andr-p Areth: txt AC[P]^N B rel Andr Glyc Tich. rec (for ευφρανονται) ευφραν-
 θησονται, with B f(sic) rel vss Andr Areth Primas: txt AC^{PN} g n 1. 12. 36 Andr-a Tich.
 for πεμφουσιν, δωσουσιν B rel Andr Areth: txt AC^N 10-7 (g h i 1. 27. 37. 49
 B⁷, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a Primas, πεμψουσιν [P]^N 1 36, mittunt vulg-ms Tich.
 αλληλους C 27. oi προφ. οι δυο N: οι δυο οι πρ. 50.

phetic language, has become the church of God, so the outer city, in the same language, has become the great city which will be the subject of God's final judgments. For those who consider this, there can be no hesitation in interpreting even this local designation also of this great city. And some from among (construction, see reff.) the peoples and tribes and languages and nations look upon (the prophetic history is carried on in the present, as in ch. xviii. 11 compared with ib. ver. 9, and elsewhere) their corpse (see above) three days and a half (on this period we may remark, that these 3½ days are connected by analogy with the periods previously mentioned: with the 1260 days and 42 months = 3½ years: and that in each case the half of the mystic number 7 enters. Also, that Elliott's calculation of this period as 3½ years, by which he makes out that that period elapsed, "precisely, to a day," between the ninth session of the Lateran council, and the posting up of the theses by Luther at Wittenberg,—and on the accuracy of which he exclaims, "O wonderful prophecy! O the depth of the riches of the wisdom and of the foreknowledge of God!"—labours under this fatal defect:—that whereas his 3 years, from May 5, 1514, to May 5, 1517, are years of 365 days, his half-year, from May 5, 1517, to Oct. 31, of the same year, is "180, or half 360 days:" i.e. wanting 2½ days of the time required ac-

cording to that reckoning. I may observe, that in his Apocalypsis Alfordiana, p. 128, he has repeated this inconsistency, and do not permit (ἀφιουσιν, as ἦφιεν in Mark i. 34, xi. 16, is from the form ἀφίω. The same form occurs in Eccl. ii. 18; Philo, Leg. ad Cai. § 30, vol. ii., p. 576. See Winer, edn. 6, § 14. 3 [and Moulton's note, p. 97. 2]) their corpses to be put into a tomb (the following exposition will hardly be credited: but is useful, as shewing how far away men can be led in forcing the sense in favour of a particular view. Wordsw. regards the two witnesses as the Old and New Testaments, and the beast that makes war with them as Papal Rome. On this clause, he says, "the original word here is μνήματα, not τάφους, and is to be rendered not graves, but monuments: i.e. she has laboured that the Two Witnesses may not be committed to the immortal monuments of Editions, Translations, and Expositions." It will be hardly necessary to remind any N. T. student that μνῆμα never occurs in it in any sense but in the concrete one of a grave or tomb: see reff. The same is true of the LXX, where it occurs fifteen times. And again it is fatal to this strange exposition, that it is not the beast, but ἐκ τῶν λαῶν κ. φυλ. κ. γλ., who will not permit their bodies to be put into a tomb. It may also be remarked, that it is now to a Roman printing press that we owe our only edition of the oldest published codex of the Greek Old and

φῆται ἔβασάνισαν τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.
 11 καὶ μετὰ τὰς τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ ἡμισυ, πνεῦμα ζωῆς
 ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσῆλθεν [ἐν] αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔστησαν ἐπὶ τοὺς
 πόδας αὐτῶν, καὶ φόβος μέγας ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τοὺς θεω-
 ρούντας αὐτούς. 12 καὶ ἤκουσαν φωνῆς μεγάλης ἐκ τοῦ
 οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης αὐτοῖς Ἀνάβατε ὧδε. καὶ ἀνέβησαν
 εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ, καὶ ἑθεώρῃσαν αὐτοὺς
 οἱ ἐχθροὶ αὐτῶν. 13 καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐγένετο
 σεισμὸς μέγας, καὶ τὸ δέκατον τῆς πόλεως ἔπεσεν, καὶ
 ἀπεκτάνθησαν ἐν τῷ σεισμῷ ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων χιλιάδες

y ch. vi. 12 (reff.).

z = ch. iii. 4. Acts i. 15. Num. xxv. 53.

11. om τας [P]N h n 1. 37-8. 40-9. ins το bef ημισυ C. (ημισυον ΔN (but corrd)
 and A² in ver 9.) rec (for [εν] αυτοις) επ' αυτοις, with h 10 Br (26. 33-7. 41. 2-9,
 e sil): eis αυτοις N B rel Andr Areth: αυτοις C[P] 1. 17. 38. εν αυτοις A g n² 18. 36.
 51 Andr-a Idac.—εισῆλθεν εκ του θεου αυτοις C. (n¹ wanting.) for επι, υπο 1 (30 P).
 rec (for επεπ.) επεσεν, with N B rel Andr Areth: om 40: επιπεσειται 38: txt
 AC[P] d h l 9. 10-3-6-7-8-9. 27. 37. 47-9 Br Andr-a. επι των θεωρουντων C[P]
 17¹: θεωρ. N¹.

12. for ηκουσαν, ηκουσα N-corr B rel copt arm Andr Areth Tich: ακουσονται 38: txt
 AC[P]N¹ (17-8-9 P) 32². 4 vulg. rec φωνην μεγαλην . . . λεγουσαν, with A B rel:
 txt C[P]N g h n 1. 10-7. 36-7. 49 Br Andr-a-p. om αυτοις A n. rec αναβητε,
 with B rel Andr Areth: txt ACPN 26. 36. 42.

13. om 1st και B rel Areth Tich: ins AC[P]N g h l m n 10-7-8. 34 (1. 26. 37. 40-1-
 2-9 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr Primas. for ωρα, ημερι B rel Andr Areth: txt
 AC[P]N g 33 (1. 36, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a Primas. for και το, ωστε το C.
 for δεκατον, γ' B.

New Testaments). And they that dwell upon the earth (see reff.: the godless world) rejoice over them (at their fall: ἐνί with dat., of the close juxtaposition which connects a mental affection with its object) and are glad and shall send gifts to one another (as on a day of festival, see reff.; and Winer, Realw. i. 411, art. Geföhne), because these two prophets tormented them that dwelt upon the earth (viz. by the plagues above mentioned, vv. 5, 6). And after the three days and half, the Spirit of life (not, a spirit: the whole diction is closely imitated from that used of the dry bones in Ezek. xxxvii. 10, where A reads εἰσῆλθεν εἰς αὐτοὺς πνεῦμα ζωῆς: and no inference as to indefiniteness can be drawn from the absence of the art. from such a word as πνεῦμα) from God (may belong to ζωῆς only; but much better to πνεῦμα ζωῆς taken as one word. The art. τό would strictly be required, but may well be wanting in later Greek) entered into them (the ἐν would be a pregnant construction: entered into, so as to be in), and they stood upon their feet (the very words of Ezek. i. c., but with one difference, the accus. πόδας, which, as remarked on ch. iv. 2, is characteristic of our Writer at the first mention of a

superimposition), and great fear fell upon those who beheld them. And they heard a great voice from heaven saying to them, Come up hither. And they went up to heaven in the cloud (or, as we more commonly say in English, the clouds: viz. the cloud which ordinarily floats in the air; the mist: see reff.: not, as Wordsw., "the cloud of Christ's glory:" nor needing, as Elliott, identification with any cloud previously mentioned in this book. But the ascension of the witnesses partakes of the character of His ascension. No attempt has been made to explain this ascension by those who interpret the witnesses figuratively of the Old and New Testaments or the like. The modern historical system, which can interpret such a Scripture phrase of "calling up to political ascendancy and power," surely needs no refutation from me), and their enemies beheld them. And in that hour there was a great earthquake, and the tenth part of the city (the great city, as above) fell, and there were slain in the earthquake names of men (i. e. men themselves, the ὀνόματα shewing that the number is carefully and precisely stated, as if the name of each were recounted: see reff.: and more below) seven thousands (i. e. the

a Acts v 13. Eph. ii 3. 1 Thess. iv 13 v. 6. 1 Tim v 20al. b Luke xxiv 5. 27 Acts x. 4. [xii. 9.] xxiv. 25 only. Sir. xiv. 24. 1 Macc xiii. 2 B [ἐκφ. AN] only. 19. d ch. xvi. 11. Ezra i. 2. Neh i. 4. Dan ii. 18, 19 Theod e = ch. ix. 12 f = ch. ix. 12 xxi. 1, 4 only. g constr., ch. iv 1 al fr. h see Matt. iv. 8 || L.

ἐπτά, καὶ ^aοἱ λοιποὶ ^bἔμφοβοι ἐγένοντο καὶ ^cἔδωκαν ^eδόξαν ^{ACPN B} αἰὼν ἡ. 1. 2 4. 6 9. 10-3 16 to 19-16. 32 to 38. 40-1-2 47 to 51. 90 B^e

τῷ ^dθεῷ τοῦ ^dοὐρανοῦ. ¹⁴ Ἡ ^eοὐαὶ ἡ δευτέρα ^fἀπῆλθεν. ἰδοῦ, ἡ ^eοὐαὶ ἡ τρίτη ἔρχεται ταχύ.

¹⁵ Καὶ ὁ ἔβδομος ἄγγελος ἐσάλπισεν, καὶ ἐγένοντο φωναὶ μεγάλαι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ^eλέγοντες Ἐγένετο ἡ ^hβασιλεία

for ἐμφοβοι, ἐν φόβῳ N f 82, ἐνφοβοι C(Del). [P def.]

14. om 1st η N^{8a} m 1. παρηλθεν N n. η ουαι η τριτη bef ιδου B rel Andr Areth: om ιδου l 6. 32-3(-5, e sil) fuld æth: txt AC[P] g 1. 17. 38 vss Andr-a Primas. —ιδου ερχεται η ουαι η τριτη N 36.

15. om δ Α. for εγενοντο, εγενετο N¹. rec (for λεγοντες) λεγουσαι, with C[P]N rel Andr Areth: om 33: txt A B a d f k 2. 6. 9. 16-9. 26-7. 30. 41-2. 90. rec εγενοντο αι βασιλειαι, with l 1. 36 Andr-b: txt AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.

number 7000. In every place of the 23 where *χιλιάς* occurs in the N. T., it signifies simply the numeral 1000, and never a chiliad, or a province, as Elliott, forcing the expression to mean, in his historical interpretation, the seven Dutch united provinces (so also Cocceius), which were lost to the Papacy at the Reformation. He also forces *ὀνόματα ἀνθρώπων* out of its idiomatic sense to import "titles of dignity and command," Duchies, Marquisates, Lordships, and the rest (of the inhabitants of the city) became terrified, and gave glory (it would be entirely needless to contend that *ἔδωκαν* belongs to the name *subject* as *ἐγένοντο*, viz. *οἱ λοιποί*, had not an attempt been made (Ell. ii. 466) to supply "the ascended witnesses" as a new subject. To say nothing of the inapplicability of the instances cited to justify such a view, our ch. xiv. 7 is decisive against it, where men are exhorted *φοβήθητε τὸν θεὸν καὶ δότε αὐτῷ δόξαν*: as also ch. xvi. 9, where the men tormented *οὐ μετενόησαν δοῦναι αὐτῷ δόξαν*. In fact, the *giving glory to God* is not equivalent in the Scriptures to *thanksgiving to God*, but is as Bengel notices, "character conversionis," or at all events, the *recognition* of God. The exceptions to this are more apparent than real, e.g. Luke xvii. 18, where *recognition* is the main feature: ch. iv. 9, where *δόξαν* does not stand alone. See also LXX, 1 Kings vi. 5. Josh. vii. 19 is a remarkable example of the ordinary meaning of the phrase) to the God of heaven (an expression, see reff., confined to the later books of the O. T.).

14.] *Transitional*. The second woe is past (see on ch. ix. 12): behold, the third woe cometh quickly (the episodic visions of ch. x. 1-11, xi. 1-13, are finished: and the prophecy recurs to the plagues of the sixth trumpet, ch. ix. 13-21. These formed the second woe: and upon these

the third is to follow. But in actual relation, and in detail, it does not immediately follow. Instead of it, we have voices of thanksgiving in heaven, for that the hour of God's kingdom and vengeance is come. The Seer is not yet prepared to set forth the nature of this taking of the kingdom, this reward to God's servants, this destruction of the destroyers of the earth. Before he does so, another series of prophetic visions must be given, regarding not merely the dwellers on the earth, but the Church herself, her glory and her shame, her faithfulness and her apostasy. When this series has been given, then shall be declared in its fulness the manner and the process of the time of the end. And consequently as at the end of the vision of the seals, so here also. The sixth seal gave the immediately preceding signs of the great day—we were shewn in anticipatory episodes, the gathering of the elect and the multitude before the throne, and then the veil was dropt upon that series of visions and another began. And now God's avenging judgments on the earth, in answer to the prayers of His saints, having reached their final point of accomplishment, and the armies of heaven having given solemn thanks for the hour being come, again the veil is dropt, and again a new procession of visions begins from the beginning. The third woe, so soon to come, is in narration deferred until all the various underplots, so to speak, of God's Providence have been brought onward to a point ready for the great and final dénouement).

15—19.] *The seventh trumpet*. And the seventh angel blew his trumpet, and there were great voices in heaven (notice, a) that the seventh seal, the seventh trumpet, and the seventh vial, are all differently accompanied from any of the preceding series in each case. b) At each seventh

τοῦ ^h κόσμου τοῦ ⁱ κυρίου ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ ⁱ χριστοῦ ⁱ αὐτοῦ, ¹ Acts iv. 26, from Ps. ii. 2.
καὶ ^k βασιλεύσει ^k εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ¹⁸ καὶ
[οἱ] εἴκοσι τέσσαρες πρεσβύτεροι [οἱ] ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ¹ ch. xxi. 10.
¹ καθήμενοι ¹ ἐπὶ τοὺς θρόνους αὐτῶν ^m ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ τὰ ¹ gen. i. 1 Cor. iii. 23 al.
^m πρόσωπα αὐτῶν καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θεῷ, ¹⁷ λέγοντες ^k Luke i. 33.
ⁿ Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, ^o Κύριε ^o ὁ θεὸς ^o παντοκράτωρ, ¹ ch. xxi. 6.
¹² xvii 16. ¹ Cor. xiv. 25 Num. xvi 4. ⁿ Rev. here only. = Luke xviii 11. John xi.
41. Rom. i. 8 al.† Judith viii 25. Wisd. xviii. 2. 2 Macc. i. 11 only. ^o ch. i. 8 ref.
Luke v.

at end ins *αμην* § 12. 18(Sz). 38. 40 vulg(not harl lips-3 Primas).

16. om 1st *οἱ* AN¹: ins C[P]N^{3a} B rel. rec *εἴκοσι καὶ τέσσαρες*, with 19. 33 B^r
(30-7. 41-2, e sil): *κδ' β α γ h k l n* 1. 10. 49. 50. 90: txt AC[P]N¹ rel Andr Areth.
om 2nd *οἱ* A B f g l 1. 12: ins C[P]N¹ rel Andr Areth. ins *τον θρονου* bef
του θεου B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth (*του θρονου αυτου* c): om AC[P]N¹ g h n 10 (1.
37. 49 B^r, e sil) vulg copt Andr Primas. for *καθημενοι, οι καθηνται* N¹ B rel Andr-coisl
Areth; *καθηνται* CN^{3a} g 2 arm: *οι καθημενοι* f 12: txt A[P]N¹ n 10-7. 36-8. 47
(h l 1. 37. 49 B^r, e sil) ins *και bef επεσ. N g. επεσον* B rel Andr-coisl
Areth: txt AC[P]N¹ d j l 1(e sil). 2. 13. 32-3. 49¹ Andr.—(om from *αυτων* to *αυτων* 35.)
17. for *σοι, σε* B. *κυριος N.* om 2nd *ο* N.

member of the series we hear what is done, not on earth, but in heaven,—the half-hour's silence, the song of thanksgiving, the voice from the temple and the throne, saying, "It is done." c) At each seventh member likewise we have it related in the form of a solemn conclusion, 1) *ἐγένοντο βρονταὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ ἄστραπαὶ καὶ σεισμός*, ch. viii. 5,—2) *ἐγένοντο ἄστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμός καὶ χάλασα μεγάλη*, ch. xi. 19,—3) *ἐγένοντο ἄστραπαὶ καὶ φωναὶ καὶ βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμός ἐγένετο μέγας κ.τ.λ.*, ch. xvi. 18 ff. d) At each seventh member we have plain indication in the imagery or by direct expression, that the end is come, or close at hand: 1) by the imagery of the sixth seal, and the two episodes, preceding the seventh seal: 2) by the declaration here, *ἦλθεν ὁ καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι*: 3) by the *Γέγονεν* sounding from the temple and the throne on the pouring out of the seventh vial. e) All this forms strong ground for inference, that the three series of visions are not continuous, but resumptive: not indeed going over the same ground with one another, either of time or of occurrence, but each evolving something which was not in the former, and putting the course of God's Providence in a different light. It is true, that the seals involve the trumpets, the trumpets the vials: but it is not in mere temporal succession: the involution and inclusion are far deeper: the world-wide vision of the seals containing the cry for vengeance, out of which is evolved the series of the trumpets: and this again containing the episodic visions of the little book and the witnesses, out of which are evolved the

visions of ecclesiastical faithfulness and apostasy which follow), saying (whose these voices were, is not specified: but we may fairly assume them to have been those of the armies of heaven and the four living-beings, as distinguished from the twenty-four elders which follow. For the masc. part., see ref.), **The Kingdom of the world** (i. e. *over* this world: ἡ βασιλεία abstract. In the received text, reading *αἱ βασιλείαι*, it is *the kingdoms*, concrete, *of the world*) is become (aor., but alluding to the result of the whole series of events past, and not to be expressed in English except by a perfect) **our Lord's and of His Christ** (no supply, such as "*the Kingdom*," is required: nor is this the case even in the rec. text. The gen. in both cases is one merely of possession), and **He** (no emphasis on *He*, as we are almost sure to lay on it, perhaps from the accent unavoidable in the Hallelujah Chorus of Handel) shall reign to the **ages of the ages** (this announcement necessarily belongs to the time close on the millennial reign: and this is no more than we might expect from the declaration of the strong angel in ch. x. 7). **And the twenty-four elders** (representing the church in glory) **which before God sat upon their thrones** (or, omitting the *οἱ*, sitting upon their thrones before God), **fell upon their faces, and worshipped God, saying, We give thanks to Thee, O Lord God the Almighty** (this ascription of thanks is the return for the answer to the prayers of the saints furnished by the judgments of the trumpets), **who art and wast** (for construction, see ref.), **because Thou hast taken Thy great might and hast reigned** (on the

p ch. i 4 reff
q ch. xii 17.
Matt v 22.
xviii 34
xxii. 7. Luke
xiv 21 xv.
28 Eph. ii.
26 only. Psa.
xcviii 1
r = Matt iii. 7.
Eph v. 6.
Col. iii. 6.
1 Thess. i. 10.
ii 16 Zeph
ii 2.
s constr w.
gen., Matt
xxi 41. xxi.
18 al w. inf.,
Heb. xi. 15.
1 Pet iv. 17
w both, Esth.
ii 12.
t2 John 8 reff.
u ch. x. 7. Jer.
vii 25.
v ch xvi. 6
xviii 20, 24
only. Ps. ci. 15. Micah i 9.
viii 11. Jer vi. 13 al. z ch viii 9 reff.
c Heb. ix 4. Exod xxxi 7. Num., Deut., Josh. passim.
7 1 Pet iii 20 only. e so ch. viii 5. xvi. 18. (Exod. xix. 16.)
only. Exod. ix 24.

ρ ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ρ ἦν, ὅτι εἵληφας τὴν δύναμιν σου τὴν μεγά- ACPR B
λην καὶ ἐβασίλευσας. 18 καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ᾠργίσθησαν καὶ 340 n, 1.
ἦλθεν ἡ ἰδὸργή σου, καὶ ὁ s καιρὸς τῶν νεκρῶν κριθῆναι, 2. 4. 6. 9.
καὶ δοῦναι τὸν t μισθὸν τοῖς u δούλοις σου τοῖς uv προ- 10-3. 16
φήταις, καὶ τοῖς vw ἁγίοις, καὶ τοῖς x φοβουμένοις τὸ 19. 26-
x ὄνομά σου τοὺς y μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς y μεγάλους, καὶ 7. 30.
z διαφθεῖραι τοὺς za διαφθεύοντας τὴν a γῆν. 19 Καὶ 32 to 38.
ἡνολογῇ ὁ b ναὸς τοῦ b θεοῦ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὠφθη ἡ 40-1-2.
cd κιβωτὸς τῆς c διαθήκης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ναῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ 47 to 51.
e ἐγένοντο e ἄστραπαὶ καὶ e φωναὶ καὶ e βρονταὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ 90 Br.
καὶ f χάλαζα μεγάλη.

rec aft ὁ ἦν ins kas o ερχομενος, with g h n 10-7. 36. (37, e sil) 49 copt Andr-a:
ins kai only N¹: om AC[P]N^{3a} B rel am (with demid fuld harl &c) syr-dd arm-zoh(ed.
1805) Andr Areth Cypr Primas. εἰληφες C.

18. ὠργισθῇ [for -θησαν] N¹. for καιρος, κληρος C. τους αγιους κ. τους
φοβουμενους A: om (τους bef φοβ.) N. om 6th kai 1. rec τους μικρους κ. τους
μεγαλοις, with [P]N^{3c} B rel: txt ACN¹. om last kai A. διαφθειραντας C
h l m 10. 34-5. 47-8-9 Br Andr-coisl: φθειροντας P 1.

19. for ηνοιγη, ηνοιχθη B rel Areth: txt AC[P]N f l m 2. 10-7-8. 36 (h 1. 37. 41-2-9
Br, e sil), ηνοιγη g n. ins o bef εν τω ουρανω AC f g m 38 Andr-coisl Viet: om
[P]N B rel Andr Areth Primas. aft ουρ. ins ανω N¹ (N^{3a} disapproving). for
ωφθη, εδοθη C. for 1st αυτου, [του] κυριου B rel Andr-p Areth Viet (om του B l
40. 90 Br) του θεου N b and some vss: om vulg-ms copt Primas Haymo: txt AC[P]
g m n 1 (e sil). 17¹. 34-5-6 vulg syr-dd Andr. εγενετο N¹. om και σεισμος
B rel Areth: ins AC[P]N g n 17¹-8-9. 33-8. 49-corr¹ (1. 35-6, e sil) vss Andr Primas,
και σεισμοι m 34.

aor., see above). And the nations were angry (see ref. Ps.), and Thine anger came, and the time of the dead to be judged (another indication that the end is at hand when these words are spoken), and (the time) to give their reward to Thy servants the prophets (see reff. and especially Matt. x. 41, to which reference seems to be made), and to the saints, and to them that fear Thy name, the small and the great (the three terms together include the whole church), and to destroy the destroyers of (so is the pres. part. best rendered) the earth (all this looks onward to judgments and acts of God yet to come when the words are spoken. The thanksgiving is not that God hath done all this, but that the hour is come for it all to take place. Before it does, another important series of visions has to be unfolded). 19.] *Concluding, and transitional.* And the temple of God was opened in the heaven (or, according to the apparently grammatical correction of AC, "the temple of God which was in the heaven was opened"), and the ark of

His covenant was seen in His temple (the episode of ch. xi. 1 ff. began with measuring the temple of God, the shadow of things in the heavens: and now, when the time is come for the judgments there indicated to be fulfilled, that temple itself in the heavens is laid open. The ark of the Covenant is seen, the symbol of God's faithfulness in bestowing grace on His people, and inflicting vengeance on His people's enemies. This is evidently a solemn and befitting inauguration of God's final judgments, as it is a conclusion of the series pointed out by the trumpets, which have been inflicted in answer to the prayers of His saints. It is from this temple that the judgments proceed forth (cf. ch. xiv. 15, 17, xv. 5 ff., xvi. 17); from His inmost and holiest place that those acts of vengeance are wrought which the great multitude in heaven recognize as faithful and true, ch. xix. 2. The symbolism of this verse, the opening for the first time of the heavenly temple, also indicates of what nature the succeeding visions are to be: that they will re-

XII. ¹ Καὶ ⁸ σημεῖον μέγα ὥφθη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, γυνὴ ⁸ 8 = ver. 3. ch. xv. 1. Matt. xxiv. 30. Luke xxi. 11, 25.
^h περιβεβλημένη τὸν ἥλιον, καὶ ἡ σελήνη ^{ik} ὑποκάτω τῶν
^k ποδῶν αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς στέφανος ἀστέ-
 ρων δώδεκα, ² καὶ ¹ ἐν ^{lm} γαστρὶ ¹ ἔχουσα [καὶ] κράζει ⁿ ὠδί-
 νουσα καὶ ^o βασανίζομένη ^p τεκεῖν. ³ καὶ ὥφθη ἄλλο ⁹ ση-
 μεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἰδοὺ ^r δράκων ^s πυρρὸς μέγας,
 ἔχων κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ ^t κέρατα ^t δέκα, καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς κεφα-

v 3 only. Exod xxi. 22. 2 Kings xi. 5. n Gal iv. 19. 27 only. Isa xxvii. 18. o ch ix. 5 reff. m as above (l). Luke i. 31. Tit i. 12 only. r Rev. (here. &c.). 8 times ch xiii. 2, 4, 11 xx. 2) only. Isa. xxvii. 1. p constr., see note s ch. vi 4 only. Num. xix. 2. t ch xiii. 1. xvii 3, &c. Dan. vii. 17

CHAP. XII. 1. for περιβεβλημένη, περιβλεπομένη A. om η j 1. 32: την σεληνην N¹. δεκαδυο 1.

2. rec om 2nd και, with [P] B rel: ins after κραζει A: ins aft εχουσα CN g. for κραζει, εκραζεν C rel vulg Andr Areth Primas: εκραζεν B e f k l m 9. 26. 30-3-4-5-7. 51 Andr Areth Primas: κραζει 36: txt A[P]N g (1, e sil) 17¹ am(with demid al) copt Hip Meth.

3. rec μεγας bef πυρρος, with A[P] g h m n 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg: txt CN B rel syr-dd copt Meth Andr Areth Primas.—πυρρος C B rel copt Andr-coisl: txt A[P]N h 10. 13. 27. 30-3-5-6-8. 40²-7-8-9. 51 Br vulg Meth Andr(but not comm) Areth

late to God's covenant people and His dealings with them): and there were lightnings and voices and thunderings and an earthquake and a great hail (the solemn salvos, so to speak, of the artillery of heaven, with which each series of visions is concluded: see this commented on above at the beginning of this section).

CHAP. XII. 1—17.] THE VISION OF THE WOMAN AND THE GREAT RED DRAGON. On the nature of this vision, as introductory of the whole imagery of the latter part of the Apocalypse, I have already remarked at ch. xi. It is only needful now to add, that the principal details of the present section are rather descriptive than strictly prophetic: relating, just as in the prophets the descriptions of Israel and Judah, to things passed and passing, and serving for the purpose of full identification and of giving completeness to the whole vision. And a great (important in its meaning, as well as vast in its appearance) sign (σημεῖον, one of those appearances by which God ἐσήμανεν to John the revelations of this book, ch. i. 1) was seen in heaven (heaven here is manifestly *not* only the show-place of the visions as seen by the Seer, but has a substantial place in the vision: for below, ver. 7 ff., we have the heaven contrasted with the earth, and the dragon cast out of heaven into the earth. See more there), a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon (ἡ σελήνη = ἔχουσα τὴν σελήνην) beneath her feet (see Cant. vi. 10, which seems to be borne in mind), and on her head a crown of twelve stars (the whole symbolism points

to the Church, the bride of God: and of course, from the circumstances afterwards related, the O. T. church, at least at this beginning of the vision. That the blessed Virgin cannot be intended, is plain from the subsequent details, and was recognized by the early expositors. The crown of twelve stars represents the Patriarchs. Victorinus's comment is worth quoting: "Mulier . . . antiqua Ecclesia est patrum et prophetarum et sanctorum apostolorum quæ gemitus et tormenta habuit desiderii sui usque quo fructum ex plebe sua secundum carnem olim promissum sibi videret Christum ex ipsa gente corpus sumpsisse. . . . Corona stellarum duodecim chorum patrum significat secundum carnem natiuitatis, ex quibus erat Christus carnem sumpturnus", and [she is] (or, being) with child [and] crieth out in pangs and tormented to bring forth (the inf. τεκεῖν, of that which would be the result of the βασανίζεσθαι, has a parallel in Acts vii. 19, ἐκάκωσεν . . . τοῦ ποιεῖν, and in other places, see Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 4, but not without the art.). And another sign was seen in heaven: and behold, a great red dragon (interpreted below, ver. 9, to be the devil, the ancient serpent: see also vv. 13, 15. He is πυρρὸς perhaps for the combined reasons, of the wasting properties of fire, and the redness of blood: "rufus, ut homicida," as the gloss. interl.: see John viii. 44), having seven heads and ten horns, and upon his heads seven diadems (the Dragon being the devil, these symbolic features must be interpreted of the assuming by him of some

u ch. xiii. 1.
 xix 12 only.
 Esth. i. 11.
 ii. 17. Isa.
 lxii 3.
 v ch. ix. 10
 (bis), 19 (bis)
 only. Job xl.
 12 (17).
 w John xxi. 8.
 Acts viii. 3.
 xiv. 19. xvi.
 6 only
 2 Kings xvii.
 13.
 x ch. viii. 12.
 y ch. viii 5 reff.
 z ch. x. 9, 10
 reff.
 b ch. ii. 27. xix. 15. Psa ii 9
 2, 4. 1 Thess iv 17. Judg. xxi. 21.
 a ver. 13. Matt xix. 4 || Mk. Luke ii 23
 c 1 Cor. iv. 21.
 Rom i. 27. Gal vi 28 only. Isa lxxvi. 7. Jer. xx. 15.
 d = Acts viii. 39. John vii. 15. 1 Cor. xii.
 90 B^v

λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἑπτὰ ^u διαδήματα, ⁴ καὶ ἡ ^v οὐρὰ αὐτοῦ ^w σῦρει τὸ AC^p
^x τρίτον τῶν ^x ἀστέρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ^y ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς ^z εἰς
 τὴν γῆν. Καὶ ὁ ⁱ δράκων ἔστηκεν ἐνώπιον τῆς γυναικὸς
 τῆς μελλούσης τεκεῖν, ἵνα ὅταν τέκη τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς
^z καταφάγη. ⁵ καὶ ἔτεκεν υἱὸν ^a ἄρσεν, ὃς μέλλει ^b ποι-
 μαίνειν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ^c ἐν ^{bc} ῥάβδῳ ^b σιδηρᾷ καὶ ^d ἡρπάσθη
 τὸ τέκνον αὐτῆς πρὸς τὸν θεὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ.

Primas. for αυτου, αυτων A. rec διαδηματα bef επτα, with vulg-ed Primas :
 txt AC[P]N B rel am (with fuld &c) Meth Andr Areth.—om επτα 1.

4. om αυτοι 1. αστρων and εστηκει C. aft αστ. ins το τρίτον N¹.
 om τον ουρανου 1. φαγη [for καταφ.] 1.
 5. rec (for αρσεν) αρρενα, with N B (αρενα) rel Hip Meth : txt AC, αρσενα [P] g.
 om εν [P] 1. ηπραχη b : ηπραγη N b c e g h 10. 37. 47-9 B^v Hip Meth. rec
 om 2nd προς, with 1. 17. 33(-5-6, e sil) Andr-a : ins AC[P]N B rel vss Meth Andr
 Areth Primas.

of those details in the form of the beast in ch. xiii. 1 ff., to whom afterwards he gives his power and his throne : in other words, as indicating that he lays wait for the woman's offspring in the form of that anti-christian power which is afterwards represented by the beast. At the same time, the *seven crowned heads* may possess an appropriateness of their own, belonging as they do to the dragon alone (the beast has the crowns on his *horns*, ch. xiii. 1). They may represent, as he is Prince of this world, universality of earthly dominion. The ten horns belong to the fourth beast of Daniel, vii. 7, 20). And his tail draggeth down the third part of the stars of the heaven, and cast them to the earth (so the little horn in Dan. viii. 10, "cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them." The allusion here may be as Areth, in Catena, συγκατέβαλε γὰρ ἑαυτῇ πλείστων ἀγγέλων μοῖραν συναποστήσαι πείσασα τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ πεποίηκε χθονίους τοὺς οὐρανίους, καὶ σκότος τοὺς λαμπροὺς ὡς ἀστέρας. The magnitude and fury of the dragon are graphically given by the fact of its tail, in its lashing backwards and forwards in fury, sweeping down the stars of heaven). And the dragon stands (not "stood." The Commentators cite from Pliny H. N. viii. 3 of the dragon, "Nec flexu multiplici ut reliquæ serpentes corpus impellit, sed celsus et erectus in medio incedens") before the woman which is about to bear, that when she has borne he may devour her child (this was what the devil instigated Herod the Great to do, who was the dependant of the Roman Empire. But doubtless the reference is wider than this : even to

the whole course of hostility against the Lord during His humiliation : see below). And she bore a male (if ἄρσεν is neuter, and not to be written ἄρσεν, the expression is a solœicism, or rather a combination of genders, ἄρσεν going back from the masculine individual υἱὸν to the neuter of the genus) son, who shall rule (lit. shepherd, i. e. order and guide) all the nations with (ἐν of investiture, very nearly expressed by our instrumental "with," which in its primitive meaning does but signify accompaniment) a rod of iron (these words, cited verbatim from the LXX of the Messianic Psalm ii., and preceded by the ὅς of personal identification, leave no possibility of doubt, who is here intended. The man-child is the Lord Jesus Christ, and none other. And this result is a most important one for the fixity of reference of the whole prophecy. It forms one of those landmarks by which the legitimacy of various interpretations may be tested; and of which we may say, notwithstanding the contradiction sure to be given to the saying, that every interpretation which oversteps their measure is thereby convicted of error. Again, the exigencies of this passage require that the birth should be understood literally and historically, of that Birth of which all Christians know. And be it observed, that this rule of interpretation is no confident assertion of mine, as has been represented, but a result from the identifying use of words of the prophetic Scripture, spoken of Him, who will not suffer His honour to be given to another) : and her child was caught up to God and to His throne (i. e. after a conflict with the Prince

6 καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἔφυγεν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, ὅπου ἔχει ἑκεῖ^e ver. 14. Judg. xiii 10.
 ὅπου ἡτοίμασμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα ἐκεῖ^h τρέφωσιν Ruth iii 4.
 αὐτὴν ἡμέρας χιλίας διακοσίας ἐξήκοντα. 7 καὶ ἐγένετο^f John xiv. 2, 3 only.
 πόλεμος ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, ὁ^k Μιχαὴλ καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ^g 1 Chron. xv. 3.
 Luke ix. 18.
 Luke ix.
 1 constr., Acts x. 25.

22. Rom. xiii. 1. James i. 13 al.
 k Jude 9 only. Dan. x. 13, 21. xii. 1.

h plur., see ch. xvi. 15 reff.

i constr., Acts x. 25.

6. rec om 1st ἐκεῖ, with C f 1. 36-8: ins A[P]N B rel Meth Andr Areth.—τοπον bef ἐκεῖ 47 Hip. for απο, υπο B rel Meth Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N g h 10-7-8 (1. 49. 51 B^r, e sil) Hip Andr-a¹. (d def.) om του 10 B^r. ἐκτρεφωσιν B rel Meth Areth: τρεφουσιν PN: txt AC e f g m n 1. 34-6-8. 51 (49. 90, e sil) Hip Meth Andr. αυτον N¹: om f. χιλιαδες 1¹. at end ins πεντε N³.

7. aft o ins τε A, et Michael et collegium angelorum syr-dd.

of this world, who came and tried Him but found nothing in Him, the Son of the woman was taken up to heaven and sat on the right hand of God. Words can hardly be plainer than these. It surely is but needful to set against them, thus understood, the interpretation which would regard them as fulfilled by the "mighty issue of the consummated birth of a son of the church, a baptized emperor, to political supremacy in the Roman empire," "united with the solemn public profession of the divinity of the Son of man." Elliott, iii. 24). And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath there a place prepared from (the source of the preparation being His command: see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 47, b) God, that they (the subject to the verb is left indefinite. In ver. 14 below, it is simply passive, ὅπου τρέφεται ἐκεῖ) may nourish her there for a thousand two hundred and sixty days (the whole of this verse is anticipatory: the same incident being repeated with its details and in its own place in the order of the narrative below, vv. 13 ff. See there the comment and interpretation. The fact of its being here inserted by anticipation is very instructive as to that which now next follows, as not being consecutive in time after the flight of the woman, but occurring before it, and in fact referred to now in the prophecy as leading to that pursuit of the woman by the dragon, which, as matter of sequence, led to it). 7 ff.] And there was war in heaven (we now enter upon a mysterious series of events in the world of spirits, with regard to which merely fragmentary hints are given us in the Scriptures. In the O. T. we find the adversary Satan in heaven. In Job i., ii., he appears before God as the Tempter of His saints: in Zech. iii. we have him accusing Joshua the High-priest in God's presence. Again our Lord in Luke x. 18 exclaims, "I beheld Satan as

lightning fall from heaven," where see note. Cf. also John xii. 31. So that this casting down of Satan from the office of accuser in heaven was evidently connected with the great justifying work of redemption. His voice is heard before God no more: the day of acceptance in Christ Jesus has dawned. And his angels, those rebel spirits whom he led away, are cast down with him, into the earth, where now the conflict is waging during the short time which shall elapse between the Ascension and the second Advent, when he shall be bound. All this harmonizes together: and though we know no more of the matter, we have at least this sign that our knowledge, as far as it goes, is sound, —that the few hints given us do not, when thus interpreted, contradict one another, but agree as portions of one whole. The war here spoken of appears in some of its features in the book of Daniel, ch. x. 13, 21, xii. 1. In Jude 9 also we find Michael the adversary of the devil in the matter of the saints of God): Michael ("one of the chief princes," Dan. x. 13: "your prince," i. e. of the Jewish nation, ib. ver. 21: "the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people," ib. xii. 1: "the archangel," Jude 9: not to be identified with Christ, any more than any other of the great angels in this book. Such identification here would confuse hopelessly the actors in this heavenly scene. Satan's being cast out of heaven to the earth is the result not of his contest with the Lord Himself, of which it is only an incident leading to a new phase, but of the appointed conflict with his faithful fellow-angels led on by the archangel Michael. The οἱ ἄγγελοι αὐτοῦ in both cases requires a nearer correspondence in the two chiefs than is found between Satan and the Son of God) and his angels to war (the construction is remarkable, but may

1 ch. ii. 16 reff
m v. 2, &c.
reff.
n Matt. xxv.
41.
o = Acts xix.
16 (Mark
ix 18 Luke
xii. 24).
Ps xii. 4
Dan. vii 21
Theod.
p ch. xx 11
(Heb xii 17).
DAN ii. 35
Theod. see
Luke ii. 7.
q ch. xx 2
r v 14, 15.
2 Cor xi 3
GEN. iii 1, 4
s ch. iii. 20 reff.
t = Luke ii. 1.
Acts xix 27.
u ch. iii. 10.
xvi. 14 Matt.
xxiv. 14.
Acts xi. 28 Isa xiv. 26.
v 26; from Ps ii 2 gen., 1 Cor. iii. 23 al
Matt. xxii 12 Acts xxi. 30.
y heie only +. see note
z constr., here only. see

[i τοῦ] ¹πολεμήσαι μετὰ τοῦ ^mδράκοντος, καὶ ὁ ^mδράκων ACPS B
a lo n, 1.
¹ἐπολέμησεν καὶ οἱ ⁿἄγγελοι ⁿαὐτοῦ, ⁸καὶ οὐκ ^oἴσχυσαν,
2. 4. 6 9.
οὐδέ ^pτόπος ^pεὔρεθῃ αὐτῶν ἔτι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. ⁹καὶ
10-3 16
ἐβλήθη ὁ ^mδράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ^{gr}ῥοφίς ὁ ^qἀρχαῖος, ὁ καλού-
to 19 26-
μενος διάβολος καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς, ὁ ^sπλανῶν τὴν ^{tu}οἰκον-
7. 30.
μένην ^uὅλην, ^vἐβλήθη ^vεἰς τὴν γῆν, καὶ οἱ ⁿἄγγελοι
32 to 38.
ⁿαὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἐβλήθησαν. ¹⁰καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν με-
40-1-2.
γάλην ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ λέγουσαν Ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ ^wσωτηρία
47 to 51.
καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία
90 Br.
τοῦ ^xχριστοῦ ^zαὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἐβλήθη ὁ ^{*}κατήγωρ τῶν ἀδελ-
φῶν ἡμῶν, ὁ ^zκατηγορῶν ^{*}αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

rec (for του πολεμῆσαι) ἐπολεμησαν, with vulg Areth Jer: txt AC[P]N B re. syr-dd
Andr Primas Cassiod.—om του N B rel Andr: ins AC[P] g h 10-7. 36-9. 49 Br.

rec (for μετα) κατα, with b 1. 33-4, adversus Ambrst: txt AC[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-fl.
8. ἴσχυσεν A rel copt Vict Andr-coisl Cassiod; ἴσχυον B f 38⁴(app): txt C[P]N g
n 17. 33 (1. 35-6. 40, e sil) vulg syr-dd. aft ἴσχ. ins pos αυτον N. rec ουτε,
with [P] 1. 17 (33 to 36 ?): txt ACN B rel Andr Areth. for τοπος, τοτε(sic) N¹
(txt N^{3c}). for αυτων, αυτω rel copt Cassiod: αυτοις N^{3c} 17. 36: om N¹: txt AC[P]
B f g n 1 (e sil). 38. 51 vulg syr-dd Vict Andr Areth Primas Jer. om ετι N^{3c} 1 n.

9. om o (bef οφίς) N 1 Andr-p. om 2nd και N. om δ (bef σατανας) B rel
Andr Areth: ins AC[P]N g 17-8. 33 (1. 30-5-6, e sil) Andr-p. om μετ' αυτον 1.

10. rec λεγουσαν bef εν τω ουρανω, with 1. 33(-4-5, e sil) Andr-a: om εν τω ουρ.
41-2 tol: txt AC[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth Tich Primas. for χριστου, κυριου C.

rec κατεβλήθη, with h 1. 10-3-7 (49 Br, e sil) Andr-p: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr
Areth. om from δ to δ 1. *rec κατήγορος, with C[P]N B rel Andr Areth:

κατήγορ A. *rec αὐτῶν, with CN B rel Andr-coisl Areth: om 32: αυτους
AP n 1. 36 Andr. om last ημων f k n 1. 50.

easily be explained as one compounded of (τοῦ) τὸν M. καὶ τοὺς ἄγγ. αὐτοῦ πολεμήσαι (in which case the τοῦ depends on the ἐγένετο, as in ref.) and δ M. καὶ οἱ ἄγγ. αὐτοῦ ἐπολέμησαν. In the next clause, it passes into this latter) with the dragon, and the dragon warred and his angels, and they prevailed not, nor was even (οὐδέ brings in a climax) their place found any more in heaven. And the great dragon was cast down, the ancient serpent (in allusion to the history in Gen. iii. Remember also that St. John had related the saying of our Lord, that the devil was ἀνθρωποκτόνος ἄπ' ἀρχῆς), he who is called the devil and Satan, he who deceiveth the whole inhabited world, was cast to the earth, and his angels were cast with him (I would appeal in passing to the solemnity of the terms here used, and the particularity of the designation, and ask whether it is possible to understand this of the mere casting down of paganism from the throne of the Roman empire? whether the words themselves do not vindicate their plain literal sense, as

further illustrated by the song of rejoicing which follows?). And I heard a great voice in heaven (proceeding apparently from the elders, representing the church (cf. τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν): but it is left uncertain) saying, Now is come (it is impossible in English to join to a participle of present time, such as ἔρτι, a verb in aoristic time. We are driven to the perfect in such cases) the salvation and the might and the kingdom of our God and the power of His Christ (i.e. the realization of all these: ἡ σωτηρία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν being, as so often, that salvation which belongs to God as its Author: see reff. and cf. Luke iii. 6): because the accuser (the form κατήγορ, instead of κατήγορος, is rabbinical, רשע). They had also a corresponding term, סנהגור, סנהגור, = סנהגורος, to designate Michael, the advocate of God's people. See Schöttgen, vol. i. p. 1119 ff., where he accumulates extracts of some interest from the rabbinical books) of our brethren is cast down, who accuseth (the pres. part. of the usual habit, though that his office was now at an

^a ἡμέρας καὶ ^a νυκτός. ¹¹ καὶ αὐτοὶ ^b ἐνίκησαν αὐτὸν ^c διὰ ^a ch. iv. 8 reff.
^{τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ἀρνίου καὶ ^c διὰ τὸν ^d λόγον τῆς ^d μαρτυρίας} b ch. ii. 7 reff.
^{αὐτῶν, καὶ ^e οὐκ ^e ἠγάπησαν τὴν ^e ψυχὴν αὐτῶν ^e ἄχρι} c = John vi. 57.
^{θανάτου. ¹² διὰ τοῦτο ^b εὐφραίνεσθε οὐρανοὶ καὶ οἱ ἐν} d see ch. i. 2.
^{αὐτοῖς ⁱ σκηνοῦντες. ^k οὐαὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν,} e see Acts xx.
^{ὅτι κατέβη ὁ διάβολος πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔχων ¹ θυμὸν μέγαν,} f = Acts xv. 26
^{εἰδὼς ὅτι ^m ὀλίγον ^m καιρὸν ἔχει. ¹³ Καὶ ὅτε εἶδεν ὁ} al. 1 Kings
^{δράκων ὅτι ⁿ ἐβλήθη ⁿ εἰς τὴν γῆν, ^o ἐδίωξεν τὴν γυναῖκα} g ch. ii. 10 reff.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} h ch. xi. 10 reff.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} Isa. xlv. 23.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} xlix. 13
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} i ch. vii. 15 reff.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} k constr., ch
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} i ch. 13 only.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} l = Acts xix.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} 28 al Jer.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} xliii. (xxxvi.)
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} 7.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} m here only.
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} ὁλ. χρόν.,
^{ῥῆτις ^q ἔτεκεν τὸν ^q ἄρσενα. ¹⁴ καὶ ἐδόθησαν τῇ γυναικὶ} 2 Kings xxi. 5.

Acts xiv. 28.
p = 1 John 1. 2 reff.

n ch. viii. 5 reff.
q ver. 5 (reff.).

o Rev., here only. = John v. 16. xv. 20.

11. οὗτοι Ν. for τον λογον της μαρτυρίας, την μαρτυριαν C. for 2nd αυτων, εαυτων Ν^{3a}.

12. rec ins οι bef ουρανοι, with A c g m n 10-6-7. 32-3 (1. 36-7. 47-9 Br, e sil) Andr: om C[P]N B rel Andr-coisl Areth. κατασκηνοῦντες C: κατοικουντες N c e k 26. 30: κατοικ. bef εν αυτοις Ν. rec aft ουαι ins τοις κατοικουσιν, with (37. 40-1-2 P) Andr-a(and comm): so 1, but with δε written over ουαι: om AC[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth lat-fl.—τη γη κ. τη θαλασση B rel Andr Areth lat-fl: εις την γην κ. την θαλασσαν Ν: txt (A)C[P] g n. (for γην, αγαπην A.) ins ο bef εχων 1. om μεγαν Ν.

13. οτι bef ο δρακων Ν^{3a}. for εδιωξεν, εδωκεν Ν¹: εξεδιωξεν Ν^{3a}. rec αρρενα, with B rel: txt C[P]N f g, αρσεναν A.

14. for εδοθησαν, εδοθη Ν^{3a} 46.

end) them before our God by day and by night (see, as above, the passage cited in Schöttgen). And they conquered him on account of the blood of the Lamb (i. e. by virtue of that blood having been shed: not as in E. V., “by the blood,” as if *διὰ* had been with the genitive. The meaning is far more significant; their victory over Satan was grounded in, was a consequence of, His having shed his precious blood: without that, the adversary’s charges against them would have been unanswerable. It is remarkable, that the rabbinical books give a tradition that Satan accuses men all the days of the year, *except on the Day of Atonement*. Vajikra Rabba, § 21, fol. 164. 3, in Schöttgen) and on account of the word of their testimony (the strict sense of *διὰ* with an accus. must again be kept. It is *because* they have given a faithful testimony, even unto death, that they are victorious: this is *their* part, their appropriation of and standing in the virtue of that blood of the Lamb. Without both these, victory would not have been theirs: both together form its ground): and they loved not their life unto death (i. e. they carried their not-love of their life even unto death: see reff.). For this cause (viz., because the dragon is cast down: as is shewn by the contrast below) rejoice, ye heavens and they that dwell (there is no sense of transitoriness in St. John’s use of *σκηνώω*: rather, one of repose and tranquillity (reff.)) in them. Woe to the

earth and the sea (the construction is a combination of the usual accus. in exclamations, with *οὐαί*, which takes a dative), because the devil is come down (see above on *ἔρτι ἐγένετο*, ver. 10, on the impossibility of expressing the aor. in such connexions) to you (the earth and sea) having great wrath (the enmity, which was manifested as his natural state towards Christ, ver. 4, being now kindled into wrath), because he knoweth (so E. V., rightly, the participle carrying with it this ratiocinative force) that he hath but (in our language this “but” is necessary to shew that it is not the *ἔχειν* but the *ὀλίγον* which excites his wrath. In Greek this is made clear by the position of *ὀλίγον*) a short season (i. e. because the Lord cometh quickly, and then the period of his active hostility against the church and the race whom Christ has redeemed will be at an end: he will be bound and cast into the pit. Until then, he is carrying it on, in ways which the prophecy goes on to detail). And when the dragon saw that he was cast down to the earth, he persecuted the woman which brought forth the male child (the narrative at ver. 6 is again taken up and given more in detail. There, the reason of the woman’s flight is matter of inference: here, it is plainly expressed, and the manner of the flight also is related. *ἔτεκεν* is not to be taken as pluperfect, still less as pointing to what was yet to take place; but is the simple historic tense,

rch. iv. 8 reff. sch. iv. 7 reff. *[αἷ]* δύο ἰ πτέρυγες τοῦ st ἀετοῦ τοῦ ἰ μεγάλου, ἵνα ἰ πέτηται AC P⁸ B⁹ a lo n. 1. 2 4. 6 9. 11. Exod. 10-3 16 to 19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 38. 40-1-2. 47 to 51. 90 B¹. *εἰς τὴν ἔρημον εἰς τὸν ^w τόπον αὐτῆς, ὅπου τρέφεται* *ἐκεῖ ^x καιρὸν καὶ ^x καιροὺς καὶ ^{xy} ἡμισυ ^x καιροῦ ^z ἀπὸ* *προσώπου τοῦ ὄψεως. ¹⁵ καὶ ἔβαλεν ὁ ὄφις ἐκ τοῦ* *στόματος αὐτοῦ ὀπίσω τῆς γυναικὸς ὕδωρ ὡς ποταμόν,* *ἵνα αὐτὴν ^a ποταμοφόρητον ποιήσῃ. ¹⁶ καὶ ἔβοήθησεν* *in ref., ἔφυγεν . . . καὶ ἔφκσεν ἐκεῖ ἀπὸ* *προσώπου Ἀβ., to the last verb, τρέφεται: importing "safe from," "far from," "hidden from". And the serpent cast out of his mouth after the woman water as a river, that he might make her to be borne away by the river. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth (reff.) and swallowed down the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth (in passing to the interpretation, we cannot help being struck with the continued analogy between this prophecy and the history of the Exodus. There we have the flight into the wilderness, there the feeding in the wilderness, as already remarked: there again the forty-two stations, corresponding to the forty-two months of the three years and half of this prophecy: there too the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, not indeed in strict correspondence with this last feature, but at least suggestive of it. These analogies themselves suggest caution in the application of the words of the prophecy; and in this direction. The church in the wilderness of old was not, as some expositors would represent this woman, the pure church of God: His veritable servants were hidden in the midst of that church, as much as that church itself was withdrawn from the enmity of Pharaoh. And, it is to be noted, it was that very church herself which afterwards, when seated at Jerusalem, forsook her Lord and Husband, and committed adultery with the kings of the earth, and became drunk with the blood of the saints. It would seem then that we must not understand the woman of the invisible spiritual church of Christ, nor her flight into the wilderness*

rec om αἷ, with N⁸ B⁹ rel Hip¹ Andr-coisl Areth: ins AC[P] g l n 1. 12. 27¹. 36 Hip¹ Andr. om 1st του N⁸. πεταται n 1. 38. om εἰς τὴν ἔρημον 1. 12 Andr-p. om του N⁸. for οπου, οπως (B⁹ ?) rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N 17¹. 32-3 vulg syr-dd copt Hip² Primas.—τρεφεται B⁹ rel: txt AC[P]N 1. 30-3(-4, e sil) Hip².—(In Tischd¹'s edn of B⁹ αυτης οπου τρεφεται εκει καιρον και is omitted.) ins και bef καιρον N⁸a: om καιρον N¹. om και ημισυ καιρον C: ημισου N¹. 15. for εβαλεν, ελαβεν Δ¹. rec οπισω της γυναικος bef εκ του στοματος αυτου, with 1: txt AC[P]N B⁹ rel vs: gr-lat-ff. rec (for αυτην) ταυτην, with [P] l 1. 17. 33-5 Hip Andr-b-p: txt ACN B⁹ rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas.—ποιηση bef αυ. ποτ. C.

used for identification in again taking up the narrative). And there were given (in the usual apocalyptic sense of δοθῆναι, to be granted by God for His purposes) to the woman [the] two wings of the great eagle (the figure is taken from O. T. expressions used by God in reference to the flight of Israel from Egypt. The most remarkable of these is in ref. Exod., ἀνέλαβον ὑμᾶς ὥσελ ἐπὶ πτερίγων ἀετῶν καὶ προσηγαγόμεν ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἑμαυτόν. So also in ref. Deut. But the articles are not to be taken as identifying the eagle with the figure used in those places, which would be most unnatural: much less must they, with Ebrard, be supposed to identify this eagle with that in ch. viii. 13, with which it has no connexion. The articles are simply generic, as in ὁ κροκόδειλος ὁ χειρᾶιος, Levit. xi. 29. With these O. T. references before us, we can hardly be justified in pressing the figure of the eagle's wings to an interpretation in the fulfilment of the prophecy, or in making it mean that the flight took place under the protection of the Roman eagles, as some have done), that she might fly into the wilderness (the flight of Israel out of Egypt is still borne in mind) to her place (prepared of God, ver. 6: so also in Exod. xxiii. 20, ὅπως εἰσαγάγῃ σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἣν ἡτοιμασά σοι), where she is nourished (there) (as God nourished Israel with manna in the wilderness, see Deut. viii. 3, 16, where ψωμί(ειν) is used) a time and times and half a time (i.e. 3½ years = 42 months, ch. xi. 2 = 1260 days, ver. 6 and ch. xi. 3) from the face of the serpent (ἀπὸ must not be joined, as some texts are punctuated, with πέτηται, but belongs, as

in ref., ἔφυγεν . . . καὶ ἔφκσεν ἐκεῖ ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἀβ., to the last verb, τρέφεται: importing "safe from," "far from," "hidden from"). And the serpent cast out of his mouth after the woman water as a river, that he might make her to be borne away by the river. And the earth helped the woman, and the earth opened her mouth (reff.) and swallowed down the river which the dragon cast out of his mouth (in passing to the interpretation, we cannot help being struck with the continued analogy between this prophecy and the history of the Exodus. There we have the flight into the wilderness, there the feeding in the wilderness, as already remarked: there again the forty-two stations, corresponding to the forty-two months of the three years and half of this prophecy: there too the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, not indeed in strict correspondence with this last feature, but at least suggestive of it. These analogies themselves suggest caution in the application of the words of the prophecy; and in this direction. The church in the wilderness of old was not, as some expositors would represent this woman, the pure church of God: His veritable servants were hidden in the midst of that church, as much as that church itself was withdrawn from the enmity of Pharaoh. And, it is to be noted, it was that very church herself which afterwards, when seated at Jerusalem, forsook her Lord and Husband, and committed adultery with the kings of the earth, and became drunk with the blood of the saints. It would seem then that we must not understand the woman of the invisible spiritual church of Christ, nor her flight into the wilderness

ἡ γῆ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἤνοιξεν ἡ γῆ τὸ στόμα αὐτῆς, καὶ ^{cd}κατέπιεν τὸν ποταμὸν ὃν ἔβαλεν ὁ δράκων ἐκ τοῦ

^c Num. (xvi. 32) xxv. 10.
^d Matt xxiii. 24 1 Cor. xv 54. 2 Cor. ii. 7. v. 4.

Heb. xi. 29. 1 Pet. v. 8 only.

16. *for τον ποταμον ον, το υδωρ ο Α.*

εγεβαλεν B: ανεβαλεν f.

of the withdrawal of God's true servants from the eyes of the world. They indeed have been just as much withdrawn from the eyes of the world at all times, and will continue so till the great manifestation of the sons of God. I own that, considering the analogies and the language used, I am much more disposed to interpret the persecution of the woman by the dragon of the various persecutions by Jews which followed the Ascension, and her flight into the wilderness of the gradual withdrawal of the church and her agency from Jerusalem and Judæa, finally consummated by the flight to the mountains on the approaching siege, commanded by our Lord Himself. And then the river which the dragon sent out of his mouth after the woman might be variously understood,—of the Roman armies which threatened to sweep away Christianity in the wreck of the Jewish nation,—or of the persecutions which followed the church into her retreats, but eventually became absorbed by the civil power turning Christian,—or of the Jewish nation itself, banded together against Christianity wherever it appeared, but eventually itself becoming powerless against it by its dispersion and ruin,—or again, of the influx of heretical opinions from the Pagan philosophies which tended to swamp the true faith. I confess that not one of these seems to me satisfactorily to answer the conditions: nor do we gain any thing by their combination. But any thing within reasonable regard for the analogies and symbolism of the text seems better than the now too commonly received historical interpretation, with its wild fancies and arbitrary assignment of words and figures. As to the time indicated by the 1260 days or $3\frac{1}{2}$ years, the interpretations given have not been convincing, nor even specious. We may observe thus much in this place: that if we regard this prophecy as including long historic periods, we are driven to one of two resources with regard to these numbers: either we must adopt the *year-day* theory (that which reckons a day for a year, and consequently a month for thirty years,—and should reckon a year for 360 years), or we must believe the numbers to have merely a symbolical and mystical, not a chronological force. If (and this second alternative is best stated in an inverse form) we regard the periods

mentioned as to be literally accepted, then the prophecy cannot refer to long historic periods, but must be limited to a succession of incidents concentrated in one place and lustrum either in the far past or in the far future. Of all prophecies about which these questions can be raised, the present is the one which least satisfactorily admits of such literal interpretation and its consequences. Its actors, the woman and the dragon, are beyond all controversy mystical personages: one of them is expressly interpreted for us to be the devil: respecting the other there can be little doubt that she is the Church of God: her seed being, as expressly interpreted to be, God's Christian people. The conflict then is that between Satan and the church. Its first great incident is the birth and triumph of the Son of God and of man. Is it likely that a few days or years will limit the duration of a prophecy confessedly of such wide import? I own it seems to me that this vision, even if it stood alone, is decisive against the literal acceptance of the stated periods. Rejecting that, how do we stand with regard to the other alternative in its two forms? Granting for the moment the *year-day* principle, will it help us here? If we take the flight into the wilderness as happening at any time between the Ascension, A.D. 30, and the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, 1260 years will bring us to some time between A.D. 1290 and 1830: a period during which no event can be pointed out as putting an end to the wilderness-state of the church. If again we enlarge our limit for the former event, and bring it down as late as Elliott does, i. e. to the period between the fourth and seventh centuries, we fall into all the difficulties which beset his most unsatisfactory explanation of the man-child and his being caught up to God's throne, and besides into this one: that if the occultation of true religion (= the condition of the invisible Church) was the beginning of the wilderness-state, then either the open establishment of the Protestant churches was the end of the wilderness-state of concealment, or those churches are no true churches: either of which alternatives would hardly be allowed by that author. And if on the other hand we desert the *year day* principle, and say that these

ε ch. xi. 18 reff. constr. here only. 3 Kings xi. 9.
 f = ch. xi. 10.
 g = ch. x. 9 reff.
 h Rev. only
 ch. xi. 7 i reff.
 i 1 John ii. 3, 4 reff.
 k ch. vi. 9
 l ch. i. 2 reff.
 m Matt vii. 26. Rom. ix. 27 (from Isa x. 22). Heb. xi. 12. ch. xx. 6 only. 3 Kings iv. 29.

στόματος αὐτοῦ. ¹⁷ καὶ ἔωργίσθη ὁ δράκων ἑπὶ τῇ ^{ACPS n} ^{a to n. 1.} ^{2 4 6 9.} ^{10-3 16} ^{to 19 20-} ^{7. 30.} ^{32 to 38.} ^{40-1 2.} ^{47 to 51.} ^{90 Br.}
 γυναικί, καὶ ἔ ἀπῆλθεν ^h ποιῆσαι ^h πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν λοι-
 πῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς τῶν ἱτηρούντων τὰς ἑντολάς
 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ^k ἔχόντων τὴν ^{kl} μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ.
 18 Καὶ ἐστάθη ἐπὶ τὴν ^m ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης.

17. om ἐπὶ C. πολεμον bef ποιῆσαι N. ἐπιλοιπῶν N. rec ins του
 bef ἡσου, with (N) B-corr d l 1. 19: om AC[P] B¹ rel Andr Areth. rec aft ἡσου
 ins χριστου, with (40?) vulg-ed Primas: om AC[P](N) B rel vss Hip Andr Areth
 lat ff.—(for τ. ιϛ, του θϛ N¹: θεου (in full) k.)—om last clause 40?
 18. rec ἐσταθην, with [P] B rel ecpt Andr Areth: txt ACN m vulg syr-dd æth arm
 Vict Tich.

defined and constantly recurring periods are not to be pressed, but indicate only long spaces of time thus pointed out mystically or analogically, we seem to incur danger of missing the prophetic sense, and leaving unfixed that which apparently the Spirit of God intended us to ascertain). And the dragon was wroth at the woman (on ἐπὶ with a dat. as applied to the object of mental affections, see ref. and note) and departed (from his pursuit of her) to make war with the rest of her seed, who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus (τὴν μαρτ. Ἰησοῦ as in ch. vi. 9: see note there. Notice as important elements for the interpretation, 1) that the woman has seed besides the Man-child who was caught up to God's throne (for this is the reference of τῶν λοιπῶν), who are not only distinct from herself, but who do not accompany her in her flight into the wilderness: 2) that those persons are described as being they who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus: 3) that during the woman's time of her being fed in the wilderness, the dragon is making war, not against her, but against this remnant of her seed: 4) that by the form of expression here, these present participles descriptive of habit, and occurring at the breaking off of the vision as regards the general description of the dragon's agency, it is almost necessarily implied, that the woman, while hidden in the wilderness from the dragon's wrath, goes on bringing forth sons and daughters thus described.

If I mistake not, the above considerations are fatal to the view which makes the flight of the woman into the wilderness consist in the withdrawal of God's true servants from the world and from open recognition. For thus she must be identical with this remnant of her seed, and would herself be the object of the dragon's hostile warfare, at the very time when, by the terms of the pro-

phesy, she is safely hidden from it. I own that I have been led by these circumstances to think whether after all the woman may represent, not the invisible church of God's true people which under all conditions of the world must be known only to Him, but the *true visible Church*: that Church which in its divinely prescribed form as existing at Jerusalem was the mother of our Lord according to the flesh, and which continued as established by our Lord and His Apostles, in unbroken unity during the first centuries, but which as time went on was broken up by evil men and evil doctrines, and has remained, unseen, unrealized, her unity an article of faith, not of sight, but still multiplying her seed, those who keep the commandments of God and have the testimony of Jesus, in various sects and distant countries, waiting the day for her comely order and oneness again to be manifested—the day when she shall “come up out of the wilderness, leaning on her Beloved:” when our Lord's prayer for the unity of His being accomplished, the world shall believe that the Father has sent Him. If we are disposed to carry out this idea, we might see the great realization of the flight into the wilderness in the final severance of the Eastern and Western churches in the seventh century, and the flood cast after the woman by the dragon in the irruption of the Mahometan armies. But this, though not less satisfactory than the other interpretations, is as unsatisfactory. The latter part of the vision yet waits its clearing up).

XII. 18—XIII. 10.] THE VISION OF THE BEAST THAT CAME UP OUT OF THE SEA. See Dan. vii. 7, 8, 19—27, to which continual reference will be made in the Commentary. And he (the dragon) stood upon the sand of the sea (see Dan. vii. 2, where the four winds of heaven are striving upon the great sea); and I saw out of the sea a wild-beast coming

καὶ ἐθαύμασεν ὅλη ἡ γῆ ^u ὅπισω τοῦ θηρίου, ⁴ καὶ προσ-
 ἐκύνησαν τῷ δράκοντι ὅτι ἔδωκεν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τῷ θηρίῳ,
 καὶ προσεκύνησαν τῷ θηρίῳ λέγοντες ^v Τίς ^v ὅμοιος τῷ
 θηρίῳ; καὶ τίς δύναται ^w πολεμῆσαι μετ' αὐτοῦ; ⁵ καὶ
 ἐδόθη αὐτῷ στόμα ^x λαλοῦν ^x μεγάλα καὶ ^y βλάσφημα
 καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἐξουσία ^z ποιῆσαι ^a μῆνας τεσσεράκοντα ...ἐξου-
 σία πο-
 33.
 u = John xii. 19 Acts v. 37 xx 30
 1 Tim v. 15. 3 Kings i. 7.
 v Exod. xv. 11. Psā xxxiv. 10. lxx 19.
 see note
 w ch. ii. 16 reff.
 x DAN. vii. 8. (xi. 36.)
 y = Acts ii. 11. 2 Pet. ii. 11. (1 Tim. i. 13.
 2 Tim. iii. 2) only f. Isa. lxvi. 3 only
 x = DAN. vii. 24. xi. 26, 30, 32. Ps xxxvi 5 (oi Acts
 a see ch. xi. 2, 3. xii. 6, 14

Steph *εθαυμασθη*, with A n 1. 12. 36: *εθαυμαστωθη* C: txt [P]N B rel Andr-coisl Areth.

Steph ins *εν βεφ ολη τη γη*, with n 1. 12. 36 Andr-p: om AC[P]N B rel.

4. rec (for *τω δρακοντι*) *τον δρακοντα*: txt AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth.—om from
 θηριον last ver to 2nd θηριω 1. rec (for *οτι εδωκεν*) *ος εδωκεν*: *τω δεδωκοτι* B rel
 Areth: *τω δοντι* f: txt AC[P]N g 12. 34-5-6 am (with demid fuld lips-5) syr-dd Andr
 Iren-int Primas, *οτε εδωκεν* n 46.—om from *τω δρακ.* to *προσεκυν.* e. rec om *την*:
 ins AC[P]N B rel Andr Areth. rec (for 2nd *τω θηριω*) *το θηριον*, with A (40, e sil)
 Andr-a(Del) Areth: txt C[P]N B rel Andr-coisl.—for *τω θ. κ. προσεκ. τω θ., του θηριου*
των θηριων 36. rec om last *και*, with rel Areth: ins AC[P]N B f g h m n 1. 10-7.
 34-6-7-8. 421-7-9 B vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr Iren-int Primas. for *δυναται*,
δυνατος B rel Areth: txt AC[P]N g j m n 1. (17¹?) 34-5-6 (38. 49, e sil) vulg syr-dd
 copt Andr Iren-int Primas.

5. rec (for *βλασφημα*) *βλασφημιας*, with CN b g 16-8. 51 (27. 38, e sil) vss Andr:
βλασφημιαν [P] B rel vulg Dion Areth Iren-int: txt A m n 12. 34. 47.—om from *και*
εδ. to *και εδ.* c 1. om *εξουσια* N¹. elz ins *πολεμον* bef *ποιησαι*, with B rel
 Andr-coisl: om AC[P]N g n 1. 18. 36 vulg syr-dd Andr Tich.—om *ποιησαι* (as well
 as *πολεμον*) arm Dion Iren-int Primas: for *ποιησαι*, *πολεμησαι* f.—aft *ποιησαι* ins o
θελει N. aft *τεσσ.* ins *και* A g 16 fuld syr-dd Iren-int.

ACPN B
 a lo n, 1.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10-3. 16
 to 19 26-
 7. 30-2.
 34 to 38.
 40-1-2.
 47 to 51.
 90 Br.

tus merely relates, that there were many rumours about Nero's death, "eoque pluribus vivere eum fingentibus credentibusque," Hist. ii. 8, and that on the strength of this, a Pseudo-Nero arose in the East, Hist. i. 2, "mota etiam prope Parthorum arma falsi Neronis ludibrio." See also the citations from the Sibylline oracles, Lactantius, and Sulpicius Severus, in Düst.'s note. The first who mentions the idea of Nero *returning from the dead*, is Augustine, Civ. Dei xx. 19. 3, vol. vii. p. 686, in explaining 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff.: "quidam putant hoc (ver. 7) de imperio dictum fuisse Romano—ut hoc quod dixit, jam enim mysterium iniquitatis operatur, Neronem voluerit intelligi, cujus jam facta velut Antichristi videbantur. Unde nonnulli ipsum resurrectionem et futurum Antichristum suspicantur." But it is observable that Aug. does not connect the idea with the Apocalypse. This is first done by Sulp. Severus, and completed by Victorinus, whose very words ("unum autem de capitibus occisum in morte et plaga mortis ejus curata est, Neronem dicit. Constat enim, dum insequeretur eum equitatus missus a senatu, ipsam sibi gulam succidisse. Hunc ergo suscitatum Deus mittit regem dignum dignis, et Christum qualem meruerint Judæi") betray the origin of the idea having been

from this passage itself). And the whole earth wondered after (pregnant construction for wondered at, as they followed, or gazed, after) the beast, and worshipped the dragon, because he gave the (or, *his*) power to the beast, and worshipped the beast, saying, Who is like to the beast? And who is able to war with him (these words are a sort of parody, in their blasphemy, on ascriptions of praise to God: cf. besides reff., Ps. cxii. 5; Isa. xl. 18, 25, xlv. 5; Jer. xxix. 20 (xlix. 19); Micah vii. 18: they represent to us the relapse into all the substantial blasphemies of paganism under the resuscitated Empire of Rome, and the retention of pagan titles and forms. I may remark, that nothing in those words finds any representative in the history of the times of the Pagan Empire)? And there was given to it a mouth speaking great and blasphemous things (so we read of the little horn in Daniel vii. 8): and there was given to it power to work (more probably, as in former reff., than "to spend" merely: this meaning is indeed found in latter reff., but the places in Daniel seem to decide for us) forty-two months (the well-known period of the agency of antichrist = 3½ years = 1260 days: see Prolegomena, § v. 29 f.), and he opened his mouth (spoken, see reff., of the commencement of a series of dis-

δύο. ⁶ καὶ ⁶ ἤνοιξεν τὸ ⁶ στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰς βλασφημίας ⁶ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, ⁶ βλασφημῆσαι τὸ ⁶ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν ⁶ σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ⁶ σκηνούντας. ⁷ καὶ ⁶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ⁶ ποιῆσαι ⁶ πόλεμον μετὰ τῶν ⁶ ἁγίων καὶ νικῆσαι αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ⁶ ἔξουσία ⁶ ἐπὶ πάντων ⁶ φυλὴν καὶ ⁶ λαὸν καὶ ⁶ γλῶσσαν καὶ ⁶ ἔθνος. ⁸ καὶ ⁶ προσκυνήσουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ ⁶ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ⁶ οὐ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ⁶ ὄνομα ⁶ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ ⁶ βιβλίῳ τῆς ⁶ ζωῆς τοῦ ⁶ ἀρρίου τοῦ ⁶ ἐσφαγμένου ⁶ ἀπὸ ⁶ κατα-

1 ch. iii. 10 reff.

m constr., ch. iii. 8 reff.

n see ch. iii. 5 reff.

o ch. v. 12, 21

p = ch. xvii. 8. Matt. xxv. 34.

Luke xi. 60. Heb. iv. 3. ix. 29.

q John xvii. 24. Eph. i. 4.

(2 Macc. ii. 29 only.)

6. rec βλασφημῖαν, with [P] B rel vss Andr Areth: txt ACN g m 1. 18. 34-(5-6?) vulg Andr-coisl.—n passes from 1st αὐτου to 2nd. for το ὄνομα αὐτου, αὐτον N¹.

om και την σκηνην αὐτου (homœotel) C toll. rec ins και bef τους εν τῷ ουρανῳ, with [P] N^{3a} B¹ b² 19. 32². 4. 51 (a m n 1. 35-7-8. 47, e sil) vulg copt Andr Areth Iren-int Primas: om ACN¹ rel Andr-coisl. σκηνούντες (sic) N.

7. om 1st clause (homœotel from και εδοθη occurring twice) AC[P] f 1 (but ins (see below) marg) 12 Andr-p Iren-int: ins N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas.—rec πολεμον bef ποιῆσαι, with m 1-marg 34 (35. 40-7, e sil) vulg Andr-coisl Ambr: txt N B rel syr-dd copt Andr-a Areth Primas. νικησει 1-marg. ἐξουσία N¹. rec om και λαον, with h 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 Br, e sil) copt Andr-p: ins AC[P] N B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Iren-int Primas.

8. rec (for αὐτον) αὐτα, with [P] N g m 1. 17-8. 38 (e h l 30-7. 47-9 Br, e sil) Andr-p: txt AC B rel Andr Areth. rec (for οὐ) ὧν, with [P] N B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas Tich: ὧν 50: ὡ δ: txt A (see below) C Iren-int. for οὐ, ουτε b a d e j k 2. 13-6. 30. 40. 50-1. 90: om N¹: txt C[P] rel vulg Andr Areth Iren-int Primas Tich.—for οὐ οὐ, ουαι A. rec (for το ὄνομα) τα ὀνοματα, with [P] N g n 1 (47, e sil) vulg Andr-a Areth Primas: txt AC B rel syr-dd copt Andr Iren-int Tich. rec om αὐτον, with [P] N^{3a} B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas Tich: ins AC, αὐτων N¹ g. for εν, επι B. rec (for τῷ βιβλίῳ) τη βιβλῳ, with 1: βιβλῳ N¹ 36: τῷ βιβλίῳ N^{3a}: βιβλίῳ C: txt A[P] B rel Andr Areth. rec om 2nd του, with 34 (30-5, e sil): ins AC[P] N B rel Andr Areth. for ἐσφαγμένου, ἐσφαγισμένου 1. 47 Andr-a (Del).

courses. These vv. 6, 7, in fact expand into detail that which ver. 5 gave compendiously) for blasphemies against God, to blaspheme His name and His tabernacle, which dwell in heaven (the apposition is strange, but if the καὶ must be omitted, the meaning is to enhance the enormity of the blasphemy by bringing out the lofty nature of God's holy Name and dwelling-place. With the καὶ, the last clause would mean that he blasphemes them that dwell in heaven, i.e. the holy angels of God. To take this as still the meaning without the καὶ, is to introduce into the apocalyptic style an asyndeton which is not found in it). And there was given to it to make war with the saints (see Dan. vii. 21) and to conquer them (see ch. xi. 7, of which this is a wider statement): and there was given to it power over every tribe and people and tongue and nation (viz. universal empire). And all shall worship it (αὐτόν, though masculine, must be referred

to the θηρίον, which has been now for some time spoken of as an agent, and not to an impersonation of it by a living king) who dwell upon the earth, (every one) whose (the change into the singular arises from resolving πάντες into its component individuals) name (οὐ . . . αὐτοῦ, the usual Hellenistic redundancy: see reff.) is not written in the book of life of the Lamb which is slain from the foundation of the world (these last words are ambiguously placed. They may belong either to γέγραπται, or to ἐσφαγμένου. The former connexion is taken by Hammond, Bengel, Heinr., Ewald, Züllig, De Wette, Hengstb., Düsterd. But the other is far more obvious and natural: and had it not been for the apparent difficulty of the sense thus conveyed, the going so far back as to γέγραπται for a connexion would never have been thought of. See this remarkably shewn in the Catena: ὧν γέγραπται, ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου γέγραπται· οὕτω γὰρ

s ch. ii. 7 reff.
t = Acts xiii.
48.

u here bis.
Eph. iv. 8
only. Jer.
xv. 2. Ezek.
xxix. 25.
v Matt. xxvi.
52. Luke
xxii. 49.
Heb. xi. 37.
ch. vi. 8 reff.
xii. 1 al. Ezra x. 2.

βολῆς ^{pa} κόσμον. ⁹ Εἴ τις ^s ἔχει ^s οὖς, ^s ἀκουσάτω. ¹⁰ Εἴ
τις ^t εἰς ^u αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς ^u αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει· εἴ τις
^v ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκτανθῆναι, αὐτὸν ^v ἐν μαχαίρῃ ἀποκταν-
θῆναι. ^w Ὡδὲ ἐστὶν ἡ ^x ὑπομονὴ καὶ ἡ πίστις τῶν ^y ἁγίων.

11 Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο θηρίον ^z ἀναβαῖνον ^z ἐκ τῆς γῆς, καὶ
w = ver. 18. ch. xiv. 12. xvii. 9. x ch. i. 9. Luke xxi. 19. Rom. ii. 7. v. 3, 4. Heb.
y ch. v. 8 reff. z 1 Kings xxviii. 13, 14.

10. rec (for 1st *eis* αἰχμαλωσίαν) αἰχμαλωσίαν συναγει, with b² 1 Andr-a Areth: αἰχμαλωτίζει 1: αἰχμαλωτίζει 18 Primas(*qui captivum duxerit*): αἰχμαλωτῆς εἰ 36: εχει αἰχμαλωσίαν rel Andr-p: εχει (alone) 9: αἰχμαλωσίαν επαγει m: αἰχμαλωσίαν επαγει 34: *eis* αἰχμαλωσίαν (alone) f 47: txt AC[P]N B g n 6. 12. 32-5-8 am(with fuld, agst demid). for *eis* αἰχμαλωσίαν υπαγει, αἰχμαλωτισθησεται 18 Primas(*et ipse carietur*): αἰχμαλωσίαν υπαγει (omg *eis*) 16. 32: υπαγει (alone) C[P]N B rel: om 1. 12: txt A b² 1 m 34 vulg(*in captivitate vadet* ed-Clem, *vadet in captivitate* am fuld). rec μαχαίρα (twice), with [P]N B rel Andr Areth: txt AC. (Simply ver 14.)—om 2nd εν μαχ. 51. rec (for 1st ἀποκτανθῆναι) αποκτενει δει, with C[P] B rel: αποκτεινει δει N n, -κτεννει δει g: δει a to f j k 2. 4. 6. 13-(9?) 27. 30-2. 40-2¹. 50-1. 90: txt A.—for ἀποκτ. αυτ. εν μαχ. αποκτ., δει αυτον αποκτανθῆναι 9. 82.

δεῖ νοεῖν, οὐχ ὥς ἡ γραφὴ ἔχει· ὅτι μὴδὲ ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμον ἡ τοῦ ἀρνίου σφαγὴ. The difficulty however is but apparent: 1 Pet. i. 19, 20 says more fully the same thing. That death of Christ which was foreordained from the foundation of the world, is said to have *taken place* in the counsels of Him with whom the end and the beginning are one. Ch. xvii. 8, which is cited by De W. as decisive for his view, is irrelevant. Of course where simply the writing in the book of life from the foundation of the world is expressed, no other element is to be introduced: but it does not therefore follow, that where, as here, other elements are by the construction introduced, that, and that alone is to be understood).

9, 10.] These verses bear various meanings, according to the reading which we adopt. If the rec. be taken, they express a consolation to the persecuted saints in the form of a *jus talionis*: the judgment of God will overtake the persecutors, and in that form in which their persecution was exercised. If we take the reading in the text, they form a prophetic declaration how it shall fare with the saints in the day of persecution, and declare also that in holy suffering of captivity and death consists their faith and patience. The latter appears to me, both from critical and contextual considerations, by far the more eligible. Thus we have what is so frequent in this book, an O.T. citation (see below): and all falls into its place in connexion with the victorious war of the beast against the saints: whereas the other declaration is at least out of place in the context. If any man hath an ear, let

him hear (see reff. This notice is given to bespeak solemn attention to what follows, as warning Christians of their fate in the days of the beast's persecution). If any one is for captivity, into captivity he goeth: if any to be slain (ἀποκτανθῆναι = *eis* τὸ ἀποκτανθῆναι) with (see reff. and note on ch. vi. 8) the sword, that (i. e. it is necessary that: δει, as the other reading supplies) he should be slain with the sword (so ref. Jer., "Such as are for death, to death: and such as are for the sword, to the sword: and such as are for the famine, to the famine: and such as are for captivity, to captivity:" cf. also Jer. xliii. 11 and Zech. xi. 9. As that was the order and process of God's anger in his judgments on his people of old, so shall the issue be with the saints in the war of persecution which the beast shall wage with them). Here is (reff., viz. in the endurance of these persecutions) the endurance and the faith of the saints.

11—18.] THE SECOND WILD-BEAST, THE REVIVER AND THE UPHOLDER OF THE FIRST. It may be well to premise a few remarks, tending to the right understanding of this portion of the prophecy. 1) These two beasts are identical as to genus: they are both *θηρία*, ravaging powers, hostile to God's flock and fold. 2) They are diverse in origin. The former came up out of the sea: that is, if we go back to the symbolism of Daniel, was an empire, rising up out of confusion into order and life: the latter comes out of the earth: i. e. we may not unreasonably say, arises out of human society and its progress: which as interpreted by the context, will import its origin and gradual

39...
ACFN B
a to n, 1.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30-2.
34 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B.

εἶχεν κέρατα δύο ἁ ὅμοια ἁ ἄρνίῳ, καὶ ἐλάλει ὡς δράκων. ^{a constr., ch. ix. 10.}

11. for ὁμοια, ὀνομα C.

ἀρνίου 1.

development during the reign and progress of the secular empire denoted by the former beast. 3) The second beast is, in its zeal and action, entirely subsidiary to the first. It wields its authority, works miracles in its support, causes men to make and to worship its image; nay, itself is lost in the splendour and importance of the other. 4) An important distinction exists between the two beasts, in that this second one has two horns like a lamb. In other words, this second beast puts on a mild and lamb-like appearance, which the other did not. But it speaks as a dragon: its words, which carry its real character, are fierce and unrelenting: while it professes that which is gentle, its behests are cruel. And now I may appeal to the reader, whether all these requisites do not meet in that great wasting Power which arose, not out of anarchy and conquest, but out of men's daily life and habits, out of and in the presence of the last form of the secular power, which was the Empire of Pagan Rome; I mean, the *sacerdotal persecuting power*, which, gentle in its aspect and professions, was yet cruel in its actions; which did all the deeds of the Empire, in its presence, which kept up its image, its laws, its formulæ, its privileges; which, coming in as it did by a corrupt and ambitious priesthood, deceived by its miracles the dwellers on earth, and by them maintained the image of the despotic secular power? Surely it is this Latin Christianity, in its ecclesiastico-secular form, not identical with, but as preparing the way for, the great apostasy, helping, so to speak, to place the woman on the beast, as in ch. xvii., that is here depicted before us. It is this which, owing its power in the main to imposture and unwarrantably assumed spiritual authority, deserves best the name of *the false prophet*, expressly given to this second beast in ch. xix. 20. Nor would I limit the interpretation, as has generally been done, by dividing off Pagan from Christian. Primarily, this second beast plainly sets forth the Pagan sacerdotal power; this it was that made the image of the Emperors, that compelled Christians to worship that image, that wrought signs and wonders by its omens and magic. But as the first beast, still subsisting, has passed into a so-called Christian Roman Empire, so has the second beast into a so-called Christian priesthood, the veritable inheritor of pagan rites, images, and

superstitions; actually the continuators, *nomine mutato*, of the same worship in the same places; that of the Virgin for that of Venus, Cosmas and Damian for Romulus and Remus, the image of Peter for that of Jupiter Tonans: lamb-like in profession, with the names and appearances of Christianity, but dragon-like in word and act. And this was surely never more strikingly shewn than at the time when I am writing (Jan. 1860), when the Papal priesthood is zealously combining in the suicidal act of upholding the temporal power as necessary to the spiritual pre-eminence of their "Lord God the Pope." So that I believe the interpretation of the second beast to be, the *sacerdotal persecuting power, pagan and Christian*, as the first is the secular persecuting power, pagan or Christian. I conceive the view which would limit it to the priesthood of Paganism (Hammond, Grot., Ewald, De Wette, Hengstb., Düsterd.) quite insufficient for the importance of the prophecy; while that of Elliott, al., which would limit it to the priesthood of the Papacy, fails notably in giving a meaning to its acts as here described, the making an image to the beast and causing men to worship it. **And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth** (see the preceding note), **and it had two horns like a lamb** (i. e. like the two horns of a lamb: see ref. It is quite true that the absence of the article before ἄρνιῳ forbids the idea that a direct comparison is intended between this lamb-like beast, and the Lamb on Mount Sion: but it does not follow from this that no reference is made to that Lamb in the choice of the animal to which this beast is compared. I believe the choice is made to set forth the hybrid character of this second beast: see more below. The *number* may perhaps be of no special import, but merely inserted to complete the similarity: it, as a lamb has, had two horns), **and it spoke as a dragon** (here again we cannot doubt that the term is chosen on account of the dragon which has been before mentioned. It is no objection to this, that we do not hear of that dragon speaking (Düsterd.): the character of the animal explains what kind of speech is meant, and the acts of the dragon were of that kind. And as to this second beast, though its appearance and profession are sacerdotal, its words and acts are devilish. The whole description strongly recalls to our mind our Lord's *προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν*

b constr., here only. see Matt. xxi. 23 || (cf. ποιεῖν τὸ θελημα, Matt vii. 21. John, passim.) c constr., ch. iii. 9 reff. d Acts vii. 2. xi. 29 al. Ps. cvi. 34 e w. acc., ver. 8 reff. f constr., ch. iii. 8 reff. g ver. 3. cf. Mic. i. 11 h here bis. ch. xvi. 14. xix. 20. John u (11) 23. iii. 2 iv. 54. vi. 2. 14, 30 al? Acts vi. 8 al. Dan. iii. 32 (iv 2) see Matt xxiv. 24. i. - ver. 12 (see note) k 4 KINGS i. 10, 12. (3 KINGS xviii. 38.) l ch. iii. 20 reff. m ch. iii. 10 reff. n constr., ch. ii. 7 reff. o Matt. xxii. 20 ¶. Rom. viii. 29 al. after this, Rev. passim. Dan. iii. 1, &c.

12 καὶ τὴν ^b ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πρώτου θηρίου ^b πᾶσαν ^b ποιεῖ ^{ACPN B} ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ^c ποιεῖ τὴν γῆν καὶ τοὺς ^d ἐν αὐτῇ ^{2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16. 10-19. 26-7. 30-2. 34 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 Br.} ^a κατοικοῦντας ^c ἵνα ^e προσκυνήσουσιν τὸ θηρίον τὸ πρῶτον, ^f οὗ ἔθεραπεύθη ἡ ^g πληγὴ τοῦ ^h θανάτου ^f αὐτοῦ. 13 καὶ ^h ποιεῖ ^h σημεῖα μεγάλα, ⁱ ἵνα καὶ ^k πῦρ ποιῇ ^k ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβαίνειν εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων 14 καὶ ^l πλανᾷ τοὺς ^m κατοικοῦντας ^m ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς διὰ τὰ ^h σημεῖα ^h ἃ ⁿ ἔδωκε αὐτῷ ^h ποιῆσαι ἐνώπιον τοῦ θηρίου, λέγων τοῖς ^m κατοικοῦσιν ^m ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ποιῆσαι ^o εἰκόνα

12. for 1st ποιεῖ, εἵποιε 6: *faciebat* vulg: ποιήσει m 34-5 Andr-coisl: ποιεῖν j. (9. 10 &c. have txt.) for 2nd ποιεῖ, εἵποιε B rel syr-dd Andr-p Areth; *faciebat* vulg: ποιήσει m 34-5 Andr-coisl: txt AC[P]N g n 1. 16-8. 36. 40-7 Andr-a. [for τὴν γῆν καὶ, ἐνώπιον P(sic).] rec κατοικούντας bef εν αυτη, with C and (appy, though e sil) f 40 vulg Iren-int: om κατοικ. 41: txt A[P]N B rel Hip Andr Areth. rec προσκυνήσουσι, with [P] B rel: προσκυν(sic, omg ινα) N: txt A f k l 30¹-6. om του θανατου A. om αυτου [P] f vulg Primas.

13. for ποιεῖ, εἵποιε c: ποιήσει m 34-5 Andr-coisl. καὶ πυρ bef ινα B rel Areth: πυρ ινα, omg καὶ, f: πυρ εκ τ. ουρ. bef ινα 40: txt AC[P]N m 34 (g 1. 35-6, e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Iren-int.—ινα εν πλανη ποιει πυρ εκ κ.τ.λ., omg καὶ, n 79 Andr-a(Del). rec καταβ. bef εκ του ουρανου, with [P]N 1 (g, e sil) syr-dd (æth) Hip: txt AC B rel.—for καταβαίνειν, καταβαίνει (omg ποιη) B rel (-vei B k l 30-6-9. 50) copt Areth: καταβναι m 35: txt AC[P]N g (n) 1. 38 vulg Andr Iren-int. (καταβαίνιν C.) for εἰς, ἐπὶ B rel Andr-p Areth: txt AC[P]N m n 1. 34(-5-6, e sil) Hip Andr. 14. λεγοντος B¹: λεγον 1. aft 2nd γης ins καὶ N. εικοναν A Andr-b.

ψευδοπροφητῶν, οἵτινες ἔρχονται πρὸς δυνάμεις ἐν δυνάμειν προβάτων, ἔσθων δὲ εἰσὶν ἄνθρωποι ἀπαγες, Matt. vii. 15). And it worketh all the power (performs all the acts of authority) of the first beast in his presence (while the first beast is subsisting and beholding; and as the expression seems to shew, being in a relation to it of serving and upholding), and maketh the earth and those that dwell in it to worship (construction, see reff.) the first beast, whose wound of death was healed (this was formerly, ver. 4, described as the reason why the world wondered after the former beast): and worketh great miracles, so that (ἵνα depends on μεγάλα: "miracula magna, tam magna, ut" &c. So that ἵνα ποιῇ = ὥστε ποιεῖν. See Winer, edn. 6, § 53. 6, who as well as Düsterd. finds fault with Bengel for recognizing here a feature of St. John's style. But Bengel only remarks "ἵνα frequens Johanni particula: in omnibus suis libris non nisi semel, Joh. iii. 16. ὥστε posuit:" and this is true and applicable to the case here in hand, where ὥστε would naturally have stood,—whatever may be the minute shade of difference between the force of ἵνα as connected with the previous words in various passages. We know

that the Apocalypse is written in a laxer style and more faulty Greek than either the Gospel or the Epistles: what wonder, if the use of ἵνα epexegetic be carried further in it, and from its meaning of ideal purpose be extended to detail of matter of fact? Granting the two meanings to be even as far apart as Düsterd. insists, may we not say that the Writer who so often uses the one is just the person who, when writing less strictly, was likely to use the other? As to the fact described, it is notorious enough that the great arm of support of the sacerdotal power, pagan and papal, has ever been the claim to work miracles) he even maketh fire to come down from the heaven to the earth in the sight of men ("hæc magi per angelos refugas et hodie faciunt," says Victorinus, writing in the beginning of the fourth century, before yet the Empire professed Christianity. But it is probable that this special miracle is mentioned to recall the spirit and power of Elias, and shew how the false prophet shall counterfeit the true). And he deceiveth those who dwell on the earth on account of (the prep. expresses not the instrument, but the ground of the deceit: the imposture succeeds, because of . . .) the miracles which it has

τῷ θηρίῳ ὃς ἔχει τὴν πληγὴν τῆς μαχαίρης καὶ ἔζησεν. ^{p ch. ii. 8 reff.}
 15 καὶ ἡ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ἡ δοῦναι ἡ πνεῦμα τῇ ἡ εἰκόνι τοῦ θηρίου, ^{q Ezek. xxxvii. 6.}
 ἡ καὶ λαλήσῃ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ θηρίου, καὶ ποιήσῃ [ἡ ἡ] ^{r constr., ver. 12.}
 ὅσοι ἔαν μὴ ἡ προσκυνήσωσιν τὴν ἡ εἰκόνα τοῦ θηρίου ἀπο- ^{s ch. iii. 19 reff.}
 κτανθῶσιν. 16 καὶ ποιεῖ πάντας, τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς ^{t ch. xi. 18.}
 μεγάλους, καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς, καὶ ^{xix. 5, 18.}
 τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ τοὺς δούλους, ἡ ἡ ὧσιν αὐτοῖς ^{xx. 12. Isa. ix. 14.}
^{u Prov. xxii. 2.}
^{Sir. x. 22.}
^{ch. vi. 15.}
^{xix. 18.}
^{1 Cor. xii. 13.}
^{Gal. iii. 28.}
^{Eph. vi. 8.}
^{Col. iii. 11.}
^{w = John xiii. 22. xix. 3 al. Ezek. ix. 4. impers. plur., see ch. xvi. 15 reff.}

rec (for ὅς) ὃ, with **N** rel Hip Andr Areth; § 16. 16. 90: txt AC[P] B m n 34-5-6.
 for εχει, ειχε B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: txt AC[P] N f g h 1. 34-5-6-8 vulg Hip
 Andr-coisl Primas. om την **N** B a b c d e f j k 2. 6. 13. 26-7. 30-2. 40-1-2-8. 50-1.
 90 Areth.—πληγης(sic) **N**. ins απο bef της μαχαρ. f 47: και εζησεν απο της
 μαχαρας B rel: και εζησεν απο της πληγης της μαχαρας 16. 39: txt AC[P] N 10-7-8.
 30 (g h m n 1. 34 5-6-7-8. 49 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Primas.
 15. for αυτω, αυτη (mechanical repetition of η from preceding word?) AC [P¹ (corr'd
 eadem manu P)]. πνευμα bef δουναι B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth: om δουναι C: txt
 A[P] N f g n 17. 34 (1. 36, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr. ποιησει **N** f g k 36. 42.
 rec has ινα bef αποκτανθωσι and not bef οσοι, with 1 (h 37 Br, e sil): om (alto-
 gether) **N** B rel arm Andr: txt A[P] g 1 26. 36. 47-9 vulg syr-dd Hip Andr-a Primas.
 (homœotel in C n, from θηριου 1st to 3rd.) rec (for εαν) αν, with **N** 1. 34-6 (35.
 40-1-2. 51, e sil) Andr-a: om c g: txt A[P] B rel (including 4. 10-3-6-7-8-9: Mill
 Wetst silent) Hip Andr Areth. προσκυνησουσιν **N** e f l, προσκυνησουσιν(sic) 36.
 for την εικονα, τη εικονι [P] N B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth: txt A 1 (1 41-2. 51,
 e sil) Andr.

16. ποιησει **N**^{3a}. om 2nd τους **N**. transp πλουσ. and πτωχ. **N** [και τ. πλ.
 κ. τ. πτωχ. is written on the margin by P¹(?)]. rec (for δωσιν) δωση, with 34 Hip:
 δωσει 1: λαβωσι, omg αυτοις, g (26): δωσουσιν b c e 4. 18. 40-7-8 Andr-p Areth(Del):
 δωσουσιν rel Areth: txt AC[P] N B f h m 10-3-72. 35-6-7-8. 49. 51 Andr. (dilig.)
 αυτω (for -τοις) **N**¹.

been given to him to work in the presence of the beast, ordering those who dwell on the earth to make an image to the beast (dat. commodi) who hath the stroke of the sword and lived (this part of the prophecy seems to describe the acts of the pagan sacerdotal power then presently to follow. See more below). And it was given to him to give breath (or, spirit; by inference, life) to the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should even speak, and should cause (the regular subject to ποιήσῃ is the image, not the second beast) that as many as do not worship the image of the beast, shall be slain. The Seer is now describing facts which history substantiates to us in their literal fulfilment. The image of Cæsar was every where that which men were made to worship: it was before this that the Christian martyrs were brought to the test, and put to death if they refused the act of adoration. The words of Pliny's letter to Trajan are express on the point: "cum præeunte me deos appellarent, et imagini tuæ, quam propter hoc jusseram cum simulacris numinum afferri, thure ac vino supplicarent, præterea maledicerent Christo, quorum nihil

cogi posse dicuntur qui sunt revera Christiani, dimittendos esse putavi." Above he had said, "perseverantes duci jussi." And if it be said as an objection to this, that it is not an image of the Emperor but of the beast itself which is spoken of, the answer is very simple, that as the Seer himself in ch. xvii. 11, does not hesitate to identify one of the ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς with the beast itself, so we may fairly assume that the image of the beast for the time being would be the image of the reigning Emperor.

It is not so easy to assign a meaning to the giving life and speech to the image of the beast. Victorinus gives a curious explanation: "faciet etiam ut imago aurea Antichristo in templo Hierosolymis ponatur, et intret angelus refuga et inde voces et sortes reddat." The allusion probably is to some lying wonders permitted to the Pagan priests to try the faith of God's people. We cannot help, as we read, thinking of the moving images, and winking and speaking pictures, so often employed for purposes of imposture by their far less excusable Papal successors. And he (i. e. the second beast, more naturally than the image) maketh all men, the small and

^x Rev. (here bis. ch. xiv. 9, 11 ad³) only, exc. Acts xvii. 20⁺
^y ch. vii. 3 reff.
^z Matt. xxi. 12.
¹ Luke xvii. 28.
² Isa. xxiv. 2.
³ 1 Macc. xii. 36.
^a ver. 10.
^x χάραγμα ἐπὶ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν τῆς δεξιᾶς ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῶν, ¹⁷ [καὶ] ^a ὥνα μήτις δύνῃται ^z ἀγοράσαι ¹⁸ ἢ ^z πωλῆσαι εἰ μὴ ὁ ἔχων τὸ ^x χάραγμα τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ θηρίου ἢ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. ¹⁸ ^a Ὡδε ἢ

ACPS B
 a to n. 1.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10. 3. 16.
 to 19. 26.
 7. 30-2.
 34 to 42.
 47 to 51.
 90 B*.

χαραγμα B rel Areth: txt AC[P]N g j k m n 17. 34-5-6-8. 47 vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Iren-int. for η, θ (with καὶ written over) 1. rec των μετωπων, with B h j n 1. 10. 30² 4 (17. 35-6-7. 49 B*, e sil): τω μετωπω 40: του μετωπου C Areth: txt A[P]N rel copt arm Hip Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Tich.

17. om και CN¹ h n 6. 32 tol syr-dd copt Hip Andr-a Iren-int Primas: ins A[P]N^{3a} B rel vulg æth Andr Areth. δυναται [P] v b c f l n 1. 6. 16. 27. 32-7. 41-8. 50 Andr-p: txt ACN rel Hip Andr Areth. for δ, η 1. rec ins ἢ bef το ονομα, with 30²-4-8 vulg-ed copt Areth: του θηρια η N 38: om A[P] B rel vulg-mss Hip Andr. (d illeg.)—του ονοματος C fuld(with tol lips-4) syr-dd Andr-a Iren-int Primas: nomine am.—om το ονομα του θ. 40. for του θηριου, αυτου N 38. ins η τον αριθμον του θηριου bef η τ. αρ. του ονομ. αυ. B.

the great, and the rich and the poor, and the free and the bond, that they should give them (i. e. stamp on them. The subject to δῶσιν is left uncertain: it will naturally be understood to be, those whose office it is: see reff. It evidently is not as Düsterd., "that they impress on themselves:" nor does this at all follow from ch. xiv. 9, 11, xvi. 2, xix. 20, xx. 4, which he quotes to support it, but merely that they may refuse to receive it, and by receiving it become apostates from God) a mark (such a mark as masters set on their slaves, or monarchs on their soldiers, a brand, stamped or burnt in, στίγματα, see note on Gal. vi. 17, and Grotius and Wetst. here. We read in 3 Macc. ii. 29, of Ptolemy Philopater, that he ordered the Jews in Alexandria to be forcibly enrolled, τοὺς τε ἀπογραφομένους χαράσσεσθαι καὶ διὰ πυρὸς εἰς τὸ σῶμα παραστήμω Διονύσου κισσοφύλλω. And Philo, de Monarch. i. § 8, vol. ii. p. 221, mentions idolaters who confessed their idolatry by ἐν τοῖς σώμασι καταστίζοντες αὐτὴν σιδήρῳ πεπωρωμένῳ πρὸς ἀνεξάλειπτον διαμονήν, οὐδὲ γὰρ χρόνῳ ταῦτα διαμαυροῦνται) on their right hand (στίγματά ἐστι τῶν στρατευομένων ἐν ταῖς χερσίν, Ælian, in Grot.) or upon (before, the fact of the mark being visible on the hand was prominent, and the gen. was used: now, that of the act of impression is, and the accus. is used) their forehead (i. e. in some conspicuous part of the body, that all may see it: or as Aug. Civ. Dei, xx. 9. 3, vol. vii. p. 674, "in fronte, propter professionem: in manu, propter operationem"), [and] that no one should be able to buy or to sell, except he who has the mark, the name of the beast, or the number of his name (τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ. is in apposition with τὸ χάραγμα: it is in this that the mark consists: either in the name stamped in

letters, or in the number of the name thus stamped, i. e. the number which those letters make when added together according to their numerical value. The practice of thus calculating the numerical value of the letters in names was widely prevalent: see the instances collected by Mr. Elliott, vol. iii. pp. 220 ff.: and more below.

This particular in the prophetic description seems to point to the commercial and spiritual interdicts which have, both by Pagan and by Papal persecutors, been laid on nonconformity: from even before the interdict of Diocletian mentioned by Bede in his hymn on Justin Martyr ("non illis emendi quidquam, Aut vendendi copia: nec ipsam haurire aquam Dabatur licentia, antequam sacrificarent Detestandis idolis," Mede, p. 511) through those of the middle ages (of which Mr. Elliott gives an example from Harduin vi. ii. 1684, in a canon of the 3rd Lateran Council under Pope Alexander III., "ne quis eos—scil. hæreticos—in domibus vel in terra sua tenere vel fovere vel negotiationem cum eis exercere præsumat"), down to the last remaining civil disabilities imposed on nonconformity in modern Papal or Protestant countries. For these last have their share in the enormities of the first and second beast in as far as they adopt or continue their practices.

With regard to the circumstance of the imposition of the mark, I conceive that with the latitude here given, that it may be the name or the number, and having regard to the analogy of the mark inscribed on the saints (ch. vii. 1 ff.: cf. ch. xiii. 1), we need not be anxious to find other than a general and figurative interpretation. As it is clear that in the case of the servants of God no actual visible mark is intended, so it may well be inferred here

σοφία ἐστίν. ὁ ^b ἔχων ^b νοῦν ^c ψηφισάτω τὸν ἀριθμὸν τοῦ ^b θηρίου ἀριθμὸς γὰρ ^d ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν· καὶ ὁ ἀριθμὸς αὐτοῦ ἑξακόσιοι ἐξήκοντα ἑξ.

b 1 Cor. ii. 16.
see ch. xvii.
9.
c Luke xiv. 28
only τ.
d = ch. xxi. 17.
Isa. viii. 1.

XIV. ¹ Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ τὸ ἀρνίον ἐστὸς ἐπὶ τὸ

18. rec ins τον bef νουν, with m 1. 30²: om AC[P]N B rel Hip Andr Areth. for νουν, ους N¹: νους 39, ουν n. aft αυτου ins εστιν 1: om και ο αριθμος αυτου N.

rec χῆς', with B rel: χῆς n: χμς or χρς d: ἑξακοσια δεκα εἰς C 11 (as also some mentd by Iren) Tich(in some edns), χῆς' 5: ἑξακοσια ἐξηκοντα εἰς [P] e g l 16. 47 Andr: ἑξακοσια ἐξηκοντα εἰς N 39: txt A.

ΣΗΜ. XIV. 1. rec om το (bef αρνιον), with [P] h n 1. 7. 34 (32-5-6-7. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr: ins ACN B rel copt Origo Meth Areth. (d illeg.) rec (for εστος) εσθηκος, with rel Andr-p Areth, εσθηκως l m; εσθηκεν c: txt AC[P]N, εστως B g n 1. 18. 34-

that the mark signifies rather conformity and addiction to the behests of the beast, than any actual stigma impressed. Certainly we fail to recognize any adequate exposition of such stigma in the sign of the Cross as propounded by Mr. Elliott (iii. 236), or in the monogram on the labarum as succeeded by the Papal cross-keys of Bp. Wordsworth (Apocalypse, Appendix G: see also his note in loc.). Here is wisdom (these words serve to direct attention to the challenge which follows: see ver. 10, where *ᾧδὲ ἐστιν* is similarly used): let him who hath understanding calculate the number of the beast (the terms of the challenge serve at once to shew that the feat proposed is possible, and that it is difficult. Irenæus's view, that if St. John had meant the number to be known he would have declared it, and that of Andreas, *ὁ χρόνος ἀποκαλύψει*, are, it seems to me, excluded by these considerations. The number *may* be calculated: and is *intended to be known*: for (gives a reason why the calculation may be made) it is the number of a man (i. e. is counted as men generally count: not, as Bede, Grot., al., and recently Hofmann, Schriftb. ii. 637, the number belonging to an individual man: see against this the ref. which are decisive as to usage), and the number of it (the beast) is six hundred sixty-six (of all the hundreds of attempts which have been made in answer to the challenge, there is but one which seems to approach near enough to an adequate solution to require serious consideration. And that one is the word mentioned, though not adopted, by Irenæus, v. 30. 3, p. 330 (the passage cited in the Prolegg. § i. par. 7), viz. *λατῆινος* (the diphthong *ει* being, as all critical students of the Greek text know, not only an allowable way, but the usual way, of writing the long *i* by the Greeks of the time): ($\lambda = 30$) + ($\alpha = 1$) + ($\tau = 300$) + ($\epsilon = 5$) + ($\iota =$

10) + ($\nu = 50$) + ($\omicron = 70$) + ($\varsigma = 200$) = 666. This name describes the common character of the rulers of the former Pagan Roman Empire,—“*Latini sunt qui nunc regnant*,” Iren.: and, which Irenæus could not foresee, unites under itself the character of the latter Papal Roman Empire also, as revived and kept up by the agency of its false prophet the priesthood. The Latin Empire, the Latin Church, Latin Christianity, have ever been its commonly current appellations: its language, civil and ecclesiastical, has ever been Latin: its public services, in defiance of the most obvious requisite for public worship, have ever been throughout the world conducted in Latin: there is no one word which could so completely describe its character, and at the same time unite the ancient and modern attributes of the two beasts, as this. Short of saying absolutely that this *was* the word in St. John's mind, I have the strongest persuasion that no other can be found approaching so near to a complete solution. See however the remarks on this subject in the Prolegomena, § v. par. 32, where I have after all thought it best to leave the matter in doubt).

CH. XIV. 1—20.] THE CONTRAST: THE BLESSEDNESS, AND THE COUNTER-AGENCY OF THE SAINTS OF GOD. THE HARVEST AND THE VINTAGE OF THE EARTH. This is not entirely another vision, but an introduction of a new element, one of comfort and joy, upon the scene of the last. And thus it must be viewed: with reference to the persecution by the beast which is alluded to in its course, vv. 9 ff. It is also anticipatory, first containing reference to the mystic Babylon, hereafter to become the subject of prophecy in detail; and to the consummation of punishment and reward, also to be treated in detail hereafter. It is *general* in its character, reaching forward close to the time of the end, treating

e ch. xvii. 5.
xix 12 (bis),
16
f ch. vii. 3 reff.
g ch. i. 15 reff.
h ch. vi. 1. (x.
3.) xix. 6.
P. s. lxxvi. 18.
i ch. v. 6. xiii.
3.
k ch. xviii. 22
only 4.
l 1 Cor. xiv. 7
only. Isa
xlii. 16 only.
m ch. v. 8 reff.
n ch. v. 9 (reff.).
o ch. i. 4 reff.

ὄρος Σιών, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες ACPN B
χιλιάδες, ἔχουσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ 2. 4. 6. 9.
πατρὸς αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν. 10-3. 16
2 καὶ ἤκουσα φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς φωνὴν ὕδατων to 19. 26-
πολλῶν καὶ ὡς φωνὴν βροντῆς μεγάλης, καὶ ἡ φωνὴ 7. 30-2.
ἦν ἡκουσα ὡς καθαρωδῶν καθαριζόντων ἐν ταῖς κιθάραις 34 to 42.
αὐτῶν. 3 καὶ ᾄδουσιν [ὡς] ᾠδὴν καινὴν ἐνώπιον 47 to 51.
90 Br.

5-6-8 Orig Meth Andr. om το (bef oros) and σιών C. aft μετ' αὐτου ins
αριθμος B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]N 10-7 (f g h k n 1. 36 to 40. 49
Br, e sil) vulg (copt) Orig Meth Andr Cyp. rec om αὐτου και το ονομα, with [P]
1. 34(-5, e sil): ins ACN B rel vss gr-lat-ff. ins to bef γεγραμμενον A. for
γεγραμμενον, καιομενον 1. for αὐτων, αὐτω(sic) N¹.
2. om μεγαλης N¹. rec (for η φωνη ην) φωνην, with [P] n 1 Andr: txt ACN B
rel vss Orig Meth Andr-coisl Areth. rec om ως (bef καθαρωδων), with 1 Andr-p: ins
AC[P]N B rel vss Orig Meth Andr Areth. om αὐτων C.
3. om ὡς [P]N B rel syr-dd copt arm Orig Meth Andr Areth: ins AC g n 1. 17. 42¹
vulg Andr-a. (18¹ def.) aft καινην ins και ην (ην above the line) N. the 1st

compactly of the torment of the apostates and the blessedness of the holy dead, and leading, by its concluding section, which treats of the harvest and the vintage of the earth, to the vision of the seven last vials, now immediately to follow.

It naturally divides itself into three sections: of which the first is, 1—5.] *The Lamb on Mount Zion, and his hundred and forty-four thousand. And I saw, and beheld the Lamb* (viz., the same which before was seen in the midst of the throne, ch. v. 6 al.) *standing upon* (see on this accus., when the super-position is first mentioned, note, ch. iv. 2) *the mount Zion* (as in ch. xi., the holy city is introduced as the seat of God's true Church and worship, so by a similar figure (not the same, for thus Mount Zion would be outside the *vads*, and thus given to the Gentiles) the holy mountain Zion is now chosen for the site of the display of God's chosen ones with Christ, the Son of David, whose city Zion was), and with Him an hundred and forty-four thousand, having His name and the name of His Father (observe the tacit assumption that all understand Who is imported by the Lamb) *written on their foreheads* (first observe the contrast: the nations of the earth, constrained to receive the mark of the beast on their forehead and hand, and the Lamb's elect, marked with His name and that of His Father. The question next meets us, Are these 144,000 identical with the same number in ch. vii. 4? This question clearly must not be answered merely by the absence of a defining article here, to identify these *χιλιάδες* as those there spoken of. For it might well be,

that the reader should be meant to identify the two in his mind, by recognizing the marks common to the two, without the note of identification being expressly set in the text. The presumption certainly is that the same number occurring here, representing as there the elect and first-fruits of the church, here as there also inscribed on their foreheads with the seal of God in the one case, and His Name in the other, must be descriptive of the same body of persons. And this view, if acquiesced in here, will reflect back considerable light on that former vision of the sealing in ch. vii. Those, as these, will represent the first-fruits or choice ones among God's people, as indeed we have treated them in this commentary, and not the totality of those who shall form the great multitude which no man can number. These, as those, are taken to represent the people of God: their introduction serves to place before us the church on the holy hill of Zion, where God has placed His King, as an introduction to the description of her agency in preaching the everlasting Gospel, and her faithfulness amidst persecutions). *And I heard a voice out of heaven as a voice of many waters* (reff.), and as a voice of great thunder (ch. vi. 1): and the voice which I heard (was) as of harpers harping with (the ἐν of investiture, cf. ch. vi. 8, ix. 19 and notes) *their harps. And they sing [as it were] a new song* (i. e. if the *ὡς* be retained, they sing what sounded like a melody unheard before. The subject to ᾄδουσιν is of course not the 144,000, but the heavenly harpers. On the subject of their song, see below) *before the throne and before the four*

τοῦ ὁ θρόνου καὶ ἐνώπιον τῶν τεσσάρων ζώων καὶ τῶν ^{p gender, ch. v. 13 al.}
 πρεσβυτέρων καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο μαθεῖν τὴν ^{q = 1 Cor. vi. 20, ch. v. 9 (ἐκ).} ῥῶδην εἰ μὴ
 αἱ ἑκατὸν τεσσεράκοντα τέσσαρες χιλιάδες ^{r ch iii 4 reff. s = here only see 2 Cor. xi 2. Ἄβελ.} οἱ ἡγόρασ-
 μένοι ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς. ⁴ οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ
 ἐμολύνθησαν. ^s παρθένοι γάρ εἰσιν. οὗτοι οἱ ^t ἀκολου-
 ῇρχε, Suidas. t Matt. viii. 19 || L.

των is written twice in **N**. om και των πρεσβυτερων C: aft και ins ενωπιον **N**.
 ουδε εις B a b c d e 51. rec ηδυνατο, with [P] B (f?) g 1. 18. 34 (2. 16. 37.
 40-1-2-7, e sil) Meth Andr: txt ACN rel Orig Areth. (13' def.) om αι **N**^{3a} a 1 n.
 om τεσσαρες C: μαν(sic) **N**¹.
 4. om ουτοι ειςιν A vulg-ms æth. rec aft 2nd ουτοι ins εισιν, with B rel syr-dd
 copt Meth Andr Areth Cyr Primas: om ACPN n 1. 38 vulg(with am &c, agst fuld al)
 arm Orig Andr-a Ambrst. om οι **N**.

living-beings and the elders (the whole heavenly symbolism remaining as before, while the visions regarding God's temple and Mount Sion and the holy city are going forward. I would call the attention of the reader to the fact, essential to the right understanding of the vision, that the harpers and the song are in heaven, the 144,000 on earth): and no one was able to learn the song (to apprehend its melody and meaning, so as to accompany it and bear a part in the chorus) except the hundred and forty-four thousands who (the gender is *πρὸς τὸ σημαίνον*, see ref.) were purchased (reff. and ver. 4) from the earth (the song has regard to matters of trial and triumph, of deep joy and heavenly purity of heart, which none other among men but these pure and holy ones are capable of apprehending. The sweetest and most skilful harmonies convey no pleasure to, nor are they appreciated by an uneducated ear: whereas the experienced musician finds in every chord the most exquisite enjoyment. The unskilled ear, even though naturally distinctive of musical sounds, could not learn nor reproduce them: but both these can be done by those who have ears to hear them. Even so this heavenly song speaks only to the virgin heart, and can be learnt only by those who accompany the Lamb whithersoever He goeth). These are they who were not (the aor. shews that their course is ended and looked back on as a thing past: and serves to confute all interpretations which regard them as representing saints while in the midst of their earthly conflict and trial) defiled with women (see below); for they are (always were and have kept themselves till the time present) virgins (there are two ways of understanding these words. Either they may be figurative, merely implying that these pure ones lived in all chastity, whe-

ther in single or in married life, and incurred no pollution (ref. 2 Cor.): or they may be meant literally, that these purest ones had lived in that state of which St. Paul says 1 Cor. vii. 1, *καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι*. And as between these two meanings I conceive that the somewhat emphatic position of *μετὰ γυναικῶν* goes some way to decide. It is not *ἐμολύνθησαν*, the fact of impurity in allowed intercourse, but *μετὰ γυναικῶν*, that is put forward, the fact of commerce with women. I would therefore believe that in the description of these who are the first-fruits from the earth, the feature of virginity is to be taken in its literal meaning. Nor need any difficulty be found in this. It is on all hands granted that he who is married in the Lord enters into holy relations of which the single have no experience, and goes through blessed and elevating degrees of self-sacrifice, and loving allowance, and preferring others before himself. And as every step of grace assured is a step of glory secured, there is no doubt that the holy married servants of God shall have a peculiar entrance into the fulness of that future Kingdom's employ, which will not be the lot of the single: seeing that in this matter also, the childhood of this state will be the father of the manhood of that one. But neither on the other hand can it be denied that the state of holy virginity has also its peculiar blessings and exemptions. Of these, the Apostle himself speaks of that absence of distraction from the Lord's work, which is apt to beset the married, busy as they are with the cares of a household and with pleasing one another. And another and primary blessing is, that in them that fountain of carnal desire has never been opened, which is so apt to be a channel for unholy thoughts and an access for the tempter. The virgins may thus

u John viii, 21, θοῦντες τῷ ἀρνίῳ τῷ ὅπου αὐτὸς ὑπάγει. οὗτοι ἡγοράσθησαν
 22. xii. 26, ἡ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ ἀπαρχὴ τῷ θεῷ καὶ τῷ ἀρνίῳ, ⁵ καὶ ... τῷ θεῷ
 33. xiv. 4, ἐν τῷ ^x στόματι αὐτῶν οὐχ ^x εὐρέθη ἡ ψεύδους ² ἁμαρτοί εἰσιν. AC² P² B
 v ver. 3, James i. 18 only. Exod. xxiii. 19 al. fr. x 1 Pet. ii. 22. ZEPH. iii. 13. y Ezek. xxxiii. 31. Sir. 1. 2 4. 6.
 w Rom. viii. 23. xi. 16. xvi. 5. 1 Cor. xv. 20, 23 xvi. 15. James i. 18 only. Exod. xxiii. 19 al. fr. x 1 Pet. ii. 22. ZEPH. iii. 13. y Ezek. xxxiii. 31. Sir. 1. 2 4. 6.
 xx 24. z Jude 24 reff Psa. xiv. 2. 7. 30-2. 34 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B².

εἰς B a to f j k l 13. 30-2. 40-7-8. 50. 82. 90 Orig Areth. rec υπαγει, with [P]^N
 B rel Orig Meth: txt AC l m n 16. ins υπο ιησου bef ηγορασθησαν B rel syr-dd
 Areth: om AC² g m n 34-6 (1. 35, e sil) vulg copt arm Orig, Meth Andr Ps-Ath.
 om απο των ανθρωπων C. απ αρχης N 39. ins εν bef τω αρνιω N¹.
 5. ουχ ευρεθη bef εν τω στοματι αυτων B rel copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas: txt AC[P]^N
 g h n 1. 36. 49 (m 37 B², e sil) vulg Orig Meth Andr. rec (for ψευδος) δολος,
 with 1 Andr-a: txt AC[P]^N B rel vss Orig, Meth Andr Areth Jer. rec aft αμαρτοι
 ins γαρ, with N B rel vulg-ed (with am² demid tol lips-6) syr-dd copt Orig, Meth Andr
 Areth: om AC[P]¹ 17 am¹ (with fuld harl lips).—om αμαρτοι εἰσιν 36. rec aft
 εἰσιν ins ενωπιον του θρονου του θεου, with vulg-ed; ουτοι εἰσιν οι ακολουθουντες τῷ
 αρνιω 34. 35 (Del) 47 Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]^N B rel am (with fuld harl tol &c)
 syr-dd copt Orig, Meth Andr Jer.

have missed the victory over the lusts of the flesh: but they have also in great part escaped the conflict. Theirs is not the triumph of the toil-worn and stained soldier, but the calm and the unspottedness of those who have kept from the strife. *We* are perhaps more like that which the Lord intended us to be: but they are more like the Lord Himself. And if He is to have round Him a peculiar and closer band, standing with Him on Mount Sion, none will surely grudge this place to those who were not defiled with women. Among these will be not only those who have lived and served Him in holy virginity, but also the dear children whom He has claimed from us for Himself, the youths and maidens who were gathered to His side before the strife began: before their tongues had learned the language of social falsehood, or their good names been tarnished with the breath of inevitable calumny. There is one meaning which these words will not bear, and which it is surprising that any Commentator should ever have attached to them; viz. that μετὰ γυναικῶν refers to the woman mentioned below, ch. xvii. So Bp. Wordsworth, Lectures, p. 284: "They have not been defiled with women. What women? it may be asked. If we proceed, we read of the woman seated on the Beast, and of the harlotry of the woman, with whom the Kings of the earth commit fornication. And soon we see her displayed in all her meretricious splendour. There then is the reply." Similarly in his notes ad loc. The fact, that an indefinite plural sometimes points to a singular, is, as in all other figures of speech, substantiated by the undoubted requirements of the particular context: whereas here the whole context is against it: the following παρ-

θένοι γὰρ εἰσιν carrying its decisive condemnation): these (are) they that follow the Lamb wheresoever (for this use of ὅπου, see reff.) he goeth (ἔν seems to have lost its peculiar force, and to have been joined to the ὅπου preceding, so that an indicative after it did not offend the ear.

The description has very commonly been taken as applying to the entire obedience of the elect, following their Lord to prison and to death, and wherever He may call them: so Cocceius, Grot., Vitringa, Wolf (who cites the oath of soldiers, ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς στρατηγοῖς ὅπου ποῦ ἔν ἔχωσιν), Bengel, De Wette, Hengstb., Ebrard: but this exposition is surely out of place here, where not their life of conflict, but their state of glory is described. The words, as Aug. (in a beautiful passage, De sancta Virginitate, c. 27, vol. vi. p. 410 f., in which however he rhetorically mingles both meanings), Andreas, Züllig, Stern, Düsterd., are used of special privilege of nearness to the Person of the Lamb in glory): these were purchased from men as a first-fruit to God and to the Lamb (all have been thus purchased: but these specially as and for the purpose of being a first-fruit. The ref. James treats of a different matter, the purchase of all the redeemed as the first-fruits of creation. But these are a first-fruit among the purchased themselves), and in their mouth was not found falsehood: they are blameless (the Apostle has before him the words of Ps. xiv. 1 ff., so strikingly similar: τίς κατασκηνώσει ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ ἁγίῳ σου; πορευόμενος ἁμώμος, λαλῶν ἀλήθειαν ἐν καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, ὃς οὐκ ἐδόλωσεν ἐν γλώσσῃ αὐτοῦ. These stand on Mount Sion, with Him who eminently fulfilled this character, and being in all things like Him).

6 Καὶ εἶδον [ἄλλον] ἄγγελον ^a πετόμενον ἐν ^b μεσουρα- ^a so (-o-) ch. iv. 7 reff.
 νήματι, ^c ἔχοντα ^d εὐαγγέλιον ^d αἰώνιον ^e εὐαγγελίσαι ^f ἐπὶ ^b ch. viii 13
 τοὺς ^g καθημένους ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ ^f ἐπὶ πᾶν ^h ἔθνος καὶ ^c constr., Luke vii 40. xii.
^h φυλὴν καὶ ^h γλῶσσαν καὶ ^h λαόν, ⁱ λέγων ^k ἐν φωνῇ ^{60.} John xvi.
 μεγάλη Φοβήθητε τὸν θεόν καὶ ¹ δότε αὐτῷ ¹ δόξαν, ὅτι ^{12.} 2 John
 ἦλθεν ἡ ^m ὥρα τῆς ⁿ κρίσεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκυνήσατε ^{12.} 3 John
 τῷ ^o ποιήσαντι τὸν ^o οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν ^o γῆν καὶ ^o θάλασ- ^d here only.
 σαν ^{13.} ch. iv. 1 al. fr. ^g = Matt iv. 16. Luke i. 79. Judith v. 3. ^h ch. v. 9 reff. ^e act., ch. x. 7
ⁿ = ch. xvi. 7. xix. 2. Jude 16. isa. xxxiv. 8 (a). ¹ ch. xi. 13 reff. ^m 1 John ii. 18 reff.
^o Acts iv 24. xiv. 15. Exod xx. 11.

6. om αλλον N¹ B rel Orig Andr-p Areth Ambr: ins AC[P]N³⁰ g h 10-7. 51 Br (26. 49, e sil) vss Andr-a Cyp², ins aft αγγελον 34 (35?) Andr-coisl. rec
 πετωμενον, with [P] B 1 n 1. 32-6 (Beh's-5-mss Br, e sil): πεταμενον N: txt AC rel
 Orig Andr Areth. μεσουρανισματι 1: μεσουρανισματι N¹(txt N^{3a}). ευαγ-
 γελισασθε N h n 10. 34-5-6. 49 Orig. rec om 1st επι, with B rel Orig Andr Areth:
 ins AC[P]N 34 (35?) Andr-coisl. rec (for τους καθημενους) τους κατοικουντας,
 with A f n 51 (syr-dd copt) Andr-a, τους καθημενους και τους κατοικουντας 36, τους
 καθημενους τους κατοικουντας 1, τοις καθημενοις j 38: txt C[P]N B rel vulg Orig Andr
 Areth Cyp¹. rec om 3rd επι, with n 1. 34(-6, e sil) Andr-a: ins AC[P]N B rel
 vulg syr-dd Orig Andr Areth Cyp¹ Primas.
 7. rec λεγοντα, with 1. 17 (Br, e sil) am(and others) syr-dd Orig: om N: txt
 AC[P] B rel vulg(with fuld &c) copt Andr Areth. om εν A. for θεον,
 κυριον B rel vulg-ed Areth: txt AC[P]N g h n 10-7. 49 (1. 37 Br, e sil) am syr-dd copt
 Orig Andr Cyp¹. om αυτου 1. for τω ποιησαντι, αυτον ποιησαντα B: τον
 ποιησ. Orig: αυτον τον ποιησ. rel Andr-a Areth: txt AC[P]N g h l 10-6-7. 34 (1. 35-
 6-7. 49 Br, e sil) Andr, αυτω τω ποιησαντι 18. 38-9.—πρησαντι(sic, but corr'd) N¹.
 ins την bef θαλασσαν N B rel Orig Andr Areth: om AC[P] g (1).—θαλασσας 1.

6—13.] *Three Angels appear in mid-heaven, announcing three details of the period of the coming prophecy. A proclamation of the blessedness of the holy dead.* These four announcements form the text and the compendium of the rest of the book: see Prolegg. § v. parr. 57 ff. And I saw an[other] angel (besides those already mentioned) flying in mid-heaven (see ch. viii. 13), having the everlasting gospel (such and no other is the meaning of εὐαγγέλιον αἰώνιον, notwithstanding that it is anarthrous. From this latter circumstance no argument can be derived in the case of a word which had become so technical an one: even in Rom. i. 1, we have ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ; and in no place in the N. T. does the word occur in any other than the technical sense of "the Gospel." Besides which, the epithet αἰώνιος here, if nothing else, fixes it to this meaning. Düsterd., wishing to evade the prophetic sense, would render it, a message of good tidings (viz. regarding the Lord's coming) determined by God from everlasting. And so Grot. ("bonum nuntium jampridem a Deo definitum"), Ewald, Züllig, Hengstb., al. I should have thought such a rendering only needed mentioning to be repudiated. Ch. x. 7, which is adduced to justify it,

is quite beside the purpose. See there.

The epithet αἰώνιος, here only applied to the Gospel, belongs to it as from everlasting to everlasting, like Him whose word it is: in contrast to the enemies of God whose destruction is in view) to preach (see reff.) to ("over," throughout the extent of, and thus "upon." Or we may justify it as in reff., by the signification "with reference to," "towards." Ch. x. 11, which is referred to by Düsterd., is not to the point) those that sit (reff.) upon the earth, and to every nation and tribe and tongue and people (cf. Matt. xxiv. 14, κηρυχθήσεται τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, εἰς μαρτυρίαν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ τότε ἕξει τὸ τέλος), saying with a loud voice, Fear God and give Him glory (the message of repentance ever accompanies the hearing of the Gospel among the nations; cf. the first preaching of our Lord and of His Forerunner, Matt. iv. 17, iii. 2, and St. Paul's message to the Thessalonians, 1 Thess. i. 9), because the season of His judgment is come (see the citation from Matt. xxiv. above: the time of the end is close at hand when this great era of Christian missions is inaugurated: see below): and worship Him who made the heaven and the earth and

p ch. viii. 10.
 xvi. 4. (viii.
 17 reff.)
 Prov. viii. 24.
 q here only.
 1 ch xviii 2
 Isa. xxi. 8.
 Jer. xxviii.
 (li.) 8.
 s ch. xvi. 19.
 xviii. 5.
 xviii. 2.
 Dan. ix. 27.
 t Jer xxviii.
 (li.) 7. xxviii.
 1 (xxv. 13).
 u = see ver. 10.
 v w. acc., ch
 xiii 4 reff
 w ch. xiii. 14.
 15 reff
 x ch xiii. 16
 (reff)
 y = ch xvi 19 xix 15 see ver 8, note.
 1 Cor. xii. 24. Heb iv. 2. a here only Psal. lxxiv. 8. Jer xxxii 1 (xviii 15) only b ch. xviii.
 6. Isa. li. 17. see Matt xx. 22, 23 q. xxi 39 d.

σαν καὶ ῥ πηγὰς ῥ ὑδάτων. ⁸ Καὶ ⁹ ἄλλος ⁹ δεύτερος ἄγγε-
 λος ἠκολούθησεν λέγων ¹ Ἐπεσεν [ἔπεσεν] ¹⁸ Βαβυλῶν ἡ
⁸ μεγάλη, ἥ ἐκ τοῦ ² οἴνου τοῦ ³ θυμοῦ τῆς πορνείας ³³ ἐκ τοῦ
 αὐτῆς ⁴ πεπότικεν ⁴ πάντα τὰ ⁵ ἔθνη. ⁹ Καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος
 τρίτος ἠκολούθησεν αὐτοῖς λέγων ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ Εἰ τις
¹⁰ προσκυνεῖ τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν ¹¹ εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαμβάνει
¹² χάραγμα ἐπὶ τοῦ ¹³ μετώπου αὐτοῦ ἢ ἐπὶ τὴν ¹⁴ χεῖρα
 αὐτοῦ, ¹⁵ καὶ αὐτὸς πίεται ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ ¹⁶ θυμοῦ τοῦ
 θεοῦ τοῦ ¹⁷ κεκρασμένου ¹⁸ ἀκράτου ἐν τῷ ¹⁹ ποτηρίῳ τῆς

8. rec om δευτερος, with f (90, e sil) vulg: ins A([P]N) B rel syr-dd Andr Areth
 Primas.—αγγελος bef δευτερος [P]N^{3c} h n 6. 10-7-8. 36(omg αλλος) 37. 40-9 (Br?)
 copt arm Andr-p, αγγελος δευτερον C: δευτερος, omg αγγελος, N¹ g. om 2nd επεσεν
 CN^{3a} B rel copt Andr-coisl: ins A[P] g h n 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 42-7-9 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd
 Andr Areth Primas spec. (homœotel N¹ 27, ηκολουθησεν vn 8 and 9: homœotel 9, λεγων
 vn 8 and 9.) rec ins η πολισ bef η μεγαλη, with (39, e sil) æth: om AC[P]N^{3a} B
 rel vulg syr-dd copt arm gr-lat-ff. η μεγαλη bef βαβυλων 1. rec (for η) οτι,
 with 1. 36 (40-1, e sil) Andr Areth: om [P]N^{3a} B rel copt arm: txt AC g 26. 34-5-8.
 50-1 vulg syr-dd æth Andr-coisl. (d illeg.) om του θυμου h 1. ταυτης B a
 e k l 2. 4. 13. 30-2-3-9. 40-2-8. 50. πεπωκαν(sic) N^{3a}. rec om τα, with
 d(perhaps) k 33 (2. 34-9. 41-2, e sil): txt AC[P]N^{3a} B rel Andr Areth.

9. rec (for αλλος αγγελος τριτος) τριτος αγγελος, with vulg(am lips 4-5 al, agst fuld
 al) Areth Cyp Primas: αλλος αγγελος f 1: αλλος τριτος αγγελος 47: txt AC[P]N^{3a}
 B 33(sic, Del) rel syr-dd copt Andr.—ηκολ. bef τριτος N^{1a}. for αυτος, αυτω A
 Primas. rec το θηριον bef προσκυνει, with 1: txt (AC)[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt
 gr-lat-ff.—τω θηριω C g: το θυσιαστηριον A: το ποτηριον f.—προσκυνησει 38. for
 1st αυτου, αυτων C. om 3rd και C f. τω μετωπω N.

10. for εν τω ποτηριω, εκ του ποτηριου A l 6. 39. την οργην A.

the sea and fountains of waters (i.e. turn from idols and vanities to serve the living and true God. The division of the waters into the sea and the fountains is one kept up through this prophecy: cf. ch. viii. 8—11, xvi. 3, 4). And another second angel followed ("Quot res nunciandæ, totidem nuncii," of Grot., is not strictly correct, the last being announced merely by a voice in heaven. But it belongs to the solemnity of this series of proclamations that a separate place and marked distinction should dignify each of them) saying, Babylon the great is fallen, [is fallen] (aor. of that which is past; only to be expressed in English by a perfect), which hath given all the nations to drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication (two things are mingled: 1) the wine of her fornication, of which all nations have drunk, ch. xvii. 2; and 2) the wine of the wrath of God which He shall give her to drink, ver. 10, and ch. xvi. 19. The latter is the retribution for the former: the former turns into the latter: they are treated as one and the same. Grot. and Ewald would render

θυμός venenum; and Ewald and Züllig understand by οἶνου τοῦ θυμοῦ, vini feruidi, neither of which the words will bear. The whole is from Jer. li. (xxviii.) 7, 8, where Babylon is a cup in the Lord's hand of which the nations are made to drink. This is the first mention of Babylon, hereafter to be so much spoken of. I reserve treatment of the interpretation till ch. xvii.: only mentioning by anticipation that Rome, pagan and papal, but principally papal, is intended). And another third angel followed them saying with a loud voice, If any one worshippeth the beast and his image (see above, ch. xiii. 15), and receiveth the mark on his forehead or upon his hand (ch. xiii. 16), he also (καί either 1) may be quasi-redundant, introducing the apodosis merely as an addition to the protasis, or 2) may mean, as well as Babylon. The former sense seems to me the more probable) shall drink (we have the second person πίνειν of the same future form in Luke xvii. 8: see also Ps. lxxiv. 8, cited below) of the wine of the wrath of God, which is mingled (i.e. as E. V. poured into the

ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ^ο βασανισθήσεται ^δ ἐν πυρὶ καὶ ^ο θείῳ ^ε ch. ix. 5 reff.
^ε ἐνώπιον τῶν ^ι ἀγγέλων καὶ ἐνώπιον τοῦ ἀρνίου. ¹¹ καὶ ^δ ch. xvi. 8.
^δ ^{gh} καπνὸς τοῦ ^ι βασανισμοῦ αὐτῶν εἰς αἰῶνας αἰώνων ^ε ch. ix. 17, 18
^h ἀναβαίνει, καὶ οὐκ ^κ ἔχουσιν ^κ ἀνάπαυσιν ^κ ἡμέρας καὶ ^f ch. ix. 10.
^κ νυκτὸς οἱ ^ν προσκυνοῦντες τὸ θηρίον καὶ τὴν ^ω εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ, ^g ch. xv. 10.
καὶ ^ι εἴ τις λαμβάνει τὸ ^χ χάραγμα τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ. ^h Isa. xxi. 10.
¹² ^m Ὡδε ἡ ^m ὑπομονὴ τῶν ^m ἁγίων ἐστίν, ⁿ οἱ ^{ορ} τηροῦντες ⁱ ch. ix. 5.
τὰς ^ο ἐντολὰς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ^{pa} πίστιν ^q Ἰησοῦ. ¹³ Καὶ ⁱⁱ ch. x. 7, 10,
ἤκουσα φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λεγούσης, Γράψον Μακάριοι ^{ch} ch. iv. 8.
οἱ νεκροὶ οἱ ^ι ^ν Κυριῷ ἀποθνήσκοντες ^s ἀπ' ἄρτι. ^{ναί}, ¹ Cor. xvi.
^q Rom. iii. 22. Gal i. 16. iii. 22. James ii. 1 see Mark xi. 22. ²² al.
^s Matt. xxiii. 39. xxvi. 64. John (i. 52 rec.) xiii. 19. xiv. 7 only. ^r see 1 Thess. iv. 16. 1 Cor. xv. 18.

βασανισθονται A d f 36 copt. rec ins αγιων bef αγγελων, with B rel lux (and some other mss of vulg) Andr Areth Cyp₂ Primas; so, but omg των, f: αγγελων αγιων, omg των, C[P]N g 38. 92 vulg syr-dd Cyp₁: των αγγελων των αγιων B^r: ins αγιων both bef and aft αγγελων 36: txt A 26 spec vulg-ms copt aeth.—(homœotel ενωπ. 1.)

11. rec αναβαινει bef εις αιων. αιων., with copt Cyp₂ Primas: om ε. α. α. αν. 39: txt AC[P]N B rel am (with fuld lips-5 tol lux) syr-dd Andr Areth Cyp₁ spec.—αιωνα αιωνος C n 18: αιωνα αιωνων [P] f l 1. 4. 6. 19. 26-7. 48 Andr Areth: αιωνας των αιωνων N. om το (bef χαραγμα) 1.

12. rec om η, with 4. 33 (2. 35-6-9. 48. 51 B^r, e sil) Areth: ins AC[P]N B rel Andr. rec ins ωδε bef οι τηρουντες, with d(perhaps) 1. 10-6. 49 (1 n 17-9. 37-9 B^r, e sil) Andr-a: om AC[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas. (των τηρουντων N g 36-8.) om του θεου 1.

13. λεγουσης bef εκ του ουρ. N 38 (insg μοι aft λεγ.). rec aft λεγουσης ins μοι, with h n 1. 10-7. 36 (47-9 B^r, e sil) Andr Primas: om AC[P]N B rel am (with fuld lips) syr-dd copt aeth Andr-coisl Areth lat-ff. for κυριω, χριστω CP.

cup. From the almost universal custom of mixing wine with water, the common term for preparing wine, putting it into the cup, came to be κεράννυμι. Hence the apparent contradiction in terms here, τοῦ κεκρασμένου ἀκράτου (and in Ps. lxxiv. 8 below). On Od. ε. 98, κέρασσε δὲ νέκταρ ἐρυθρόν, Eustathius says, οὐ δηλοῖ κρᾶμά τι, ἀλλ' ἂν τι τοῦ ἐνέχει κέεται. See Wetst., who gives several citations in which κεράννυμι itself is derived from κέρας, a drinking-horn) pure (unmixed: cf. Galen in Wetst., οἶνον ἀκρατον εἶναι λέγομεν, ὃ μὴ μέμικται τῷ ὕδωρ, ἢ παντάπασιν ὀλίγον μέμικται. The figure of the cup of the Lord's wrath is found in ref. Ps., ποτήριον ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου, οἶνον ἀκράτου πλήρες κεράσματος . . . πίνονται πάντες οἱ ἀμαρτωλοὶ τῆς γῆς, from which this is evidently taken) in the cup of His anger, and shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the angels and in the presence of the Lamb (see ch. xx. 10, and ref. Isa. from which the imagery comes. De Wette is certainly wrong in interpreting ἐνώπιον "nach dem Urtheile," "in the judgment of." It is literal, and

the meaning as in Luke xvi. 23 ff., that the torments are visible to the angels and the Lamb). And the smoke of their torment goeth up to ages of ages (see ref. Isa., and Gen. xix. 28, which doubtless is the fountain-head: also ch. xix. 3): and they have not rest (from torment) day and night who worship the beast and his image; and whoever (from speaking collectively the solemn declaration becomes even more solemn by individualizing) receives the mark of his name. Here (viz. in the inference to be drawn from the certainty of everlasting torment to all who worship the beast or receive his mark: that all the saints of God must refuse to do either) is the endurance of the saints, who keep (the independent nom. construction, see reff.) the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus (gen. objective, which has Him for its object: compare ref. Mark). And I heard a voice out of heaven (whose, is not told us, and it is in vain to speculate: certainly not, as Hengstb., from the spirits of the just themselves. The γράφων would rather point to the angel who reveals the visions to the Seer, ch. i. 1, and compare ch.

t ch ii. 7. &c. ^t λέγει τὸ ^t πνεῦμα, ^{uv} ἵνα ^{vw} ἀναπαήσονται ἐκ τῶν ^x κόπων
 xxii. 17. αὐτῶν· τὰ γὰρ ^y ἔργα αὐτῶν ^y ἀκολουθεῖ ^y μετ' αὐτῶν.
 u — ch. xxii. 14. see Winer.
 edn 6, § 53 6. 14 Καὶ εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ νεφέλη λευκή, καὶ ^z ἐπὶ τὴν ^z νεφέλην ^m καὶ
 v indic. constr., ch. iii. 9 reff. ^z καθήμενον ^a ὁμοιον υἱὸν ἀνθρώπου, ἔχων ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ^m καὶ
 w ch. vi. 11 reff. ^z see ch. ii. 2. a ch. i. 13. DAN. vii. 13. x. 16 Theod. (Ezek. i. 26.)
 y ch. vi. 8 reff. z see Matt. xxvi. 64 || Mk. 10-3. 16

λεγει bef ναι B rel: om ναι N¹ 16. 34: txt AC[P]N^{8a} g n (1. 4. 17-8-9. 26. 38. 47, e sil).
 —for ναι, καὶ k 33 (35-6?). rec (for ἀναπαῆσ.) ἀναπαυσ., with [P] B rel: txt
 ACN.—rec -σονται, with [P] rel Andr: txt ACN B k l n 1. 16. 36. 50 Areth.
 rec (for γαρ) δε, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N⁸ g 18. 26. 38 vulg syr-dd Primas
 spec Aug. om 2nd αυτων 1. 90 Br.

14. om καὶ εἶδον (hom.) N. rec καθήμενος ὁμοιος, with h² l 1. 10 (16. 37. 47-9
 Br, e sil) syr-dd Andr: καθήμενος ὁμοιος 39: καθήμενον ὁμοιος m 30: καθήμενος ὁμοιον
 a: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas Tich. for νιοι, νιον AN
 B b c f k 2. 9. 13. 27. 30-2-3. 41-2: om 40: νιος 1: υἱὸν n: νιον [P] 26: txt C rel
 Synop Andr Areth.—for νιο ἀνθρώπου, ἀνθρώπων j. εχον CN^{3a}: εχοντα N¹ e g n
 13. 26-7. 42²: εχοντι 38. την κεφαλην A a b d e k n 30-8. 40-7. 90 Andr-coisl:
 txt C[P]N B rel Synop Andr Areth.

iv. 1, and xix. 9), saying, Write, Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord henceforth (the connexion is not difficult. The mention of the endurance of the saints brings with it the certainty of persecution unto death. The present proclamation declares the blessedness of all who die not only in persecution, but in any manner, in the Lord, in the faith and obedience of Christ. And the special command to write this, conveys special comfort to those in all ages of the church who should read it. But it is not so easy to assign a fit meaning to ἀπ' ἄρτι. That it belongs to the former sentence, not to the following one, is I conceive plain: few will be found to join with Lambert Bos, Exercitt. p. 209, in connecting it to ναι, and making it = ἀπηρτισμένως, absoluté. And, thus joined with the former sentence, it must express some reason why this blessedness is to be more completely realized from this time when it is proclaimed, than it was before. Now this reason will quickly appear, if we consider the particular time, in connexion with which the proclamation is made. The harvest of the earth is about to be reaped; the vintage of the earth to be gathered. At this time it is, that the complete blessedness of the holy dead commences: when the garner is filled and the chaff cast out. And that not on account of their deliverance from any purgatorial fire, but because of the completion of this number of their brethren, and the full capacities of bliss brought in by the resurrection. Nor can it legitimately be objected to this, that the pres. part. ἀποθνήσκοντες requires a continuance of that which is imported by it: that the deaths implied must follow after the proclama-

tion. For no doubt this would be so, the proclamation itself being anticipatory, and the harvest not yet actually come: but on the other hand so much must hardly be built upon the pres. part., which is so often used to designate a class only, not to fix a time). Yea, saith the Spirit (the utterance of the voice from heaven still continues. The affirmation of the Spirit (reff.) ratifies the blessedness proclaimed, and assigns a reason for it), that they shall rest (the ἵνα gives the ground of the μακάριοι, and the construction with an indic. fut. is a mixed one compounded of "that they may," and "in that they shall." The future ἀναπαήσονται from ἀναπαύω is formed as κατακάησμαι from κατακαύω. It seems not to be elsewhere found) from their labours: for their works follow with them (γάρ, which has seemed so difficult, and which apparently gave rise to the δέ of the rec., is in fact easily explained. They rest from their labours, because the time of working is over, their works accompanying them not in a life of activity, but in blessed memory: wherefore not labour, but rest is their lot. Wetst. quotes from Aboth vi. 9, "hora discussus hominis non comitantur eum argentum aut aurum aut lapides pretiosi aut margaritæ, sed lex et opera bona").

14—20.] The vision of the harvest and the vintage. 14—16.] The harvest. And I saw, and behold a white cloud, and upon the cloud (ἐπὶ with accus. on first mention, see ch. iv. 2 note), one sitting like to the Son of man (i. e. to Christ, see ch. i. 13 note. This clearly is our Lord Himself, as there), having upon his head a golden crown (in token of His victory being finally gained: see ch.

αὐτοῦ στέφανον χρυσοῦν καὶ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ ^b δρέπανον ^b ὀξύ. ^c 15 καὶ ἄλλος ἄγγελος ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ κράζων ^c ἐν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ τῷ ^z καθημένῳ ^z ἐπὶ τῆς ^z νεφέλης ^c Πέμψον ^c τὸ ^c δρέπανόν σου καὶ ^f θέρισον, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα ^f θερίσαι, ^c ὅτι ^z ἐξηράνθη ^o ἡ θερισμός τῆς γῆς. ¹⁶ καὶ ⁱ ἔβαλεν ^o καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης τὸ δρέπανον αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν

...ἐπὶ
τὴν α.

g = here only. (Matt. xxi. 19, 20 al.)

16.

i ver. 19. see Mark ii. 22. vii. 33 al.

h =

Matt. ix. 37, 38. see Matt. xiii. 30, 39.

b here, &c (7 times). Mark iv. 29 only. Deut. xvi. 9. ch. i. 16^{eff.} ch. v. 2. vv. 7, 9. e JOEL iii. 13 (ἐξαπο-στέλλω). Mark iv. 29. f Matt. xxv. 24 al. 1 Kings viii. 12. Jer. xxvii. (1.)

15. κραζων bef εκ του ναου A: om εκ του ναου e: for ναου, συνον l n 1. aft ναου ins αυτου N. rec μεγαλη bef φωνη, with (1) (30-9. 40-1, e sil) copt: txt AC[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd arm Andr Areth.—μεγ. τη φ. 1. rec aft ηλθεν ins σοι, with l¹ 16 (39, e sil); συν 1. 17. 36 Andr-a: om AC[P]N B 33(sic, Del) rel vss Andr Areth Primas. rec ins του bef θερισαι, with (N) a e h 10-8. 30-3-8. 49. 90 (g k 26. 34-7-9 B¹, e sil): om AC[P] B rel Andr Areth.—(for θερισαι, θερισμού N 38. 41.) 16. rec την νεφελην, with C[P] rel Andr-coisl Areth: τη νεφελη B a b d f l 26. 33. 50. 90: txt AN j 16¹. 36-8. 47 Andr.—(homœotel in 1, επι to επι.)

xix. 12) and in His hand a sharp sickle. And another angel (besides the three angels before mentioned: no inference can be drawn from this that the Sitter on the cloud is a mere angel) came out of the temple, crying out in a loud voice to him that sat upon the cloud, Put forth (send = ἀποστέλλειν, ref. Mark. De W.'s objection, that the sitter on the cloud cannot be Christ Himself, because He would not be introduced receiving a command from an angel, may be well answered, as Dusterd., that the angel is only the messenger of the will of God. And I may add what to me makes this reply undoubtedly valid, that the command is one regarding the times and seasons, which the Father hath kept in his own power) thy sickle (the whole is a remembrance of our Lord's own saying in ref. Mark: see below) and reap: because the time to reap is come, because the harvest of the earth (θερισμός for that which is to be reaped: as in the first ref.) is dried (perfectly ripe, so that the stalk is dry = παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός, Mark iv. 29: = also the fields being λευκαὶ πρὸς θερισμόν ἤδη, John iv. 35: which they can only become by losing their moisture. The distinction in the passages cited by Mr. Elliott from Bernard ("magis sicce ad ignem quam albæ ad messem"), and Pope Gregory X. ("agerque potius arscere videatur ad ignem, quam albescere inveniat ad messem") does not seem likely to exist. The passage of Hermas, book iii. sim. 3, 4; Luke xxiii. 31; John xv. 6, do not apply; trees, and not grain, being there spoken of). And he that sat upon the cloud put in (ref.) his sickle upon (into, from above) the earth, and the earth was reaped (to what does this harvest refer? Is it the

ingathering of the wicked, or of the saints, or of both together? Each of these has examples in Scripture symbolism. The first, in Jer. li. 33, where it is said of Babylon, "It is time to thresh her, yet a little while and the time of her harvest is come:" and as appears, Joel iii. 13, though the reference seems rather there to be to the vintage, and the LXX render τῇ τρυγητός: the second, in Matt. ix. 37, 38; Mark iv. 29; Luke x. 2; John iv. 35: the third, in Matt. xiii. 30, 39. The verdict of Commentators is very much divided. There are circumstances in the context which tell both ways. The parallelism with the vintage, which follows, seems to favour a harvest of the wicked: but then on the other hand, if so, what is the distinction between the two ingatherings? And why do we read of the casting into the winepress of God's wrath in the second case, and of no corresponding feature in the other? Again, why is the agency so different—the Son of man on the white cloud with the golden crown in the one case, the mere angel in the other? Besides, the two gatherings seem quite distinct. The former is over before the other begins. On the whole then, though I would not pronounce decidedly, I must incline to think that the harvest is the ingathering of the saints, God's harvest, reaped from the earth: described here thus generally, before the vintage of wrath which follows. And thus we have at least these two visions in harmony with the character of this section, which contains the mingled agency and fortunes of the Church and of its enemies; thus this harvest answers to the great preaching of the everlasting gospel above, vv. 6, 7, while the following vision fulfils the denuncia-

κ = ch. viii. 3
 ref.
 l usage aft.
 εἶδον, see
 ch. ii 26; ref.
 m = Acts xxi.
 φ. 1 kings
 iv 6 al
 n as above (m).
 Matt. xxv. 6.
 Eph. iv 31.
 Heb. v. 7.
 ch xxi. 4
 only.
 o ver 15.
 p here bis.
 Luke vi 44
 only. Deut.
 xxi. 21.
 q here only.
 Gen. xl. 10.
 r here only.
 zech. xi. 8
 Symm. =
 Thucyd. ii 19 al.
 u here Joe. ch. xix. 15. Matt. xxi. 33 only. Isa. lxiii 2.
 s Matt. vii. 16. Luke vi. 44 only. Gen. xl. 10, 11.
 t ver. 16 (ref.).
 AC P N B
 b to n, 1.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10-3. 16
 to 19 26-
 7. 30.
 32 to 42.
 47 to 51.
 90 B^r.

17. εἰληθεν . . . οὐν bef αγγελος 1.

for εἰληθεν, ηλθεν B.

om τω C.

18. om εἰληθεν A am (with fuld &c, agst demid tol lipss &c) Ansb Ruf: ins C [P] N B rel vss Andr Areth.

rec om δ, with [P] N B rel Andr Areth: ins AC, qui habet vulg. for κρανη, φωνη AN B c g 38 vulg æth: txt C [P] rel. for λεγων, λεγω N¹: om f.

2nd το δρεπανον bef σου N: σου in both places (P) e. Steph om της αμπελου, with 1: ins AC [P] N B rel vulg syr-dd Areth. ηκμασεν η σταφυλη B rel æth Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC [P] N 1 n 1 (εκμ.) 10-6-7-8. 36-9 (a g h 37-8. 47-9 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr Jer. for αυτης, της γης B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: txt AC [P] N n 1. 10-7-8-9. 36 (a g h 37-8 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr-p Jer.

19. for εις την γην, επι της γης N j 38. for last του, σου (but corrd) N¹. rec (for τον μεγαν) την μεγαλην, with N rel Andr: μεγαλην, omg την, 33: την μεγαν 30: του μεγαλου 36: om 34 æth Vict: txt (A) C [P] B b to f h j k 1. 10. 38. 40-1-2-8-9. 50-1. 90 B^r, τον μεγα A. (of these b j k 1. 49² B^r have τον ληνον: AC [P] B &c την λ. and τον μεγ.)—τον θυμον b.

tions of wrath on those who worship the image or receive the mark of the beast, vv. 8, 11. And thus too we bring this description into harmony with our Lord's important parable in Mark iv. 29, where the very words are used of the agency of Christ Himself when the work of grace is ripe, whether in the individual or in the church. But while thus inclined, I will not deny that the other view, and that which unites both, have very much to be said for them).

17—20.] *The vintage of wrath.* And another angel (the ἄλλος may perhaps refer to the three angels who have already appeared in this vision: or, which is more probable, referring to the last-mentioned Agent, may be a general term, not necessarily implying that He was a mere angel) came out from the temple which was in heaven (from which come forth God's judgments: see ch. xi. 19), having himself also (as well as that other: but the καὶ αὐτός rather raises a distinction between the two personages than sets them on an equality: there is some slight degree of strangeness, after what has gone before, in this angel having a sickle) a sharp sickle. And another angel came out from the altar (viz. that elsewhere several times mentioned, ch. vi. 9, viii. 3,

xvi. 7, in connexion with the fulfilment of God's judgments in answer to the prayers of His saints), he who hath power over the fire (viz. that on the altar; the same angel who is introduced ch. viii. 3—5 as presenting the prayers of the saints, and casting some of the fire of the altar to the earth as introductory to the judgments of the trumpets), and he cried with a great cry to him who had the sharp sickle (it is to be observed that the whole description of this angel, coming from the altar of vengeance, differs widely from any thing in the former part of the vision, and favours the idea that this vintage is of a different nature from that harvest), saying, Put in thy sharp sickle, and gather the bunches of the vine of the earth, because her grapes are ripe. And the angel (no such expression is used above, ver. 16. There it is δ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῆς νεφέλης. All these signs of difference are worthy of notice) put in (reff.) his sickle into the earth, and gathered the vine of the earth, and cast (viz. what he had gathered) into the great winepress of the wrath of God (the curious combination, τὴν ληνὸν . . . τὸν μέγαν, is only to be accounted for by an uncertainty in the gender of the substantive (it is masc. Gen. xxx. 38, 41 ed. Rom. See Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 4, b),

20 καὶ ^{vw} ἐπατήθη ἡ ^{uv} ληνὸς ^x ἔξωθεν τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ^v ἐξήλθεν αἷμα ἐκ τῆς ^u ληνοῦ ^y ἄχρι τῶν ^z χαλινῶν τῶν ἵππων, ^a ἀπὸ ^b σταδίων χιλίων ἑξακοσίων.

XV. ¹ Καὶ εἶδον ἄλλο ^c σημεῖον ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ μέγα ^y καὶ ^d θαυμαστόν, ἀγγέλους ἑπτὰ ἔχοντας ^{ef} πληγὰς ἑπτὰ ^z τὰς ^f ἑσχάτας, ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς ^g ἐτελέσθη ὁ θυμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

² Καὶ εἶδον ^b ὡς θάλασσαν ⁱ ὑαλίνην ^k μεμυγμένην πυρί, ^{13. John vi. 19. xi. 18. ch. xxi. 16 (1 Cor. ix. 24) only +. 2 Macc. xi. 5 B. xii. 9 al3. xii. 1, 3. d Matt xxi. 42 + Mk. (from Ps. cxviii. 23). John ix. 30. 1 Pet. ii. 9. ver. 3 only. e = ch. ix. 20 reff. f ch. xxi. 9. g = ch. x. 7 reff. h ch. i. 10 al. ff. i here bus. ch. iv. 6 only +. (-λος, ch. xxi. 18.) k ch. vii. 7 reff.}

20. for *επατηθη, επιθη* 1. AC[P] B rel Andr-coisl.

rec (for *εξωθεν*) *εξω*, with **N** n 1 (37, e sil) Andr: txt *διακοσιων* **N**¹ 26.

and perhaps a tendency, when emphatically subjoining an epithet describing greatness, to substitute the worthier gender. Any thing corresponding to this feature is entirely wanting in the previous description of the harvest. See on it, ch. xix. 15, and the prophetic passages in reff. especially Isa. from which the symbolism comes). And the winepress was trodden (reff.) outside the city (see below), and blood (so Isa. lxiii. 3) came forth from the winepress as far as to the bits of the horses, to the distance (ref.) of a thousand six hundred stadii (it is exceedingly difficult to say what the meaning is, further than that the idea of a tremendous final act of vengeance is denoted. *The city* evidently = ἡ πόλις ἡ ἔξωθεν of ch. xi. 2 (not that of ib. 8, see note there), viz. *Jerusalem*, where the scene has been tacitly laid, with occasional express allusions such as that in our ver. 1. The blood coming forth from the treading of the winepress is in accordance with the O. T. prophecy alluded to, Isa. lxiii. 3. It is in the depth, and the distance indicated, that the principal difficulty lies. The number of stadii is supposed by some to be the length of the Holy Land as given by Jerome (Ep. (cxcix.) ad Dard., 4, vol. i. p. 971) at 160 Roman miles. But the great objection to this is, that 160 miles = 1280, not 1600 stadii. Another view has been, that 1600 has been chosen as a square number, = 40 × 40, or 4 × 400, or 4 × 4 × 100. Victorinus explains it "per omnes mundi quatuor partes: quaternitas enim est conquaternata, sicut in quatuor faciebus et quadriformibus et rotis quadratis." He gives a very curious interpretation of the depth,—"usque ad principes populorum." We may fairly say, either that the number is assigned simply to signify completeness and magnitude (in which case some other apocalyptic numbers which have been

much insisted on will fall perhaps under the same canon of interpretation), or else this is one of the riddles of the Apocalypse to which not even a proximate solution has ever yet been given).

CH. XV., XVI. THE SEVEN VIALS. And herein, XV. 1—8.] PREFATORY: *the description of the vision*, ver. 1: *the song of triumph of the saints victorious over the beast*, vv. 2—4: *the coming forth of the seven angels and delivering to them of the seven vials*, vv. 5—8.

And I saw another sign in heaven great and marvellous, seven angels having seven plagues which are the last (plagues), because in them is completed the wrath of God (I have adopted an unusual arrangement to throw the ὅτι into connexion with ἑσχάτας, for which epithet it renders a reason. It is to be observed 1) that this verse is evidently only a compendious description of the following vision: for the angels themselves are not seen till ver. 6, and do not receive the vials containing the plagues till after they are seen: 2) that the whole of God's wrath in *final judgment* is not exhausted by these vials, but only the whole of His wrath in sending plagues on the earth *previous to the judgment*. After these there are no more plagues: they are concluded with the destruction of Babylon. Then the Lord Himself appears, ch. xix. 11 ff.). And I saw as it were a sea of glass mingled with fire (see ch. iv. 6 and note: not merely *glassy*: the ὅς indicates the likeness: it was as it were *made of glass*. The addition *μεμυγμένην πυρί* is probably made as bringing into the previous celestial imagery an element belonging to this portion of the prophecy, of which *judgment* is the prevailing complexion. The fact, that the personages of the former heavenly vision are still present, ver. 7, seems to remove all doubt of this being *the same sea of glass* as that

1 pres. part., see note.
 m constr., here only. so
 Livy vii. 8 (fin.), 'victoriam ferre ex aliquo.'
 n ch. xiii. 17.
 o 1 Cor. xiv. 7.
 ch. v. 8.
 xiv. 2 only.
 Ps. xxxiii. 2.
 p 1 Thess. iv. 16. 1 Chron. xvi. 42.
 q ch. v. 9 reff.
 r Exod. xiv. 15.
 s Josh. xiv. 7 A. Ps civ. 28.
 v ch. xvi. 7 xix 2. see Ps. xviii. 10.
 10. Rom. ii. 33 Heb. iii. 10. Ps. xvi. 21 cxliv 17. Deut. 1 c.
 in ABN.) z John xii. 28. Ps. lxxxv. 9 (12).
 t Exod. xv. 11. Sir. xi. 4 ver. l reff.
 w = John vii. 28. Deut xxxii. 4.
 y Jer. x. 7 F. compl. &c. (not u ch i 8 reff. x Acts xiii.)
 b lo n. 1.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10-3. 16
 to 19. 26-7. 30.
 32 to 42.
 47 to 51.
 90 B¹.

καὶ τοὺς ^{lm} νικῶντας ^m ἐκ τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ^m ἐκ τῆς εἰκόνης αὐτοῦ καὶ ^m ἐκ τοῦ ἁριθμοῦ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ ἐστῶτας ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν ἑαλὴν, ἔχοντας ὁ κιθάρας τοῦ θεοῦ. ³ καὶ ἄδουσιν τὴν ᾠδὴν ὁ Μωυσέως τοῦ δούλου τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν ᾠδὴν τοῦ ἀρνίου λέγοντες Μεγάλα καὶ θαυμαστὰ τὰ ἔργα σου, κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ. δίκαιαι καὶ ἀληθιναὶ αἱ ὁδοὶ σου, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐθνῶν. τίς οὐ μὴ φοβηθῇ, κύριε, καὶ δοξάσει τὸ ὄνομα σου.

CHAP. XV. 2. νικῶντας C. ἐκ της εικονος και εκ του θηριου B b to g j (k) 2. 4. 6. 13. 26-7. 33(-9). 40-1-2-8. 50: om 2nd εκ N k l 16. 38-9. rec (aft 4th και) adds εκ του χαραγματος αυτου, with 1. 17. 33. 47 (m n 34 5-6-9, e sil) Andr Areth, m n 1 add και also: om AC[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt aeth Haymo Ruf. ins tas bef κιθαρας (repetition of termn of precedg word) B b d e j l m 13-6. 26-7. 35-8. 48. 50-1. 90. ins ky bef του θυ N.

3. homœotel in C, from θεου ver 2 to θεου ver 3. αδοντας N. rec om 1st του, with B rel: ins A[P]N h n 1. 10. 37-8. 51 B¹. λεγοντας 1. βασιλεu, omg δ, N¹. rec αγων: * αλωνων CN¹ g 18 vulg syr-dd arm-ed-marg lat-ff: cœlorum

am: εθων A[P]N^{3a} (but altered again to αιων.) B rel copt aeth Andr Areth Cyp.

4. rec aft φοβηθη ins σε, with rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P] B f 1. 36. 47 am (with demid fuld tol) aeth arm Andr Cyp Primas.—for ου μη, σε ου N g. rec δοξαση, with N rel Andr: txt AC[P] B g m n 6. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 32-9. 47-8. 50-1. 90

before described ch. iv. 6, in immediate connexion with which the four living-beings were mentioned), and the conquerors (the pres. part. has the force of simple designation, as so often in this book) of (see ref.: they have come victorious out of the strife: cf. Thuc. i. 120, ἀγαθῶν δέ, ἀδικουμένων ἐκ μὲν εἰρήνης πολέμῳ, εἰ δὲ παρασχόν, ἐκ πολέμου πάλιν ζυμβῆναι) the beast and of his image and of the number of his name (i.e. of the temptation to worship his image and to receive the mark consisting of the number of his name, ch. xiii. 17, 18), standing on (does ἐπὶ import actually "upon," so that they stood on the surface of the sea, or merely on the shore of? On every account the latter seems the more probable: as better suiting the heavenly imagery of ch. iv., and as according with the situation of the children of Israel when they sung the song to which allusion is presently made. The sense may be constructionally justified by ch. iii. 20, and viii. 3: the fact of ἐπὶ having a genitive in the latter place not setting it aside as a precedent) the sea of glass, having harps of God (sacred harps, part of the instruments of heaven used solely for the praise of God. We have had them before mentioned in ch. v. 8, xiv. 2). And they sing the song of Moses the servant of God (i.e. a song similar to that song of

triumph which Moses and the children of Israel sung when delivered from the Red Sea and from the Egyptians, Exod. xv. In Exod. xiv. 31, Moses is called, as here, the servant (θεράποντι, LXX, as also in Heb. iii. 5) of God (see also Num. xii. 7; Josh. xxii. 5 (ὁ παῖς κυρίου)): and this song is formed on the model of parts of that one: see below) and the song of the Lamb (it is not meant that there are two distinct songs: the song is one and the same; and the expression which characterizes it betokens, as do so many other notices and symbols in this book, the unity of the Old and New Test. churches. Their songs of triumph have become ours: the song of Moses is the song of the Lamb. In this great victory all the triumphs of God's people are included, and find their fulfilment), saying (the song is a reproduction of several portions of the O. T. songs of praise), Great and wonderful are thy works (Ps. cx. 2, cxxxviii. 14, LXX), Lord God Almighty: just and true are thy ways (Ps. cxliv. 17; Deut. xxxii. 4 in Moses' song), thou King of the nations (or, of the ages (see 1 Tim. i. 17 reff. and note). The confusion has apparently arisen from the similarity of ΑΙΩΝΩΝ (ἐθνῶν) and ΑΙΩΝΩΝ: but which was the original, it is impossible, in the conflict of authorities, to decide): who can but fear (Thee), O Lord (these two clauses are

² ὄνομά σου; ὅτι ὁ μόνος ^a ὁ σίος, ὅτι πάντα τὰ ^b ἔθνη ^{bc} ἤξουσιν καὶ ^{bc} προσκυνήσουσιν ^c ἐνώπιόν σου, ὅτι τὰ ^d δικάϊώματά σου ^e ἐφανερώθησαν. ⁵ Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἠνοήγη ὁ ναὸς τῆς ^f σκηνῆς τοῦ ^f μαρτυρίου ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. ⁶ καὶ ἐξῆλθον οἱ ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοι [οἱ] ἔχοντες τὰς ἑπτὰ ^g πληγὰς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, ^h ἐνδεδυμένοι ⁱ λίνον καθαρὸν ^k λαμπρόν, καὶ ^h περιεζωσμένοι περὶ τὰ ^l στήθη ^h ζώνας ^h χρυσᾶς. ⁷ καὶ ^f ἐν ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ^g ζώων ἔδωκεν τοῖς ἑπτὰ ἄγγελοις ἑπτὰ

^g ver. 1. ^h ch. i. 13 (reff.). ⁱ Matt xii. 20 (from Isa. xlii. 3) only. ^j Prov. xxxi. 13. ^k = ch. xix. 8 reff. ^l Luke xviii. 13. xxiii. 48. (plur., so Job xxxix. 20. see ch. i. 13) ^m John xiii. 25. xxi. 20 only. ⁿ Dan. ii. 32.

^a = Heb. vii. 26 reff. (see note.) ^b Psa. i. c. ch. iii. 9. ^c = Rom. v. 18 only. Baruch ii. 19. see note. ^d = Rom. iii. 21 al. ^e (Jer. xl. [xxxiii.] 6 only.) plur., ch. i. 19 reff. ^f Acts vii. 44 only. Exod. xxvii. 21 al. freq.

Areth. for *σίος, ἅγιος* B rel Andr: *sanctus et pius* demid, simly syr-dd: txt AC[P]N n 1. 36-8. 47 Andr-a Areth. for *παντα τα εθνη, παντες* B rel Andr-coisl: *παντα* (alone) g: txt AC[P]N n 10-7. 36. 49 (b 1. 37-8 Br, e sil) vss Andr Cypr Primas. (d def.) for *τα δικ., δικαιωματα ενωπιον N.*

5. for *μετα ταυτα, μετ αυτα* C 1. rec ins *ιδου bef ανοιγη*, with vulg copt Primas: om AC[P]N B rel syr-dd æth Andr Areth. (d def.)

6. *εξηλθαν* C. rec [aft *αγγελοι*] om *οι*, with N B (b d e 1. 48, e sil) Andr-a: ins AC[P] rel Andr Areth. (*οι αγγ. οι επτα οι εχ. 9.*) om *εκ του ναου* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: *εκ τ. ν. bef οι εχ. τ. ε. π. b:* ins AC[P]N (h 10) 17. 36. 47-9 (g 1 n 1. 37-9. 41 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas Tich.—for *ναου, ουνου* h 10.—om *εχοντες* . . . ναου e. *καθαρους λινους λαμπρους N:* for *λινον, λιθον* AC 38-marg 48 (mss ment by Andr Bede) am(with demid fulg lipss): om æth[: txt P B(-νον) rel vss Andr Areth Primas.] rec aft *καθαρον* ins *και*, with 32 (2 Br, e sil) vulg-ed Primas: om AC[P]N B rel vss Andr Areth. om last *και* 1. om *περι* 1.

7. om *εν N* 1. 12-6. om 2nd *επτα N.*

from Jer. x. 7, but not in the LXX [ABN]. The title "King of nations" is especially appropriate, as it is God's judgments on the nations, and their effects on them, which are the theme of the Church's praise), and shall glorify (the construction is a mixed one, compounded of *tis ou mh doxasē* and *tis ou doxasēi*) thy Name? because Thou only art holy (*δσιος* is only used of God here and ch. xvi. 5: hence the var. *ἅγιος*. Düsterd. quotes from the Schol. in Eurip. Hec. 788, τὸ πρὸς θεοὺς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γενόμενον δίκαιον ὅσιον καλοῦμεν. This first *ἔτι* grounds the *tis ou mh* in the *attributes of God*): because all the nations shall come and worship before thee (so it is declared in reff. LXX. This second *ἔτι* grounds the *tis ou mh* in *matter of fact*): because Thy righteous acts (= Thy judgments: thy deeds of righteousness acted out towards the nations, both in the publication of the Gospel and in the destruction of Thine enemies) have been made manifest (the aor. as so often lately, looking back over the past and regarding it as matter of history, simply as the past. This third *ἔτι* grounds the *παντα τα εθνη ηξ.* in its immediately exciting cause—the manifestation of God's judgments). And after these things I saw, and there was opened the temple of the tabernacle of witness in heaven

(see on ch. xi. 19, xvi. 17. The *ναὸς* is the holy place of the tabernacle, to which latter the appellation τοῦ μαρτυρίου is here peculiarly appropriate, seeing that the witness and covenant of God are about to receive their great fulfilment): and there came forth the seven angels (viz. who were before mentioned: the *οἱ* does not point out any particular seven, such as the archangels. On the other hand, if we omit the second *οἱ*, we must not violate the force of the anarthrous participle by saying "the seven angels who had," *οἱ εχοντες*. The E. V. here is strictly correct) which had (or, "having." This was their office: but they had them not yet) the seven plagues out of the temple (cf. ch. xiv. 15, 17), clad in linen (the remarkable reading *λιθον* can hardly be genuine, though strongly attested: see digest. There is a precedent for *λιθον ενδεδυμενοι* in Ezek. xxviii. 13) pure (and) glistening (the well-known clothing of angels and heavenly beings, see Acts x. 30 (i. 10), ch. xix. 8; Matt. xvii. 2 ||, xxviii. 3), and girt round their breasts with golden girdles (being in this like our Lord Himself as seen in vision, ch. i. 13). And one from among the four living-beings (appropriately to the symbolic meaning of these *ζωα* as the representatives of *creation*, see notes on ch. iv. 7, 11, inasmuch

m ch. v. 8 reff. ^m φιάλας χρυσᾶς, ⁿ γεμούσας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ ^o θεοῦ ^o τοῦ
 n ch. iv. 6, 8
 reff. w. ἐκ,
 Matt. xxiii. 25.
 o ch. vii. 2 reff.
 p ch. viii. 5
 (reff.) only.
 q ch. viii. 4 reff.
 isa. vi. 4.
 r ch. xxi. 11.
 23. 25 od.
 xi. 28, 29
 (34, 35)
 3 Kings viii. 11.
 s ch. vii. 3 reff.
 t ver. 1.
⁸ καὶ ^p ἐγεμίσθη ὁ ^a ναὸς ^{...αὐνα}
 ζώντος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. ⁸ καὶ ^p ἐκ τῆς ^a ναὸς
 ναὸς ^q καπνοῦ ^p ἐκ τῆς ^r δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ^p ἐκ τῆς
 δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν ναόν,
^s ἄχρι ^t τελεσθῶσιν αἱ ἑπτὰ ^t πληγαὶ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων.
 XVI. ¹ Καὶ ἤκουσα μεγάλης φωνῆς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ

at end add *αμην* N n 12. 46.

8. ins *εκ του beφ καπνον* B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: *του b*: om AC[P]N g n 1.
 10-7-8 (h l 37-8-9. 47-9, e sil) vulg copt Andr Primas. (*εδυνατο*, so AC a *to e*
 j k l 2. 6. 9. 17. 26-7. 30-2-8. 48. 50-1. 90 Areth.) *εις τον ναον* bef *εις-*
ελθειν N. for *εις τ. ναον, εν τω ναω 1*. for *αχρι, αχρις ου C*. om *επτα*
 (bef *αγγελων*) [P] 1.

CHAP. XVI. 1. rec *φωνης* bef *μεγαλης*, with [P]N rel vulg Andr Primas: txt AC B
 b c d f g j 4. 13-9. 27. 41-2-8. 50. 82 copt Areth. om *εκ του ναου* B rel syr-dd
 Areth: ins AC[P]N g h n 10-3. 34-8. 49 (m 1. 35-6. 40 Br, e sil) vulg Andr.—(for *ναου*,

as the coming plagues are to be inflicted on the objects of creation) gave to the seven angels seven golden vials (the φιάλη was a shallow bowl or cup, usually without a stand or foot, in which they drew out of the κρητήρ or goblet: so Plato, Crito p. 120 a, χρυσαῖς φιάλαις ἐκ τοῦ κρητήρος ἀρτυρόμενοι. The Schol. on Il. ψ. 270 explains it οὐ τὸ παρ' ἡμῶν ποτήριον, ἀλλὰ γένος τι λέβητος ἐκπέταλον ἐκ παντὸς μέρους δυνάμενον ἔχειν. Cf. Eurip. Ion 1181 ff.; Xen. Cyr. v. 2. 7), full of the wrath of God who liveth for ever and ever (this addition serves, as in ch. i. 8, to give solemnity to the fact related). And the temple was filled with smoke from (arising from) the glory of God and from His might (i.e. from His presence, in which His glory and His might were displayed. The description calls to mind similar ones in the O. T., e.g. Ps. xviii. 8 f.; Isa. lxxv. 5. See also below), and no one was able to enter into the temple (cf. 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; Exod. xl. 34, 35) until the seven plagues of the seven angels should be finished (the passages above referred to give the reason: because of the unapproachableness of God, when immediately present and working, by any created being. See Exod. xix. 21. When these judgments should be completed, then the wrathful presence and agency of God being withdrawn, He might again be approached. Many other meanings more or less far-fetched have been given, but where Scripture analogy is so plain, the simplest is the best).

CH. XVI. 1—21.] THE SEVEN VIALS. See the general remarks on ch. viii. 1 for all questions common to the three great series of visions. The following special particulars are here to be noticed: 1) In

the description, ch. xv. 1, which first introduces these plagues, they are plainly called τὰς ἑπτὰ πληγὰς τὰς ἑσχάτας. There can then be no doubt here, not only that the series reaches on to the time of the end, but that the whole of it is to be placed close to the same time. And this is borne out by the particulars evolved in the course of the visions themselves. For we find that they do not in point of time go back, but at once take up the events of the former visions, and occur during the times of the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when the mystery of God should be finished. 2) As in the seals and in the trumpets, so here again, there is a marked distinction between the first four and the following three. As there, so here, the objects of the first four are the earth, the sea, the springs of waters, and the sun. After this the objects become more particularized: the throne of the beast, the river Euphrates, with the reservation of that peculiar and vague character for the seventh, which seems to belong to it in all the three series. 3) As before, so now, there is a compendious and anticipatory character about several of the vials, leading us to believe that those of which this is not so plain, partake of this character also. For example, under the third vial we find an acknowledgment of the divine justice in making those drink blood who shed the blood of saints and prophets. This, there can be little doubt, points on to the judgment on Babylon, in whom, ch. xviii. 24, was found the blood of saints and prophets, and of all that had been slain on the earth. Again, under the sixth we have the same great gathering to battle which is described in detail, ch. xix. 17—21. And finally, under the seventh, we

λεγούσης τοῖς ἐπτα ἄγγελοις Ὑπάγετε καὶ ἑκχέετε τὰς ἑπτα ^mφιάλας τοῦ θυμοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν. u = here, &c., 8 times only. (Matt. ix. 17 al.)

² Καὶ ἠπήλθεν ὁ πρῶτος καὶ ἑξέχεεν τὴν ^mφιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν γῆν· καὶ ἐγένετο ἕλκος κακὸν καὶ ^xπουν- v = ch. x. 9. xii 17 al. Matt. xiv. 25. w Luke xvi. 21. ver. 11 only. Exod. ix. 9, &c. Deut. xxviii. 35. x = Deut. 1 c. Job ii. 7. πασων νοῦσων ἐστὶ y = Luke 1. 65. iii 2.
 ρὸν ^y ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τοὺς ἔχοντας τὸ ^zχάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας τῇ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ.

³ Καὶ ὁ δεῦτερος ἑξέχεεν τὴν ^mφιάλην αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν

πανόρατον, Theognis 274. see Matt. vi. 23 vii. 17, 18. z ch. xiii. 17 reff.

ουρανον 13.) om και bef εκχ. 1. rec εκχεατε, with B rel: εκκεχετε f(appy): txt AC[P]N f 1. 12. rec om 2nd επτα, with [P] h n 1. 10-7. 34. 49 (35-7 B, e sil) syr-dd copt: ins ACN B rel vulg Andr Areth Primas. om του θεου 1.

2. om 1st clause (hom) N¹. rec (for εις) επι, with h n 1. 10-7. 34 (35-7. 49 B, e sil) copt Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N^{3a} B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas. (d illeg.) ελκον N¹. πουντρον και κακον N: om κακον A. rec (for επι) εις, with h n 1. 10-7. 34 (35-7. 49 B, e sil) vulg copt Andr: txt AC[P]N B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth Primas. om τους εκ. τ. χαρ. τ. θηρ. 1(Del). rec τη εικονι αυτου bef προσκυνουντας, with (16. 41, e sil) syr-dd copt: txt AC[P](N) B rel vulg arm Andr Areth Primas.—την εικονα προσκυνουντας αυτου 1: προσκ. την εικονα αυτου N.

3. rec aft δευτερος ins αγγελος, with B rel vss Andr Areth: om AC[P]N^{3a} g 18 am (with demid fuld tol lipss) æth Primas.—for κ. ο δευτ. εξεχ., εις N¹.

have a compendious anticipatory notice of the judgment of Babylon, hereafter, ch. xvii., xviii., to be described in detail,—and of the great day itself in ver. 20, also hereafter (ch. xx. 11—15) to be resumed at more length. 4) As we might expect in the *final* plagues, we have no longer, as in the trumpets, a portion of each element affected, but the whole. 5) While in the first four vials the main features of the first four trumpets are reproduced, there is one notable distinction in the case of the *fourth*. While by the plague of the fourth trumpet, the sun, moon, and stars are partially darkened, by that of the fourth vial the power of the sun is *increased*, and the darkening of the Kingdom of the beast is reserved for the *fifth*.

The minor special features will be noticed as we proceed. On the whole, the series of the vials seems to bear a less general character than the other two. It takes up a particular point in the prophecy, and deals with symbols and persons previously described. It belongs, by its very conditions, exclusively to the time of, or to days approaching very near to the time of, the end: including in itself the subsequent details as far as the end of ch. xx.: without however noticing most important features and considerable prophetic periods.

1.] *Introductory.* And I heard a great voice out of the temple (from the fact ch. xv. 8, that the divine Presence is filling the temple, and that none might enter into it, this voice can be no other than the

divine voice. The words *ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ* may have been erased (as in var. readd.) from the difficulty presented by τοῦ θεοῦ below, none being able to enter during the pouring out of the vials) saying to the seven angels, Go and pour out the seven vials of the wrath of God into the earth (so, previous to the series of trumpets, the angel casts the fire from the altar into the earth, ch. viii. 5).

2.] And the first departed (each angel, as his turn comes, leaves the heavenly scene, and from the space between heaven and earth, empties his vial on the appointed object) and poured out his vial into the earth (the γῆ, which before in ver. 1 was general, is now particular, and correlative with the objects of the other vials, cf. vv. 2, 3, εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν, εἰς τοὺς ποταμούς:) and there came (took place: fell, as E. V.) an evil (κακόν, in itself) and painful (πονηρόν, to the sufferers, ἐπίπονον, Suidas. See reff.) sore upon the men that had the mark of the beast and that worshipped his image (see above ch. xiii. 15—17, xiv. 9, 10. The allegorical and historical interpretations have been very various: see them in Elliott, vol. iv. Notice the parallel with the sixth Egyptian plague, Exod. ix. 8 ff. Cf. Deut. xxviii. 27, 35).

3.] And the second poured out his vial into the sea: and it (the sea, cf. ch. viii. 8, 11: not, "there was," as De Wette: for the question would arise, where? the analogy of the Egyptian plague is surely decisive) became blood as of a dead man

a ch. vii. 8. ὁ ἄγγελος ἔειπεν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἡ ψυχὴ ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα
 b = ch. i. 10 al. ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα
 c = Gen. i. 30. ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα
 d = Gen. vii. 21, 22. Levit. xi. 10. ψ. 5. ποταμούς καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ πηγῶν τῶν ὕδατων καὶ ἔγένετο
 e = ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα
 f = ὡς νεκροῦ, καὶ πᾶσα
 g ch. xv. 4 Heb vii. 26 reff. h onstr. Luke xii. 57. John vii. 24 Job xxxvii. 23. 1 = Matt. xliii. 35. Rom. iii. 15, from Isa. lxx. 7. Ps. lxxviii. 3. k ch. xi. 18 (reff.). 1 Isa. xlix. 26

for *ὡς, ὡς* N: om 1. 46. ψυχῆς A. rec (for *ὡς*) *ὡς*, with [P]N B h l n 1. 10-7. 36-8. 49 (16. 37-9. 41-2 B^r, e sil) Andr Areth. *vivens* vulg copt: om rel Andr-coisl Primas: txt AC g syr-dd. rec om *τα*, with [P]N B rel Andr Areth: ins AC syr-dd. for *ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ*, ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης N.

4. rec aft *τρίτος* ins ἀγγέλος, with h m 1. 10. 34-8 (n 35-6. 49 B^r, e sil) lips-4 syr-dd copt Andr: om AC[P]N B rel vulg (with am fuld al) æth Areth Primas. for *εἰς, εἰς* N c. rec ins *εἰς* bef *τας* πηγῶν, with B rel Andr Areth; *εἰς* c 18: om AC[P]N g h 10. 49 B^r Primas Ansb. *εγενοντο* A g 36 syr-dd copt Primas: txt C[P]N B rel vulg Andr Areth.

5. for 1st *του, των* (but corrd) N¹. om *των υδατων* 1. rec ins *κυριε* bef *ει*, with (41, e sil) æth: om AC[P]N B rel am (with demid fuld tol lips-5, agst lipss) syr copt Andr Areth Primas. for *ὁ ἦν, ὅς* ἦν B a d e f k 2. 4. 26. 30. 40-1-2-8. rec aft *ἦν* ins *καὶ*, with 1. 32-4. 51 (g 36, e sil): om AC[P]N B rel vulg Andr Areth. rec ins *ὁ* bef *ὅς*, with [P]N B c h n 1. 6. 10 (sic) 17-8. 27. 34-5-6. 47-9. 51 B^r Andr Areth: om AC B rel Andr-coisl.

6. for 1st *αἶμα, αἱματα* N 39. *εδωκας* bef *αυτοις* N.

(blood as when a dead corpse lies in its blood: loathsome and corrupting): and every soul of life (living soul, ref. Gen.: ψυχὴ in its physical sense of animal soul) died, (all) the things in the sea (τὰ is in apposition with and exegetical of πᾶσα ψ. (ὡς)].

4—7.] And the third poured out his vial into the rivers and the fountains of the waters: and they became (it is quite impossible, in the lax construction of the Apocalyptic Greek, to maintain here a distinction, as Düsterd. has done, from the previous ἐγένετο, and to render here, "there came blood." Analogy must be our guide: and the account to be given of the singular is either that it belongs to τὰ ὕδατα, or that the rivers and fountains are taken together, and regarded as neuter in sense though not in construction) blood (that the fact was so, is testified by what follows, in which it is assumed that the sources of ordinary drink have become blood). And I heard the angel of the waters (i. e. the angel who was set over the waters; see reff.: not as Grot., "vocatur angelus aquarum quia in aquas immisit phialam." Schöttgen, h. l., p. 1131 f., gives examples of angels of the earth and of the sea: see also Wolf, h. l. This is more probable than Düsterd.'s idea that the analogy to be followed is that of the four living-beings, and that the angel

symbolized the waters) saying, Thou art righteous who art and wast (as in ch. xi. 17, the καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος is omitted. For the construction, see reff.) holy (I incline against Düsterd., to the usual connexion, viz. the making ὅς belong to ὁ ὢν κ. ὁ ἦν, and not in apposition with δίκαιος. And that which moves me to it is, 1) the extreme improbability of two epithets, δίκαιος and ὅς, both being predicated in such an acknowledgment of an act of justice: and 2) that as I have taken it, it best agrees with the ὅς in ch. xv. 4, where it is predicated of God not as the result of any manifested acts of His, but as an essential attribute confined to Him alone), because Thou didst judge thus (lit., "these things:" viz. the issue mentioned in ver. 4; the turning the drinking-water into blood: "Thou didst inflict this judgment"): because (this ὅς repeats the former ὅς, καὶ following being "and:" not, as it might be taken, "because they, &c., Thou hast also") they shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink (on the form of the inf., πείν, see Winer, edn. 6, § 15, and Anthol. xi. 140. 3, οἷς οὐ σκόμμα λέγειν, οὐ πείν φίλον): they are worthy (these words are made stronger by their asyndetous character). And I heard the altar saying (certainly the simplest understanding of these words

αὐτοῖς δέδωκας ¹ πείν. ^m ἄξιοι εἰσιν. ⁷ καὶ ἤκουσα τοῦ ^m = ch. iii. 4.
 θυσιαστηρίου λέγοντος Ναί, ⁿ Κύριε ὁ ⁿ θεὸς ὁ ⁿ παντο-
 κράτωρ, ^o ἀληθινὰ καὶ ^o δίκαιαι αἱ ^p κρίσεις σου.
 n ch. i. 8 reff.
 o ch. xv. 3 reff.
 p ch. xix. 2

⁸ Καὶ ὁ τέταρτος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν
 ἥλιον, καὶ ^q ἐδόθη αὐτῷ ^r καυματίσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ^s ἐν
 πυρὶ. ⁹ καὶ ^t ἐκαυματίσθησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ^u καύμα μέγα,
 καὶ ^v ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸ ^v ὄνομα τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἔχοντος
 ἐξουσίαν ^w ἐπὶ τὰς πληγὰς ταύτας, καὶ οὐ ^x μετενόησαν
^{xy} δοῦναι αὐτῷ ^y δόξαν.
 q Thess. i. 5.
 John v. 30.
 vii. 24. Isa.
 lvi. 2.
 2 Macc. ix. 18.
 q constr., ch. ii.
 7 reff.
 r here bis. Matt.
 xiii. 6. Mk.
 only r.
 s ch. xiv. 10 al.
 see ch. vi. 8
 reff.
 t constr., Luke
 ii. 8. John
 vii. 24.
 1 Tim. i. 18.
 ch. xvii. 6
 Xen. Mem.
 i. 5. 6.

¹⁰ Καὶ ὁ πέμπτος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν
 θρόνον τοῦ θηρίου· καὶ ^z ἐγένετο ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ ^a ἐσκο-

a ch. vii. 16 only. Isa. xlviii. 4. v ch. xiii. 6 reff.
 x constr., here only. infin. Col. iv. 6. 2 Pet. iii. 2. ver. 19. 1 Kings xvi. 1.
 z constr., Mark i. 4. ix. 3, 7. 2 Cor. vi. 14. Col. i. 18. Heb. v. 12. ch. iii. 2. Josh. ix. 12. see Winer, edn. 6,
 § 45. 5. a ch. ix. 2. Eph. iv. 18 only. Jer. xiv. 2.

rec (for δεδωκας, with [P]N B rel: txt AC. rec (for πείν) πειν, with [P]N B
 rel: ποιεῖν f k 30: txt AC. rec aft αξιοι ins γαρ, with (92?) vulg-ed Areth: om

AC[P]N B rel fuld (with lips-4 tol) Andr.—οπερ αξιοι N: οτι αξιοι 16 copt; ut digni vulg.
 7. rec ins αλλου εκ bef του θυσιαστηριου; εκ B 1 Andr-a; φωνην εκ 36: om AC[P]N
 34(Del) rel fuld (and tol) syr-dd copt Bede.

8. rec aft τεταρτος ins αγγελος, with N rel copt Andr Primas: om AC[P] B a d e f g
 j k l 4. 13-6-9. 26-7. 30-2-7. 48. 50 am (with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd æth Areth. εν
 πυρι bef τους ανθρωπους B a b c e j k l m 2. 4. 6. 13-9. 26-7. 34(-5, e sil)-9. 40-1-2-7-8.
 50-1. 90: om εν N. om εν πυρι 18.

9. aft βλασφημησαν ins οι ανθρωποι B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: om AC[P]N g 1.
 18². 36-8. 50¹ (n, e sil) vulg copt Andr Primas. for το ονομα, ενωπιον A.
 (του θεου του, so N^{3c}(p): N¹ illegible.) ins την bef εξουσίαν A[P]N h 10. 36-7. 49
 B^r Andr-p: om C B rel Andr Areth. for ου, ουχι C.

10. rec aft πεμπτος ins αγγελος, with h m n (1) 10-7. 34 (35-6-7. 49 B^r, e sil) copt
 Andr Areth Primas: om AC[P]N B rel am (with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd æth Tich Bede.
 —for πεμπτος, αγγελος 1.

is, that they involve a personification of the altar. On the altar are the prayers of the saints, offered before God: beneath the altar are the souls of the martyrs crying for vengeance: when therefore the altar speaks, it is the concentrated testimony of these which speaks by it), **Even so, Lord God Almighty: true (reff.) and just are Thy judgments.**

8, 9.] And the fourth poured out his vial upon (no longer *eis*) the sun: and it was given to it (the sun: not “to him,” the angel, as, strangely enough, Bengel and Hengstb., and Elliott, iii. 361). The angels throughout this vision are simply the pourers out of the vials, not the executors of the plagues. Besides which, the verb *καυματίζω*, in a sentence where the sun is mentioned, can have but one reference: see reff.) to scorch men (the *τούς* is probably generic merely. If it is to be assigned a meaning, it may be, the men who have received the mark and number of the beast. But the other is more likely) with (the *ἐν* of investiture: the

element in which the scorching takes place) fire (not, as Hengstb., understanding *αὐτῷ* of the angel, some fire other than the sun: but the glowing increased heat of the sun itself), and men were scorched with great heat (on the accus. after the passive verb which takes a double accus. in active, see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 32. 5), and blasphemed the name of God who hath power over these plagues, and did not repent to give Him glory (on the inf. epexegetic, see Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 1).

10, 11.] And the fifth poured out his vial upon the throne of the beast (given to it by the dragon, ch. xiii. 2. That is, on the spot where the power and presence of the beast had its proper residence): and his kingdom (those lands which owned his rule) became darkened (as in the ninth Egyptian plague, Exod. x. 21 ff., the darkness is specially sent over the land, not occasioned by any failure of the lights of heaven). And they (the inhabitants: the subjects of the beast. They

τωμένη, καὶ ^b ἐμασῶντο τὰς γλώσσας αὐτῶν ^c ἐκ τοῦ ^d πό- ACPNB
 nou, ¹¹ καὶ ^e ἐβλασφήμησαν τὸν ^{ef} θεὸν τοῦ ^f οὐρανοῦ ^c ἐκ A 60 B, 1.
 τῶν ^d πόνων αὐτῶν καὶ ^c ἐκ τῶν ^g ἑλκῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ οὐ 2. 4 6 9.
^h μετενόησαν ^h ἐκ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν. 10 3. 16
¹² Καὶ ὁ ἕκτος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν ⁱ ποτα- to 19 26-
 μὸν τὸν ⁱ μέγαν τὸν Εὐφράτην· καὶ ^k ἐξηράνθη τὸ ὕδωρ 7. 30-2.
 αὐτοῦ, ἵνα ¹ ἐτοιμασθῇ ἡ ¹ ὁδὸς τῶν βασιλέων τῶν ἀπὸ 34 to 42.
^m ἀνατολῆς ^m ἡλίου. 47 to 51.
¹³ Καὶ εἶδον ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ 90 Br.
 τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ ⁿ ψευδο-
 σκότισμην ^{3c} B e n 16. ...ετοι-
μασθη η
P.

εσκοτισμένη ^{3c} B e n 16. rec εμασῶντο, with B rel Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N a
 b d f g h k l 1. 2. 6. 9. 10-3-6-7-8-9. 37. 50. (εμασῶντο 1: εμασῶν 16.) for εκ, απο N.
 11. om εκ των ελκων αυτων (hom) N. om εκ των εργαων αυτων N.
 12. rec aft εκτος ins αγγελος, with h m n 10-7. 34 (35-6-7-9. 49 Br, e sil) copt Andr
 Areth Primas Tich: om AC[P]N B rel am (with fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd aeth. for
 μεγαν, μεγα 1. om τον (bef ευφρατην) [P]N B rel Areth: ins AC f g m n 18. 34.
 47. 51 (1. 35?) Andr. (d def.) om 2nd αυτου 1. 12. 36. rec ανατολων, with
 A h n 10-7. 38. 49 (1. 37 Br, e sil) copt Andr: txt CN B rel Areth.
 13. for ειδον, εδοθη N. homœotet in C 9. 27, στοματος 1st to 2nd: in N¹ 1st to 3rd.

are by and by identified with those who had received his mark) **chewed their tongues** (the word *μασάμαι* is confined to the comedians and later Gr. prose. ἡ τῶν γλωσσῶν μάσησις τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς οὐδύνης δηλοῖ, says Andreas) from (ἐκ, of the source of the action: see refl.) **their pain** (viz. under which they were previously suffering: not, that occasioned by the darkness, which would not of itself occasion pain: see below), and **blasphemed the God of heaven** (see ch. xi. 13) **by reason of** (ἐκ as above) **their pains and their sores** (these words bind on this judgment to that of the first and following vials, and shew that they are cumulative, not simply successive. The sores, and pains before mentioned, are still in force), and **repented not of** (see ch. ix. 20, 21) **their works**.

12.] And the sixth poured out his vial upon the great river Euphrates: and its water was dried up, that the way of the kings which come from the rising of the sun might be prepared (notice, but not to be blindly led by it, the analogy of the sixth trumpet, also having reference to the river Euphrates. In order to understand what we here read, we must carefully bear in mind the context. From what follows under this same vial, we learn that the kings of the whole earth are about to be gathered together to the great battle against God, in which He shall be victorious, and they

shall utterly perish. The time is now come for this gathering: and by the drying up of the Euphrates, the way of those kings who are to come to it from the East is made ready. This is the only understanding of these words which will suit the context, or the requirements of this series of prophecies. For to suppose the conversion of Eastern nations, or the gathering together of Christian princes, to be meant, or to regard the words as relating to any auspicious event, is to introduce a totally incongruous feature into the series of vials, which confessedly represent the "seven last plagues." Andreas explains it as above: and so Bleek, Ewald, De Wette, Düsterd., al.).

13—16.] And I saw (notice the curious reading of N, which derives some interest from the absence of any participle to signify "going forth") out of the mouth of the dragon (who is still in the prophetic scene, giving his power to the beast, ch. xiii. 2) and out of the mouth of the beast and out of the mouth of the false prophet (viz. the second beast of ch. xiii. 11 ff. Cf. ch. xix. 20, xx. 10) **three unclean spirits like frogs** (in shape and character. In the entire absence of Scripture symbolism,—for the only mention of frogs besides this is in, or in regard to, the relation of the plague in Egypt,—we can only explain the similitude from the uncleanness, and the pernicious noise, of the frog. Daubuz quotes from Philo, De Sacr. Abel

...ακα- προφήτου ° πνεύματα τρία ° ἀκάθαρτα ° ὡς ° βάτραχοι ° ch xiii 2.
 θαρ. C. 14 εἰσὶν γὰρ ° πνεύματα ° δαιμονίων ° ποιοῦντα ° σημεῖα, Matt x. 1 al.
 AN B a fr. Zech.
 to n, 1. 2. ἃ ° ἐκπορεύεται ° ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς ° οἰκουμένης, xii 2.
 4. 6. 9. ἃ ° ἐκπορεύεται ° ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς ° οἰκουμένης, p ch i. 10. xv.
 10-3. 16 ° ὅλης, ° συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ° εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ° ἡμέρας q here only.
 to 19. 26- ° ὅλης, ° συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς ° εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ° ἡμέρας Exod. vii. 2.
 7. 30-2. τῆς ° μεγάλης τοῦ ° θεοῦ τοῦ ° παντοκράτορος. 15 Ἴδου 7 al. constr.
 34 to 42. τῆς ° μεγάλης τοῦ ° θεοῦ τοῦ ° παντοκράτορος. 15 Ἴδου ch iv. 1 al. fr.
 47 to 51. ἔρχομαι ° ὡς ° κλέπτης· μακάριος ὁ ° ἡγρηγορῶν καὶ ° τηρῶν r Luke i. 33.
 90 B^r. ἔρχομαι ° ὡς ° κλέπτης· μακάριος ὁ ° ἡγρηγορῶν καὶ ° τηρῶν s ch. ix 20.
 τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ καὶ ° βλέπωσιν t ch xiii. 13
 τὴν ° ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ. 16 καὶ ° συνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ° εἰς ref.
 τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον ° Ἐβραϊστὶ Ἀρμαγεδών. u Zech. vi. 8, 9.

v Matt. ii. 7. John xix 33.

w ch. iiii. 10 ref

x John xi. 52 ch. xix. 17.

xx 8 2 Kings

y = ch. vi. 17 ref

z ch. i. 8 ref.

a ch. iiii. 3 ref.

b ch. iiii. 2, 3

c = Eph. iv. 3. 2 Tim. iv. 7 Jude 6

Prov. iv. 23.

d plur. impers. see ch. xii. 6.

e Luke

xii 20.

f Rom. i. 27 only. = Exod xx. 28.

g ch. ix 11 ref.

h Luke

ακαθαρτα bef τρια B rel Andr-coisl Areth : om ακαθαρτα 49 : txt ACN g h l n 10-7-8.
 36-8 (1. 2. 16. 37-9 B^r, e sil) vulg syr-dd Andr Primas. rec (for ως βατραχοι)
 ομοια βατραχοις, with 1² : ως βατραχους j 18. 36-8 Areth : εἰωσει βατραχους (but 1st ei
 erased) N¹. ωσει βατραχοι N^{3a} : om 1¹ : txt A B rel Andr.

14. rec (for δαιμονίων) δαιμονων, with h n 1. 10-61-7-8. 34-8 (35-6-7. 49 B^r, e sil)
 Andr : txt AN B rel Andr-coisl Areth. Steph (for α εκ.) εκπορευεσθαι, with N¹ g
 18 Andr-a : εκπορευονται N^{3a} B l 16. 36-9 : txt A rel Andr Areth.—1 has εκπορευεσθαι,
 but with a written over by an ancient hand. for επι, εις N. rec ins γης και
 τας bef οἰκουμένης, with 1-corr Andr-a : γης 1¹ : om AN B rel syr-dd Andr Areth.
 rec om τον (bef πολέμου), with 1. 34-(5-6 ?) : ins AN B rel Andr Areth. rec (aft
 ημερας) ins εκεινης, with B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Promiss Primas : om AN f g 38
 vulg copt Tich.

15. ερχεται N¹ (but corrd eadem manu ?) 38. 47 Primas. aft δ ins τε N¹.
 βλεπουσιν 1.

16. συνηγαγον N. om 1st τον N. for τοπον, ποταμον A. for αρμαγεδων,
 μαγεδων B rel vulg (some mss) Tich-mss : txt AN¹ g h l m 1. 10-3-6-7-8. 34-(5-6 ?)-7-
 8-9. 47-9 B^r, αρμεγ. (but corrd) N^{3a} : αρμαγ. g m 1 (Treg, not Del). 47 al, hermag. am
 Tich.—rec -γεδων, with B f 17 syr-dd Primas : txt AN rel vulg.

et Cain, 19, vol. i. p. 176, ἀλλὰ ταῖς
 ἀψύχοις δόξαις, λέγω δὲ βατράχοις πιεσ-
 θείς, ἤχον καὶ ψόφον ἔρμον πραγμάτων
 ἀποτελοῦσι: from Cicero ad Att., xv. 15,
 “ranæ ῥητορεύουσι:” and from Artemi-
 dorus ii. 15, βάτραχοι δὲ ἄνδρας νόητας
 κ. βαμολόχους προσσημαίνουσι), for (γάρ
 gives a reason for ὡς βάτραχοι) they are
 spirits of devils doing miracles (this is a
 plain declaration of the interpretation of
 these three, and by it the limits of inter-
 pretation are clearly set, and must not be
 overpassed. The explanation of these as
 any men, or sects of men, is therefore
 clearly wrong) which go forth over the
 kings of the whole earth (it is the uniform
 testimony of the prophetic Scriptures that
 the antichristian power shall work signs
 and wonders as means of deceiving man-
 kind: see Matt. xxiv. 24; 2 Thess. ii. 9)
 to gather them together to the war of
 the great day of Almighty God (that
 day viz. which is explained in detail in the
 subsequent part of the prophecy, ch. xix.
 17 ff. This great gathering of the beast
 and the kings of the earth against God

and the Lamb, is the signal for the imme-
 diate and glorious appearing of the Lord.
 And therefore follows an exhortation to be
 ready, and clad in the garments of righte-
 ousness, when He shall come). Behold,
 I come (the Seer speaks in the name of
 Christ) as a thief (that personal advent
 shall happen when many least expect it,
 when the world is secure in the ungodli-
 ness of ages): blessed is he that watch-
 eth, and keepeth his garments, lest he
 walk naked and they (men) see his shame
 (the figure is that of one apprehending
 the thief's coming, and therefore keeping
 watch in his clothes, not undressing. In
 the spiritual sense, the garments are the
 robe of righteousness put on by faith in
 Him who is our Righteousness: and the
 walking naked is that destitution of these
 garments which will at that day bring
 shame before assembled men and angels).
 And they (the unclean spirits, as is evident
 from συνηγαγεν being merely a recital of
 the συναγαγεῖν before: not, the angel of
 the sixth vial, as Bengel; nor God, as
 Hengst. and Ebrard) gathered them to-

17 καὶ ὁ ἔβδομος ἐξέχεεν τὴν φιάλην αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸν AN B a
 g ch ix 2 reff. ἑ ἀέρα· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου λέ- to n, 1, 2
 17. for ο ἔβδομος, οτε N¹: ο ζ N³¹. rec aft εβδομος ins αγγελος, with N^{3a} h m n 1. 4. 6. 9.
 10-7. 34 (35-6-7. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr Areth Primas: om A(N¹) B rel am(with fuld lips-5 10-3. 16
 tol) syr-dd. rec (for επ.) eis, with c f h n 1. 10-7. 49. 51 (37 B^r, e sil) Andr: txt to 19. 26.
 AN B rel Andr-coisl Areth. rec aft φωνη ins μεγαλη, with N B rel vulg syr-dd 7. 30 2.
 copt aeth Andr Areth Primas: om A 1. 12. 46 Cassiod. rec (for εκ) απο, with B 34 to 42.
 rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AN g 1. 12-8. 36-8. 46 Andr. rec aft του ναου ins του 47 to 51.
 ουρανου, with B 10(sic) rel vss Andr Areth: for ναου, ουνου n 1. 12-8. 36. 47 Andr-a: 90 B^r.
 txt A(N) f g vulg syr-dd copt Primas. for απο του θρονου, του θεου N. και απο
 του θρονου του θεου b.

gether to the place which is called in Hebrew *Harmagedon* (it is evidently in the meaning of the Hebrew name of this place that its appropriate significance lies. For otherwise why should *ἐβραϊστὶ* be prefixed to it? When St. John does this in his Gospel, in the cases of Bethesda, v. 2, Gabbatha, xix. 13, Golgotha, xix. 17, and in this book in the case of Abaddon, ch. ix. 11, it is each time not without such reference: see the notes in those places. But this circumstance does not deprive the name of geographical reality: and it is most probable on every account that such reality exists here. The words *τὸν τόπον τὸν καλούμενον* would surely not be used except of a real place habitually so named, or by a name very like this. Nor need we search far for the place pointed out. *הַרְמְגִדּוֹן*, the mountain of Megiddo, designates at least the neighbourhood where the Canaanitish kings were overthrown by Barak, Judg. v. 19; an occasion which gave rise to one of the two triumphal songs of Israel recorded in the O. T., and therefore one well worthy of symbolizing the great final overthrow of the Kings of the Earth leagued against Christ. That the name slightly differs from that given in the O. T. where it is the plain (2 Chron. xxxv. 22) or the waters (Judg. i. c.) of Megiddo, is of slight consequence, and may be owing to a reason which I shall dwell on below. The LXX in both places adopt the form which we have here, *Μαγεδών* or *-δών*. Nor must it be forgotten, that Megiddo was connected with another overthrow and slaughter, viz. that of Josiah by Pharaoh-Necho (2 Kings xxiii. 29; 2 Chron. ubi supra), which though not analogous to this predicted battle in its issue, yet served to keep up the character of the place as one of overthrow and calamity: cf. also Zech. xii. 11, and the striking description, 2 Chron. xxxv. 25, of the ordinance of lamentation for Josiah. At Megiddo also another Jewish King, Ahaziah, died of the wounds received from Jehu,

2 Kings ix. 27. The prefix *Har*, signifying "mountain," has its local propriety, see Stanley's description of the plain of Esdraelon, in the opening of his Sinai and Palestine, ch. ix. And to the fisherman of the lake of Galilee, who would know Megiddo as he saw its background of highland lit up by the morning or evening sun across the plain from his native hills, the name would doubtless be a familiar one. Still there may have been a deeper reason which led to, or at all events justified the prefix. As the name now stands, it has a meaning ominous of the great overthrow which is to take place on the spot. Drusius, believing the word to be merely a mystic one, explains it to be *הַרְמְגִדּוֹן*, *הַרְמְגִדּוֹן*, "internecio exercitus eorum," the overthrow of their army. But, conceding and maintaining the geographical reality, must not we suppose that such a name, with such a sound, so associated with the past, bore to a Hebrew ear, when used of the future, its ominous significance of overthrow? It is remarkable that in Zech. xii. 11, where the mourning for Josiah is alluded to, the LXX render not in the plain of Megiddo, but *ἐν πεδίῳ ἐκκοπτομένου*: and this agrees with the interpretation of Andreas here, who supposes the name equivalent to *διακοπή*.

17—21.] And the seventh poured out his vial upon the air (the consequences are presently seen), and there came forth a voice out of the temple from the throne (the voice, as in ver. 1, of God Himself. This is rendered even more certain here by the addition of *ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου*) saying, It is done (the limitation of the meaning of *γέγονεν* to "that is done which was commanded," viz. the outpouring of the seven vials, is in fact no limitation: for the plagues are the *last* plagues: if therefore they are done, all is done. But the declaration is of course proleptically made, and imports that the outpouring of the seventh vial had done that which should accomplish all and bring in

γούσα ^h Γέγονεν. ¹⁸ καὶ ⁱ ἐγένοντο ⁱ ἀστραπαὶ καὶ ⁱ φωναὶ ^h = Luke xiv. 22. [ch. xxi. 6-11] καὶ ⁱ βρονταί, καὶ σεισμοὶ ἐγένετο μέγας, ^k οἶος οὐκ ^k ἐγένετο ¹ ch. viii. 5. xi. 19 al. ἀφ' οὗ ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ¹ τηλικούτος σεισμοὶ ^k = Matt. xxiv. 21 al. DAN. οὕτως μέγας. ¹⁹ καὶ ^m ἐγένετο ἡ ⁿ πόλις ἡ ⁿ μεγάλη ^m εἰς ¹ 2 Cor. i. 10. τρία μέρη, καὶ αἱ πόλεις τῶν ἐθνῶν ἔπεσαν. καὶ ^o Βαβυλῶν ἡ ^o μεγάλη ^p ἐμνήσθη ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ^q δοῦναι αὐτῇ ¹ Feb. 11. 3. James iii. 4. only τ. 2 Macc. xii. 3. m ch. viii. 11 reff. τὸ ^r ποτήριον τοῦ ^r οἴνου τοῦ ^r θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ. ⁿ = ch. xi. 8. xvii. 18. xviii. 10, &c. o ch. xiv. 8 reff. p pass., Acts 1 sch. vi. ²⁰ καὶ πᾶσα νῆσος ἔφυγεν, καὶ ^s ὄρη οὐχ ^t εὐρέθησαν.

x. 31 only. Ezek. xviii. 22. q infin. ver. 9. r ch. xiv. 8, 10.
14. t ch. xviii. 21, 22. Ps. xxxvi. 36. plur. ch. i. 19 reff.

18. rec φωναὶ and βρονταὶ bef ἀστραπαὶ, with 1: βρονταὶ bef φωναὶ rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: txt A (N B) g n 2. 6. 13. 26. 36. 40.—om καὶ βρονταὶ B: N¹ has βρονταὶ in both the 1st and 4th places, N^{3a} disapproving the latter, but not καὶ precedg.

om 1st ἐγενετο B rel fuld Andr Areth: ins AN f g h n 10. 7. 36 (1. 37. 42-9. 51 B, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr-a Tich. for οἶος, οἷς N¹. for 2nd ἐγενετο, ἐγενοντο N¹. rec οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐγενοντο, with (N B) rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich: txt A c copt arm, ἐγενετο ἄνθρωπος 38.—om οἱ N B f g 17.

19. rec ἐπεσον, with rel Andr Areth: -σαν in the line, o above 10¹: txt AN^{3a} B d h² j l n 16-7. 27. 38. 42-9. (4 uncert. η πόλις . . . ἐπεσεν N¹.) ins του bef δουναι N. om το, του (bef οἶνου), and αὐτου N.

20. om 1st καὶ 1.

the end. One who had fired a train would say, "It is done," though the explosion had not yet taken place). And there were lightnings and voices and thunders (the usual accompaniments of the close of each series of visions, see ch. viii. 5, xi. 19. But, as before remarked, these phenomena occur here in rather a different connexion from that in the other two places. Here, they are more the result of the outpouring of the last vial, and they do not conclude, but only begin its effects, which do not cease until the destruction of Babylon and the great overthrow of the antichristian hosts): and there was a great earthquake (this may perhaps be not without connexion with the pouring out of the vial into the air: in the descriptions of earthquakes we read of the darkened and lurid appearance of the air preceding the shock) such as was not from the time when there was a man (not, "since man was:" the generic meaning would more probably be expressed by οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐγένοντο, as altered in rec.) upon the earth, such (on τηλικούτος, see note on ref. Heb.) an earthquake so great. And the great city (Rome: cf. ch. xi. 8 and note, xiv. 8, xvii. 18, xviii. 10, 16, 18, &c., 21) became into (i.e. was divided or split, scil. by the earthquake) three parts (see ch. xi. 13, where a similar judgment takes place at the end of the episode of the two witnesses. The three parts are supposed by Düsterd. to refer to

the three arch-enemies just now mentioned. But this is very uncertain: see on the tripartite division at ch. viii. 7), and the cities of the nations fell (not only the greatest city, but other great capitals of nations fell, from the violence and extent of the earthquake. We have its further consequences presently): and Babylon the great (mentioned specially, although really the same (see the places referred to above) with ἡ πόλις ἡ μεγάλη, because of her special adulterous character to be hereafter described, The destruction of the material city of Rome is but the beginning of the execution of vengeance on the mystic Babylon) was remembered before God (reff.), to give her the cup of the wine of the fierceness of His wrath (so E. V. for τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς; "excandescencia iræ," Vitranga. θυμός (θύω) is the outbreak, ὀργή the temper of mind. See on Rom. ii. 8: and on the figure of the cup, ch. xiv. 8, note. The sense is, that all these material judgments were but prefatory; the divine intent, in the midst of them, being to make Babylon drink the cup of His wrath in her judgment which follows): and every island fled (the effects of the earthquake are resumed, the mention of Babylon coming into remembrance being parenthetical, and suggested by the great city having been split into three parts. On the sense, as belonging to the imagery of the great day, see ch. vi. 14), and there were

u here bis.
ch. viii. 7.
xi. 19 only.
Exod. ix. 24.
v here only t.
Jos. B. J. v.
6 3, ταλαν-
ταίοι...οἱ
βαλλόμενοι
πετροί.
w = Matt vii.
25, 27. Luke
viii 23. Isa
xxiii. 18.
x ver 11. (reff.).
y = ch ix. 18.
20 reff.
z Rev., here
only. 60
Matt ii. 10.
Mark xiv. 4.
Luke xviii.
23. Exod.
ix 24
1 Kings iv. 19.
4 only. = Jude 4 al. fr.
xxviii. (11) 13.
neut. Matt. xxiv. 49. Acts ii. 15
Luke xii. 45. 1 w εκ, ver. 6 only see ch. xiv. 8. ἀπό, ver. 1. 21.
Matt. xxiii. 21. Luke xiii. 4 only Hos. x 5 1 Macc iii. 34.

21 καὶ ὡς ἡ χάλαζα μεγάλη ὡς ἡ ταλαντιαία ὡς καταβαίνει ἐκ
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· καὶ ἐβλασφήμησαν οἱ
ἄνθρωποι τὸν ἡεὸν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς τῆς χαλάζης, ὅτι
μεγάλη ἐστὶν ἡ πληγὴ αὐτῆς σφόδρα.

XVII. 1 Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἀγγέλων τῶν ἔχοντων τὰς ἑπτὰ φιάλας, καὶ ἐλάλησεν μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων
Ἄεϋρο, δείξω σοι τὸ κρίμα τῆς πορνῆς τῆς μεγάλης
τῆς καθημένης ἐπὶ [τῶν] ὑδάτων [τῶν] πολλῶν, μεθ' ἧς
ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς, καὶ ἐμεθύσθησαν οἱ
κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου τῆς πορνείας αὐτῆς.

21. ως is written over the line by N¹.

for ἀνθρώπους, οὐνοὺς 1.

CHAP. XVII. 1. for ἦλθεν, ἐξηλθεν A. om εκ N g n. [tas is written twice
in P.] rec aft λεγων ins μοι, with n 1 æth Andr Tich: om ἄν B rel vulg syr-dd
coipt arm Andr-coisl. εἰς ὑδατων πολλων (sic) A[P]N g m n 1. 34(-5-6) Hip
Andr: ἐπὶ των υδατων των πολλων B rel Areth.

2. for ἐπορν., ἐποίησαν πορνίαν N. rec εκ τ. οιν. τ. πορν. αυ. bef οι κατοικουντες
την γην, with 1 coipt: om εκ τ. οιν. τ. π. α. 40: txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd arm Hip
Andr Areth Tich.—for οινου, οικου N¹.

found no mountains (not as E. V., "the mountains (τὰ ὄρη) were not found." The expression is far stronger than this: amounting to that in ch. vi. 14, that every mountain was removed out of its place and was looked for in vain), and a great hail (see reff. Egypt is again in view) as of a talent in weight (i.e. having each hailstone of that weight. Diod. Sic. xix. 45 speaks of hailstones of a mina each in weight as being enormous: καταβραγόντων εξαίφνης μεγάλων ὑμβρων, καὶ χαλάζης ἀπίστου τὸ μέγεθος, μυααῖαι γὰρ ἔπιπτον, ἔστι δ' ὅτε καὶ μείζους, ὥστε πολλὰς μὲν τῶν οἰκίων συμπίπτειν διὰ τὸ βάρος, οὐκ ὀλίγους δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπᾶλλυσθαι: and the talent contained sixty minæ. Josephus, in reff., speaks of the stones which were thrown from the machines in the siege of Jerusalem as each of a talent weight) descendeth from heaven on men (τοὺς ἀνθρ. must apparently be generic here: it can hardly mean the men; for the plague is universal. See above on ver. 9): and men blasphemed God by reason of the plague of the hail, because great is the plague of it exceedingly (i.e. mankind in general,—not those who were struck by the hailstones who would instantly die,—so far from repenting at this great and final judgment of God, blasphemed Him and were impenitent. The issue is different from that in ch. xi. 13, where the remnant feared and

gave glory to God).

CH. XVII. 1—XIX. 10.] THE JUDGMENT OF BABYLON. And herein, XVII. 1—6.] *The description of Babylon under the figure of a drunken harlot, riding on the beast.* And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials (we are not told which of the seven, and it is idle to enquire. The seventh has been conjectured, because under the outpouring of his vial Babylon was remembered) and talked with me saying, Hither (see reff.), I will shew thee the judgment of the great harlot that sitteth upon [the] many waters, with whom the kings of the earth (have) committed fornication, and they who inhabit the earth have been made drunk from the wine (ἐκ, the wine having been the source of their drunkenness) of her fornication (the figure here used, of a harlot who has committed fornication with secular kings and peoples, is frequent in the prophets, and has one principal meaning and application, viz. to God's church and people that had forsaken Him and attached herself to others. In eighteen places out of twenty-one where the figure occurs, such is its import; viz. in Isa. i. 21; Jer. ii. 20, iii. 1, 6, 8; Ezek. xvi. 15, 16, 28, 31, 35, 41, xxiii. 5, 19, 44; Hosea ii. 5, iii. 3, iv. 15 (Micah i. 7). In three places only is the word applied to heathen cities: viz. in Isa. xxiii. 15, 16 to Tyre, where, ver. 17,

3 καὶ ἡ ἀπὴνεγκέν με εἰς ἔρημον ἔν πνεύματι καὶ εἶδον ἡ w. εἰς, Luke
 γυναῖκα κ καθήμενν κ ἐπὶ θηρίον ἰ κόκκινον, mn γέμοντα ^{xvi. 22}
^{xxxvi. 7 ἐπὶ, ch. xxi. 10. Acts xix. 12 absol., Mark xv. 1 only} ^{1 ch. 1. 10. iv. 2 xxi. 10.}
^{k ch. iv. 2 reff. & note.} ^{1 here bis. ch. xviii. 12, 16 Matt. xxvii. 28. Heb. ix. 19 only. Exod. xxv.}
^{4. Num. xix. 6.} ^{m ch. iv. 6, 8 reff.} ^{n constr., ch. iv. 1 al.}

3. for εἶδον, ἴδα A. (So also ver 6.) [κογκινον P:] θηρίου κοκινον 1. rec
 (for γεμοντα) γεμον, with N^{3a} B rel Hip Andr Areth: γεμων 1 30-2: txt (or γεμον τα)

it is also said, "she shall commit fornication with all the kingdoms of the world upon the face of the earth;" and in Nahum iii. 4 to Nineveh, which is called the well-favoured harlot, the mistress of witchcrafts, that selleth nations through her whoredoms, and families through her witchcrafts. And there the threat is pronounced of a very similar ruin to that which befalls Babylon here. So that the Scripture analogy, while it points to unfaithfulness and treachery against God's covenant, also brings to mind extensive empire and wide-spread rule over the kingdoms of the earth. It is true, that as far as *the image itself* is concerned, pagan Rome as well fulfils its requirements as Tyre and Nineveh. It will depend on subsequent features in the description, whether we are to bound our view with her history and overthrow. Still, it will not be desirable to wait for the solution of this question till we arrive at the point where those features appear: for by so doing much of our intermediate exegesis will necessarily be obscured. The decisive test then which may at once be applied to solve the question, is derived from the prophecy of the destruction of Babylon in ch. xviii. 2. It is to be laid utterly waste, and to "become the habitation of devils and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Now no such destruction as this has yet befallen Rome, unless her transfer from pagan to papal rule be such a destruction, and the Pope and his ecclesiastics be described in the above terms. In an eloquent passage of Vitringa, he presses Bossuet with this dilemma. Again, it is said of this harlot, μεθ' ἧς ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς. But we may ask, if this be pagan Rome, who and what are these kings, and what is indicated by her having been the object of their lustful desires? In the days of Imperial Rome, there were no independent kings of the earth except in Parthia and Persia. Rome in her pagan state, as described for the purpose of identification in ver. 18, was not one who intrigued with the kings of the earth, but ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐν τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς: she reigned over them with undisputed and crushing sway.

I do not hesitate therefore, induced mainly by these considerations, which will be confirmed as we proceed step by step in the prophecy, to maintain that interpretation which regards papal and not pagan Rome as pointed out by the harlot of this vision. The subject has been amply discussed by many expositors. I would especially mention Vitringa, and Bp. Wordsworth.

The "sitting upon many waters" is said of Babylon in Jer. in reff., but has here a symbolical meaning; see below, ver. 15. On the ἐμεθύσθησαν see ch. xiv. 8. The same thing is said of Babylon in Jer. l. c. But there she herself is the cup in the Lord's hand). And he (the angel) carried me away to the wilderness (not, as Elliott, al., and even Düssterd., "a wilderness." Such inferences from the absence of the art. in this later Greek, never secure, are more than ever unsafe when a preposition precedes: and the usage of the LXX should have prevented any such rendering here. In no fewer than twenty places (see Tromm.) they use the word ἔρημος anathrously, where there can be no question that "the wilderness" is the only rendering. In fact it may be questioned whether the expressly indefinite rendering, "a wilderness," is ever justifiable, except in case of predication, or junction with an adjective, without some further indication than the mere omission of the definite article after a preposition. Had it been intended here, we may safely say that εἰς τόπον ἔρημον, or εἰς τόπον τινὰ ἔρημον would have been used. The most natural way of accounting for the Seer being taken into the wilderness here, is that he was to be shewn Babylon, which was in the wilderness, and the overthrow of which, in the prophecy from which come the very words ἐπεσεν (πέπτωκεν, LXX) βαβυλῶν (Isa. xxi. 9), is headed τὸ δράμα τῆς ἐρήμου. So that by the analogy of prophecy, the journey to witness the fall of Babylon would be εἰς ἔρημον. The question of the identity of this woman with the woman in ch. xii. is not affected by that of the identity of this wilderness with that) in the spirit (see reff. and note on ch. i. 10): and I saw a woman sitting upon a scarlet

o constr. acc., here bis. Phil. i. 11. Col. i. 9. Ps xv. 11 A. (not B¹ F.) p ch xii. 1. q ch. vii. 9 reff. xvi. 16 only. Exod. xxvi. 32, 37. 19. Ps. xviii. 10. Dan. xi. 38 Theod.

ορ ὀνόματα ᾤ βλασφημίας, ἔχοντα ᾤ κεφαλὰς ἑπτὰ καὶ ᾤ κέ-
 ρατα δέκα. ⁴ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἦν ᾤ περιβεβλημένη ᾤ πορφύρου
 καὶ ᾤ κόκκινον [καὶ] ᾤ κεχρυσωμένη ᾤ χρυσοῖα καὶ ᾤ λιθῶ ᾤ τιμίῳ

AP¹ B¹ B² to n. 1. 2. 4. 6. 9. 10-3. 16 to 19. 26. 7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B¹.

A[P]¹N¹ 9. rec ονοματων, with c h m n 1. 10. 34-5-6-7. 49-corr (48. 51 Br, e sil)
 Hip Andr Areth: A[P]¹N¹ B rel. rec (for εχοντα) εχον, with B rel. εχων A l m
 n 30-2: txt PN. om κεφαλαις επτα και 1. [at end P adds ver 18, repeating
 it in its own place, writing πολλης both times, and here insg την bef βασιλειαν.]
 4. rec (for ἦν) ἦ, with 1 copt: txt A[P]¹N¹ B (Tischdf) rel vulg syr-dd æth arm Hip
 Andr Areth Cyp. (Only the ν exists in A and there is room for η ην or the like.)
 rec πορφυρα: πορφυραν h (k p) n 1. 4. 6. 10-7-8. 34-5-7. 48-9 Br Andr Areth:
 txt A[P]¹N¹ B rel Hip. rec κοκκινω: txt A [P(κογκ.)] N¹ B 1(κοκιν., so elsw) rel Hip
 Andr Areth. om 3rd και [P] B rel Hip Andr Areth: ins AN 1. 18. 33-38 (1 2.
 35-6-9. 42, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Andr a lat-ff. rec (for χρυσιω) χρυσω, with
 [P]¹N¹ g h n 1. 33(-6-7, e sil)-8. 49: txt A B rel.

beast (this beast is introduced as if a new appearance: but its identity with that mentioned before, ch. xiii. 1 ff., is plain as the description goes onward. For not to mention the features which the two have in common, this beast, as soon as described, is ever after mentioned as τὸ θηρίον: and in ch. xix. 19, 20 the identity is expressly established. For there we read, ver. 19, that the beast and the kings of the earth make war against the Lamb, which beast can be no other than this on which the woman rides, cf. our vv. 12—14:—and in the next verse, ch. xix. 20, we read that *the beast was taken, and the false prophet who did miracles before him*, which beast can be no other than that of ch. xiii. See ver. 14 there. The identity of the two is therefore matter not of opinion, but of demonstration. The differences in appearance doubtless are significant. That with which we are now concerned, the scarlet colour, is to be understood as belonging not to a covering on the beast, but to the beast itself. It is akin to the colour of the dragon (ῥυβδός), but as that is the redness of fire (see however ch. vi. 4), so is this of blood, with which both the beast and its rider are dyed. It was the colour, see ref. Heb., of the wool to be used in sprinkling the blood of sacrifice. There may be an allusion to the Roman imperial purple: for the robe which was put on our Lord in mockery was κόκκινος, ref. Matt. But this is more probably conveyed by its own proper word in the next verse.

By the woman *sitting* on the wild-beast, is signified that superintending and guiding power which the rider possesses over his beast: than which nothing could be chosen more apt to represent the superiority claimed and exercised by the See of Rome over the secular king-

doms of Christendom), full of names of blasphemy (for the construction with accus., see reff., and Winer, edn. 6, § 32. 5. The names of blasphemy, which were found before on the heads of the beast only, have now spread over its whole surface. As ridden and guided by the harlot, it is tenfold more blasphemous in its titles and assumptions than before. The heathen world had but its Divi in the Cæsars, as in other deified men of note: but Christendom has its "most Christian" and "most faithful" Kings, such as Louis XIV. and Philip II.; its "Defenders of the faith," such as Charles II. and James II.; its society of unprincipled intriguers called after the sacred name of our Lord, and working Satan's work "ad majorem Dei gloriam;" its "holy office" of the Inquisition, with its dens of darkest cruelty; finally its "patrimony of St. Peter," and its "holy Roman Empire;" all of them, and many more, new names of blasphemy, with which the woman has invested the beast. Go where we will and look where we will in Papal Christendom, names of blasphemy meet us. The taverns, the shops, the titles of men and of places, the very insurance badges on the houses, are full of them), having seven heads and ten horns (as in its former appearance, ch. xiii. 1; inherited from the dragon, ch. xii. 3. These are presently interpreted: we now return to the description of the woman herself). **And the woman was clothed in purple** (St. John's own word, even to its peculiar form, see reff., for the mock-imperial robe placed on our Lord: and therefore bearing probably here the same signification; but not in mockery, as Bede, "fucus simulati regiminis:" for the empire is real) **and scarlet** (see above. This very colour is

καὶ ^v μαργαρίταις, ἔχουσα ποτήριον χρυσοῦν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ ^v αὐτῆς ^m γέμον ^w βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ^{ox} ἀκάθαρτα τῆς ^y πορνείας αὐτῆς, ^δ καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ ^z μέτωπον αὐτῆς ^a ὄνομα ^a γεγραμμένον ^b Μυστήριον, ^c Βαβυλὼν ἡ ^c μεγάλη, ἡ ^a μήτηρ τῶν ^d πορνῶν καὶ τῶν ^w βδελυγμάτων τῆς γῆς. ^θ καὶ εἶδα τὴν γυναῖκα ^e μεθύουσαν ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ^f ἁγίων καὶ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν ^g μαρτύρων Ἰησοῦ. καὶ ^h ἐθαύμασα ἰδὼν αὐτὴν ^{hi} θαῦμα μέγα. ⁱ καὶ εἶπέν μοι ^o ὁ

^{... τῆς π.}
^{ΑΡΣ Β α}
^{to m, 1.}
^{2. 4. 6. 9.}
^{10-3. 16}
^{to 19. 26-}
^{7. 30}
^{32 to 42.}
^{47 to 51.}
^{90 B^r.}

^y ch. n. 21.
^c ch. xiv 8 reff
 13 reff.

^z ch vii 3 reff
^d ver. 1 reff
 h constr., ch xvi. 9 reff.

^a ch xiv. 1 reff.
^e ver. 2 reff.

^b ch. i 20.
^f ch. v 8 reff.
^g ch. ii.

^h ch xviii. 2.
ⁱ Eph. v 32 a l.
^o 1 Cor. vii. 14.
² Cor. vi.
 17 ch xviii. 2.
 17 ch xviii. 2.

[om from εχουσα to end of ver P.] rec χρυσουν bef ποτηριον, with h n 1.
 10. 17-8. 36 (37. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr: om χρ. e: txt AN(χρουν, but corrd) B rel syr-dd
 eopt æth arm Hip Andr-coisl Areth lat.-ff. γεμον N¹ b¹ f (?) 130-2: γεμουσα k.
 rec (for τα ακαθαρτα της) ακαθαρτητος (with 42, e sil): τα ακαθαρτα 33
 (sic, Del): txt AN B rel Hip Andr. for αυτης, της γης B rel syr-dd coopt Hip
 Areth, totius terræ Cyp Primas Promiss: αυτης και της γης N: txt A c¹ g h l m n f.
 6. 10-7-8. 34 to 38. 47-9. 51 (B^r, e sil) vulg Andr.
 6. (ειδα, so A(δα) N.) om 1st εκ [P]N^a a b a b d e f j k 2. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 30¹.
 41-7-9. 51 Andr-coisl Areth Promiss.—τω αιματι N¹ 38. om 2nd και B rel Andr-
 coisl Areth: ins A [P]N 17-8 (c f g h l 1. 6. 27. 32-7-8. 40-2-7-9. 51 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr.
 μαρτυριων A. om ιησου 1. 36. θαυμα μεγα bef ειδων(sic) αυτην N 38.

not without its significance: witness the Cardinals, at the same time the guiding council of the Church and princes of the State), [and] gilded with gold and with (the κεχρυσωμένη is zeugmatically carried on) precious stone and with pearls (this description needs no illustration for any who have witnessed, or even read of, the pomp of Papal Rome: which, found as it is every where, is concentrated in the city itself), holding a cup of gold in her hand full of abominations and of the impure things (the change of construction is remarkable: for such it must be accounted, and not, with Düsterd., the accus. governed by ἔχουσα. It seems to be made, not to avoid an accumulation of genitives, as Hengstb., but to mark a difference between the more abstract designation of the contents of the cup as βδελύγματα, and the specification of them in the concrete as τὰ ἀκάθαρτα κ.τ.λ.) of her fornication (this cup is best taken altogether symbolically, and not as the cup in the Mass, which, however degraded by her blasphemous fiction of transubstantiation, could hardly be called by this name, and moreover is not given, but denied by her to the nations of the earth. That she should have represented herself in her medals as holding forth this cup (with the remarkable inscription, “sedet super universam;” see Elliott, vol. iv. p. 30, plate), is a judicial coincidence rather than a direct fulfilment), and (having) upon her forehead a name written (as was

customary with harlots: so Seneca, Controv. i. 2, in Wetst.: “Stetisti puella in lupanari: . . . nomen tuum pendedit a fronte: pretia stupri accepisti:” and Juv. Sat. vi. 123 of Messallina, “Tunc nuda papillis Constitit auratis, titulum mentita Lyciscæ”), Mystery (is this word part of the name, or not? On the whole it seems more probable that it is. For though no such word would in the nature of things be attached to her forehead as part of her designation, so neither would the description which follows Βαβυλὼν ἡ μεγάλη, to which the word μυστήριον seems partly to refer. But whether part of the name or not, the meaning will be the same: viz. that the title following is to be taken in a spiritual and an enigmatical sense: compare ch. i. 20, and 2 Thess. ii. 7), Babylon the great, the mother of the harlots and of the abominations of the earth (i. e. not only first and greatest of these, but herself the progenitress and origin of the rest. All spiritual fornication and corruption are owing to her, and to her example and teaching). And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints and with the blood of the witnesses of Jesus (as the Seer contemplates the woman, he perceives that she is drunken: and from what is revealed to him, and from her symbolic colour of blood, he assigns the cause of that intoxication. Wetst. quotes Plin. H. N. xiv. 28, “quo facile intelligitur ebrius jam sanguine civium, et tanto magis eum sitiens”). And I wondered,

k Acts xxi. 35. ἄγγελος Διὰ τί ἐθαύμασας; ἐγὼ ἐρῶ σοι τὸ ^b μυστήριον APN B a
 Rom. xi. 18. τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ ^k βασιτάζοντος αὐτὴν τοῦ to m. 1.
 4 Kings xviii. 14 Sir vi. 25 (Bel & Dr. 36 Theod.) ἔχοντος τὰς ^p ἑπτὰ κεφαλὰς καὶ τὰ ^p δέκα κέρατα. ⁸ τὸ 2. 4. 6. 9.
 only. 10. 3. 16
 1 ch. ix. 1, 2 to 19 26-
 ref. 7. 30.
 m ver. 11. John 32 to 42.
 xvii. 12. 47 to 51.
 Acts viii. 20. 90 B.
 Rom. ix. 22. n mid., here only. Isa.
 Phil. iii. 19 2 Thess. iii. 3. Heb. x. 39. 2 Pet ii. 1. iii. 3, 7 al. Isa. xiv. 23.

7. rec σοι bef *ερω*, with [P]N f h 1. 10-7. 36 (37. 49 Br, e sil) am(with demid al) Andr Primas: txt A B rel vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr-coisl Areth Promiss. ins και bef του *εχοντος* 1.

8. rec (at beg) om *το* (with k 34, e sil): ins A[P]N B(Tischdf) 33(sic, Del) rel Hip Andr Areth. for ην, η A. rec (for *υπαγει*) *υπαγειν*, with [P]N B rel Hip Andr Promiss: txt A 12 Andr-p Areth Iren-int Primas. om 4th και 1¹. θαυμασ-

when I saw her, with great wonder (what was the ground of the Seer's astonishment? One doubtless might be assigned, which would at once account for any degree of such emotion. If this woman is the same as he before saw, who fled into the wilderness from the face of the dragon, "the faithful city become an harlot" (Isa. i. 21), he might well wonder. And certainly there is much in favour of such a supposition. It has been taken up by some considerable expositors, such as Auberlen (Der Prophet Daniel, pp. 278 ff.), who has argued earnestly but soberly for it. There is one objection to it, which has been made more of in this place than perhaps it deserves. It is, that in the Angel's replication to St. John's wonder, no allusion is made to this circumstance as its principal ground. But, it may well be replied, this would be just what we might expect, if the fact of identity were patent. The Seer, versed in the history of man's weakness and depravity, full of O. T. prophetic thoughts and sayings, would need no solution of the fact itself: this would lie at the ground of his wonder, and of the angel's explanation of the consequences which were to follow from it. Auberlen very properly lays stress on the fact, that the joint symbolism of the wilderness and the woman could not fail to call up in the mind of the Seer the last occasion when the two occurred together: and insists that this symbol must be continuous throughout. Without going so far as to pronounce the two identical, I think we cannot and ought not to lose sight of the identity of symbolism in the two cases. It is surely meant to lie beneath the surface, and to teach us an instructive lesson. We may see from it two prophetic truths: first, that the church on earth in the main will become apostate and faithless, cf. Luke xviii. 8: and secondly, that

while this shall be so, the apostasy shall not embrace the whole church, so that the second woman in the apocalyptic vision should be *absolutely* identical with the first. The identity is, in the main, not to be questioned: in formal strictness, not to be pressed. This being so, I should rather regard St. John's astonishment as a compound feeling, occasioned partly by the enormity of the sight revealed to him, partly also by the identity of the symbolism with that which had been the vehicle of a former and altogether different vision).

7—18.] *Explanation by the angel of the mystery of the woman and of the beast.* And first, 7—14.] *of the beast.* And the angel said to me, Wherefore didst thou wonder? I will tell to thee the mystery (which, be it noted, is but one) of the woman and of the wild-beast that carrieth her, which hath the seven heads and the ten horns. The beast which thou sawest, was, and is not, and shall come up out of the abyss and goeth to perdition (these words have been a very battle-field for apocalyptic expositors, whose principal differing interpretations are far too long to be given at all intelligibly here, but will be seen best in their own works, and compendiously but fairly stated in the notices in Mr. Elliott's fourth volume. What is here required, is that I should give a consistent account of that solution which I have been myself led to adopt. 1) It will not be supposed, with the general view which I have taken of the beast as the secular persecuting power, that I am prepared to accede to that line of interpretation which makes the whole vision merely descriptive of the Seer's own time, and of the Roman emperors then past, present, and expected. Against such a view it seems to me the whole imagery and diction of the vision protest: and this it will be my endeavour

σονται οἱ ὁ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, βλεπόντων τὸ θηρίον ὅτι ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν καὶ ἰσχύει ἔσθαι. ὁ δὲ οὐδὲ ὁ νοῦς ὁ ἔχων σοφίαν. αἱ ἐπὶ τὰ κεφαλὰ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη εἰσίν, ὅπου ἡ γυνὴ κάθηται ἐπ' αὐτῶν.

18.

v constr., ch. iii. 8 reff.

θησονται Α. for ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, τὴν γῆν Β α β ε f j k m 2. 9. 13-6-9. 26-7. 30-3-6-8-9. 40-2-7. 50-1. 90 vulg Hip Primas. for οὐ γεγραπται, οὐκ εγεγραπται Α : οὐκ εγεγραπτο 9 Hip. rec τα ονοματα, with [P]N c 1. 4. 10-7-9 (h n 6. 32 Br, e sil) vulg Andr Areth Primas: txt A B rel syr-dd copt Hip. for το βιβλίον, του βιβλιου B rel (Andr-p): txt A[P]N c 1. 4. 10-7. 34-6 (g h n 6. 32-7. 40-1-8-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth. rec βλεποντες, with h 1. 10-7. 33-6. 49 (37. 41 Br, e sil) Andr-a Areth: txt A[P]N B rel Andr. οτι ην bef το θηριον B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N g h 1. 10-7-8. 36-8. 49 (37. 41 Br, e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr Primas. rec (for και παρεσται) καιπερ εστιν: και παρεστιν N^{3a} 1. 11-2-6. 36. 43-7 Andr-a: txt A[P]N) B 33(sic, Del) rel Hip Andr Areth.—ins παλιν bef παρ. N¹. 9. rec ορη εισιν bef επτα, with 1. 51 (40-1, e sil): om επτα f: txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Hip Andr Areth Primas Promiss.

to shew as each of their details comes under my notice. If, as universally acknowledged, our prophecy be a taking up and continuation of that of Daniel, then we are dealing with larger matters and on a wider scale than such a limited interpretation would imply. 2) Nor again, after the meaning assigned above to the harlot and her title, will it be expected that I should agree with those who take her as, according to the letter of our ver. 18, strictly confined in meaning to the material city of Rome. She is that city: but she is also *μυστήριον*. She is herself a harlot, an apostate and faithless church; but she is also a *mother*: from her spring, of her nature partake, with her shall be destroyed, all the fornications and abominations of the earth, though they be not in Rome, though they be not called by her name, though in outward semblance they quarrel with and oppose her. 3) The above remarks will lead their intelligent reader to expect, that the present words of our text, which are in the main reproductive of the imagery of ch. xiii. 1-4, will be interpreted as those were interpreted, not of mere passing events and persons, but of world-wide and world-long empires and changes. 4) Having thus indicated the line of interpretation which I shall follow, I reserve the details for ver. 10, where they necessarily come before us): and they shall wonder who dwell upon the earth, of whom the name is not written upon (the accus. as so often in this book) the book of life from the foundation of the world (these latter words, even in ordinary N. T. Greek, would belong to γέγραπται, and the art. τὸ would be wanted to connect them with τὸ βιβ-

λίον τῆς ζωῆς. But it is by no means certain, in the loose Greek of the Apocalypse, whether these accuracies must be insisted on. Judging by the analogy of ch. xiii. 8 (see note there), ἀπὸ κατ. κόσμου belongs to that which immediately precedes it: as indeed it does in every place where it occurs in which its connexion might be ambiguous. I prefer therefore to follow analogy, rather than to insist on philological accuracy in a book where its rules are manifestly not observed), seeing (the reader expects βλέποντες, to agree with οἱ κατοικοῦντες: but instead, we have βλεπόντων, agreeing with ὧν by attraction) the beast that he was and is not and shall come again (see for full explanation, below on vv. 9, 10). Here (is) the mind that hath wisdom (by these words, as in ch. xiii. 18, attention is bespoken, and spiritual discernment challenged, for that which follows). The seven heads are seven mountains, where (= ἐφ' ὧν, on which) the woman sitteth (upon them) (ἐπ' αὐτῶν, the well-known Hebraistic redundancy of construction after ἐφ' ὧν, here expressed by ὅπου. By these words, no less plainly than by ver. 18, Rome is pointed out. Propertius, iii. 11. 57, by a remarkable coincidence, unites both descriptions in one line: "Septem urbs alta jugis, toto quæ præsidet orbi." The more remarkable out of the very many testimonies to Rome being thus known, are those of Horace, Carmen Seculare, 7, "Di quibus septem placuere colles:" Virg. Æn. vi. 782, "Illa inclyta Roma Imperium terris, animos æquabit Olympo, Septemque una sibi muro circumdabit arces:" where Servius annotates, "alii dicunt breves septem colliculos a

w = (Job xiv. 10) Dan vii. 10 Theod. see ch. xiv. 8. xviii 2. καὶ βασιλεῖς ἑπτὰ εἰσιν οἱ πέντε ἠέπεσαν, ὁ εἷς ἐστίν, . . . καὶ 6. A P N u a 40 m. 1. 2 4. 9 10-3 16 10-19. 26-7. 30. 32 to 42. 47 to 51. 90 B^r.

10. *επτα* bef *βασιλεῖς* N : *εἰσιν* bef *επτα* B rel 9 Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P] g h 10-7-8. 33-6 (1. 6. 16. 34-7-8-9. 41-7-9. 51 B^r, e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Primas Promiss. rec ins *καὶ* bef δ εἷς, with 1. 33 (48, e sil) lips-4: om A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Promiss.—ὁ δὲ εἷς h.

Romulo inclusos, qui tamen aliis nominibus appellabantur: alii volunt hos ipsos qui nunc sunt a Romulo inclusos, hoc est Palatinum, Quirinale, Aventinum, Caelium, Viminale, Æsculinum, et Janiculum." See also Georg. ii. 534: Cicero, ad Att. vi. 5, *ἐξ ἡστέος ἑπτάλοφου*: Martial iv. 64, speaking of Julius Martial's gardens on the Janiculum, "Hinc septem dominos videre montes, Et totam licet æstimare Romam." Varro de L. L. iv., "Dies Septimontium nominatus ab his septem montibus in quibus sita Roma est:"—and so Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.* p. 280 D, τὸ Σεπτιμόντιον ἄγουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν ἑβδομόν λόφον τῇ πόλει προσκατανεληθῆναι, καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἑπτάλοφον γενέσθαι. See very many more in Wetst., and a copious catena of citations in Bp. Wordsworth's *Letters to M. Gondon on the Church of Rome*, Let. xi. Also the coin of Vespasian figured in Elliott, vol. iv. p. 30): and they are seven kings (let us weigh well the significance of this indication furnished by the angel. The seven heads have a reference to the woman, who sits upon the beast to whom they belong: and, as far as *this* reference is concerned, they are *hills, on which she sits*. But they have also another reference—to the beast, of which they are the heads: and as far as this other reference is concerned, they are *kings*. Not, be it noticed, kings over the woman, nor kings of the city symbolized by her: but kings in a totally different relation, viz. that to the beast, of which they are heads. So that to interpret these kings as *emperors of Rome*, or as *successive forms of government over Rome*, is to miss the propriety of the symbolism and to introduce utter confusion. They belong to the *beast*, which is not Rome, nor the Roman Empire, but a general symbol of secular antichristian power. They are in substance the same seven crowned heads which we saw on the dragon in ch. xii. 3: the same which we saw, with names of blasphemy on them, on the beast of ch. xiii. 1, to whom the dragon gave his power and his throne). The five (i.e. the first five out of the seven) fell (Angl., "are fallen." Of whom is this word used? Is it one likely to be chosen to describe the mere passing away of king after king in an

empire more or less settled? One appropriate to Augustus and Tiberius, who died in their beds? Or again is it one which could well be predicated of the government by consuls, which had been absorbed into the imperial power, or of that by dictators, which had merely ceased *ad tempus sumi*, because it had become perpetual in the person of one man? Had Roman emperors been meant by the seven kings, or successive stages of government over Rome (even supposing these last made out, which they never have been), we should in vain have sought any precedent, or any appropriate meaning, for this *ἔπεσαν*: "have passed away" would be its constrained and unexampled sense. But let the analogy of Scripture and of this book itself guide us, and our way will be clear enough. *ἔπεσεν* is the cry over Babylon herself. *πίπτω* is used in the LXX constantly, and by Theod. in ref. Dan., of the violent fall, the overthrow, either of kings or of kingdoms: it is a word belonging to domination overthrown, to glory ruined, to empire superseded. If I understand these five of individual successive kings, if I understand them of forms of government adopted and laid down on occasion, I can give no account of this verb: but if I understand them of forms of empire, one after another heading the antichristian secular power, one after another violently overthrown and done away, I have this verb in its right place and appropriate sense. *Egypt* is fallen, the first head of the beast that persecuted God's people, Ezek. xxix., xxx.: *Nineveh* is fallen, the bloody city, Nahum iii. 1—19: *Babylon* is fallen, the great enemy of Israel, Isa. xxi. 9; Jer. l. li., al.: *Persia* is fallen, Dan. x. 13, xi. 2: *Græcia* is fallen, Dan. xi. 3, 4. Thus, and as it seems to me thus only, can we do justice to the expression. Nor is any force done thus to *βασιλεῖς*, but on the contrary it is kept to its strict prophetic import, and to the analogy of that portion of prophecy which is here especially in view. For in Dan. vii. 17 we read these great beasts which are four are four kings, *מלכים*; not *Βασιλείαι*, as LXX and Theodotion), the one is (the *Roman*), the other (required to complete the seven)

ὁ ἄλλος οὐπω ἦλθεν, καὶ ὅταν ἔλθῃ * ὀλίγον αὐτὸν δεῖ x = Mark vi. 31. 1 Pet. i. 8. v. 10. Pa. xxxvi. 10. see ch xii. 12. Acts xiv. 28. y = Phil. iii. 5. z ver. 8. a = ch. i 7 reff. b Luke xix. 12, 15. see Heb. xii. 28. Dan. v. 31.
 μῆναι. ¹¹ καὶ τὸ θηρίου ὃ ἦν καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν, καὶ * αὐτὸς ὀγδοός ἐστιν, καὶ ^γ ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐστιν, καὶ εἰς ^z ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει. ¹² καὶ τὰ δέκα κέρατα ἃ εἶδες δέκα βασιλεῖς εἰσιν, ^a οὔτινες ^b βασιλείαν οὐπω ^b ἔλαβον, ἀλλὰ ἐξουσιν ὡς βασιλεῖς μίαν ὥραν λαμβάνουσιν μετὰ τοῦ θηρίου.

δεῖ bef αυτον B a to e j k l m 2. 4. 13-6-8-9. 26-7. 30-2-4-6-8-9. 40-2-7-8. 50. 90 Andr-coisl Areth, oportet illum vulg Primas. μινε (sic) bef δεῖ N(Ξει N').

11. om 3rd καὶ N. * οὗτος N B(Mai) rel syr-dd: τουτο 40: αυτο 36: αυτος A[P] B(Tischdf) c f h 4. 10-7. 32-4 (1. 37. 47-8-9. 51 B^r, e sil) vulg copt Hip Andr Areth Primas Promiss. ins o bef ογδοος N 41-2.

12. for ουπω, ουκ A fuld: om k: txt [P] N(ουτω N') B 1 rel? (αλλα, so AN f g.) ἐξουσιν N'. aft βασιλεις N' wrote βα, but marked it for erasure.

is not yet come (I agree with Auberlen, der Prophet Daniel, pp. 304 ff., in regarding this seventh as the *Christian empire* beginning with Constantine: during whose time the beast in his proper essence, in his fullness of opposition to God and His saints, ceases to be), and when he shall come he must remain a little time (certainly the impression we derive from these words is not as Düsterd., al., that his empire is to be of very short continuance, but the ὀλίγον, as in ref. 1 Pet., gives the idea of some space not assigned, but vaguely thus stated as "some little time.") The idea given is rather that of duration than of non-duration. Herodotus, iv. 81, says of the river Exampæus, τοῦ καὶ ὀλίγον τι πρότερον τούτων μήμητι εἶχον, but it was twenty-nine chapters back. See for the usage of this book itself, ch. ii. 14, iii. 4; not xii. 12, where the context decides ὀλίγον to be emphatic. Here, the stress is on δεῖ μῆναι, and not on ὀλίγον: on the fact of *some* endurance, not on its being but short). And the beast, which was and is not (as in ver. 8, whose peculiar power and essence seem suspended while the empire is Christian by profession. But observe, the seventh is for all that a veritable head, and like the others carries names of blasphemy. The beast is not actually put out of existence, but has only received a deadly wound which is again healed, see ch. xiii. 3, notes), he himself (or, this) also is the eighth, and is of the seven, and goeth unto perdition (this eighth, the last and worst phase of the beast, is not represented as any one of his heads, but as being the *beast himself* in actual embodiment. He is ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ, —not, "one of the seven," but, the successor and result of the seven, following and springing out of them. And he εἰς ἀπώλειαν ὑπάγει—does not *fall* like the

others, but goes on and meets his own destruction at the hand of the Lord Himself. There can be little doubt in the mind of the student of prophecy, *who* is thus described: that it is the ultimate antichristian power, prefigured by the little horn in Daniel, and expressly announced by St. Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 3 ff., as ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας,—as ὁ ἄνομος, ὃν ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἀνελεῖ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ καταργήσει τῇ ἐπιφανείᾳ τῆς παρουσίας αὐτοῦ). And the ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings (not necessarily personal kings: see on ver. 10 above: but kingdoms, regarded as summed up in their kings) which (οὔτινες, kings of that kind who) have not yet received a kingdom, but receive power as kings (the ὡς βασιλεῖς is somewhat enigmatical. Auberlen suggests, whether the kingly power itself may not have passed away from these realms in the days of antichristian misrule, and thus their power be only ὡς βασιλεῖς. But this seems inconsistent with their being called βασιλεῖς. Rather I would say the ὡς represents the reservation of their kingly rights in their alliance with the beast) one hour (i. e. during the space of one hour: just as ἡμίωρον in ch. viii. 1 is during the space of half an hour. Some, e. g. Vitringa and Elliott, have upheld the meaning, for μίαν ὥραν μετὰ, of "at one and the same time withl.") From the use of ποίαν ὥραν in ch. iii. 3, we might concede such usage to be within the bare limits of possibility; though even thus the μίαν μετὰ, for "one and the same with," is a hard saying. But we are not to enquire in our exegesis, what *may* possibly be, but what *probably is*. And I venture to say that but for a preconceived opinion, no one would ever have thought of any other meaning for

om 1 Cor. i. 10. 13 οὗτοι μίαν ^c γνώμην ἔχουσιν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν καὶ ἐξου- APN B a
^cier 17 (b). to m, 1
d ch. ii. 16 reff. 2, 4, 9.
e (DAN. ii. 47.) 10-3, 16
ch. xix. 16. to 19, 26-
see 1 Tim. vi. 7, 30.
15. 32 to 42.
f ch. xix. 20 47 to 51.
reff. 90 B¹.
g Rom. i. 7.
1 Cor. i. 2.
Jude 1 al.
h Rev., here
only. 2 John
i, 13. Matt
xxiv. 31 al
freq Ps
lxxxviii 4.
i ver. 1 reff.
k plur., ch. vii.
9 ieff.

1 ch. v. 9 reff.

13. εχουσιν bef γνώμην B rel Andr-coisl: εχουσιν γυναικα (sic: om και) k: txt A[P]N g h 1. 10-7-8. 36 (16. 37. 49 B¹, e sil) vulg Hip. rec ins την bef εξουσιαν, with [P]N rel Hip Andr: om A B a c f g k l 2. 4. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 30-2-3-4-8-9. 41-2. 47 to 51 Andr-coisl Areth. (d def.) rec εαυτων, with 1. 33 (40-2, e sil): txt A[P]N B rel Hip Andr Areth. rec (for διδασιν) διαδιδωσουσιν, with vulg copt Tich Primas: δωσουσιν 18 Andr-a: txt A[P]N B 1 (διασιν with δο written over) 33(sic, Del) rel am syr-dd arm Andr Areth Iren-int.

14. for και (aft κλητοι) οτι 1.

15. for λεγει, ειπεν A; dixit vulg lat-ff. for τα υδατα, ταυτα N¹: ταυτα τα υδατα N^{3c}. om η N¹(ins N^{2a}). ins και bef λαοι N.

16. rec (for 2nd και) επι, with (34, e sil) Areth: txt A[P]N B 33(sic, Del) rel am(with demid fuld lips-5) syr-dd Hip Andr Primas.

these words than the ordinary one, "for the space of one hour." And thus accordingly we will take them, as signifying some definite space, unknown to us, thus designated: analogous in position to the δαίμων above) together with (i. e. in conjunction with, allied with: their power will be associated with his power) the beast (who are these? The answer seems to be furnished us in Dan. vii. 23 ff. They are ten kingdoms which shall arise out of the fourth great kingdom there: ten European powers, which in the last time, in concert with and subjection to the antichristian power, shall make war against Christ. In the precise number and form here indicated, they have not yet arisen. It would not be difficult to point out the elements and already consolidating shapes of most of them: but in precise number we have them not as yet. What changes in Europe may bring them into the required tale and form, it is not for us to say). These have (the present is used in describing them, though they have not yet arisen) one mind (one and the same view and intent and consent), and give their might and their power to the beast (becoming his allies and moving at his beck). These shall war with the Lamb (in concert with the beast, ch. xix. 19), and the Lamb shall conquer them, because He is Lord of lords and King of kings, and they who are with Him (νικήσουσιν αὐτούς also: the verb is implied in νικήσει above) called and chosen

(all the called are not chosen, Matt. (xx. 16,) xxii. 14: but all that are chosen are first called, 2 Pet. i. 10) and faithful (this way of taking this clause is far better than with Bengel to make κλ. κ. ἐκλ. κ. πιστοὶ into predicate, "and they that are with him are called and chosen and faithful." For 1) it can clearly be no co-ordinate reason with the other assigned for the Lamb's victory, that *His followers are*, &c., and 2) the arrangement of the sentence seems against this view, seeing that in the former case the predicate is put forward, and in this we should have expected it also: καὶ κλ. κ. ἐκλεκτ. κ. πιστοὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ).

15-18.] *Explanation of various particulars regarding the harlot, and of the harlot herself.* And he saith to me, The waters which thou sawest, where (οὗ, like ὅπου in ver. 9, = ἐφ' ὧν) the harlot sitteth, are peoples and multitudes and nations and languages (so in Isa. viii. 7, the king of Assyria and his invading people are compared to the waters of the river, strong and many. There is also doubtless an impious parody intended in the position of the harlot to that of Him who sitteth above the water-flood and remaineth King for ever, Ps. xxix. 10). And the ten horns which thou sawest, and the beast (viz. in that compact and alliance just now mentioned), these shall hate the harlot (we now enter upon prophetic particulars other than those revealed in the vision, where the harlot

^m ἡρμωμένην ⁿ ποιήσουσιν αὐτὴν καὶ γυμνὴν, καὶ τὰς ^m σάρκας αὐτῆς ^{op} φάγονται, καὶ αὐτὴν ^q κατακαύσουσιν [ἐν] ^r πυρὶ. ¹⁷ ὁ γὰρ θεὸς ^s ἔδωκεν εἰς τὰς καρδίας αὐτῶν ποιῆσαι τὴν ^t γνώμην αὐτοῦ [καὶ ποιῆσαι ^u γνώμην ^v μίαν,] καὶ δοῦναι τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτῶν τῷ θηρίῳ, ^v ἄχρι ^w τελεσθῆσονται οἱ λόγοι τοῦ θεοῦ. ¹⁸ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἣν εἶδες ἔστιν ἡ ^x πόλις ἡ ^y μεγάλη ἡ ἔχουσα βασιλείαν ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς.

8. Heb. viii. 10, from Jer. xxxviii (xxxix). 33. Neh. vii. 5.
u = ver. 13. v w. fut. ind., here only. [See Luke xiii. 35.]
x ch. xvi. 19 reff.

^m Matt. xii. 25; L. ch. xviii. 16, 19 only. Ezek. xxvi. 19. xxxvi. 10 al. n = ch. xii. 15. Gen. xxiv. 33. o ch. xix 18. Levit. xxvi. 29. p James v. 3 reff & note. q ch. viii. 7 reff. r [ch. xviii. 8. Jer. vii. 31, w. ἐν] Matt. iii. 12; L. s = 1 Thess. iv. w = ch. x. 7 reff.

ερμωμένην 1. om και γυμνην B-txt (Tischdf) c j 1. 50-txt.—aft γυμνην ins ποιήσουσιν αυτην B-marg rel Andr-coisl Areth: om A[P]N g 32 (16-8. 38, e sil) Andr-coisl Areth. καυσουσιν [for κατακ.] 1. om εν [P]N B m Andr-coisl.

17. for 1st αυτων, αυτου N¹. for αυτου, αυτων N^{3a}. om και ποιησαι γνωμην μιαν A vulg Andr-a Tich: N^{3a} would om και ποιησαι.—rec μιαν bef γνωμην, with [P]N 1. 17 Andr-p: μιαν γνωμην αυτων g: γνωμην αυτων m: γνωμην μιαν B rel Andr-coisl Areth., for 2nd αυτων, αυτω A: αυτου B f: txt [P]N g rel. rec τελεσθη (for -θησονται): τελεσθωσιν B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N h 1. 10-7-9. 27. 37. 49. 51 Br Hip Andr. rec (for οι λογοι) τα ρηματα: txt A[P]N B rel Hip Andr Areth.

18. om last η N b g: for η εχ., μη εχουσαν f. for βασιλεων, βασιλειων N. ins επι bef της γης B-corr a b d e k l 2. 9. 13-9. 26-7. 30-3. 40-1-2. 50: των επι 16. 39.

was sitting on the beast. Previous to these things coming to pass, she must be cast down from her proud position), and shall make her deserted and naked (contrast to ver. 4. Her former lovers shall no longer frequent her nor answer to her call: her rich adornments shall be stripped off. She shall lose, at the hands of those whom she formerly seduced with her cup of fornication, both her spiritual power over them and her temporal power to adorn herself, and shall eat her flesh (batten upon her spoils; confiscate her possessions: or perhaps, as the same expression, Ps. xxvii. 2; Micah iii. 2 ff., where it is used to indicate the extreme vengeance of keen hostility. So Xen. Hell. iii. 3. 6, says of the hatred between the Helots, Περιέει, &c., and the pure Spartans, ὅπου γὰρ ἐν τούτοις (the Helots, &c.) τις λόγος γένοιτο περὶ Σπαρτιατῶν, οὐδένα δύνασθαι κρύπτειν τὸ μὴ οὐχ ἡδέως ἀν καὶ ὤμων ἐσθλῆιν αὐτῶν), and shall consume her with (or, in) fire (Düsterd. remarks that in the former clause the figure of a woman is kept: in this latter the thing signified, a city. But this need not absolutely be; the woman may be here also intended: and all the more probably, because the very words ἐν πυρὶ κατακαύσουσιν are quoted from the legal formula of the condemnation of those who had committed abominable fornications: cf. Levit. xx. 14, xxi. 9. The burning of the city would be a signal

fulfilment: but we cannot positively say that that, and nothing else, is intended). For God put it (reff.: the aor. is prophetic) into their hearts to do His mind, [and to make one mind (ποιῆσαι is in the same sense each time—to put in practice: this they do in regard both to God's mind and their own common mind, the two being the same. The identity is not asserted, which would require τὴν μίαν γνώμην αὐτῶν, but implied),] and to give their kingdom (i.e., as above, the authority of their respective kingdoms) to the beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled (the prophetic words or discourses, — not ῥήματα, but λόγοι, — respecting the destruction of Babylon). And the woman whom thou sawest, is the great city, which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth (every thing here is plain. The “septem urbs alta jugis toto quæ præsidet orbi.” Propert., can be but one, and that one Rome. The pres. part., ἡ ἔχουσα, points to the time when the words were uttered, and to the dominion then subsisting. It has already been seen, that the prophecy regards Rome pagan and papal, but, from the figure of an harlot and the very nature of the predictions themselves, more the latter than the former. I may observe in passing, that the view maintained recently by Düsterd., after many others, that the whole of these prophecies regard Pagan Rome only, receives no countenance from the words of

y — ch. xxi. 23.

Luke xi. 36.

John i. 9 al.

Isa. lx. 1.

z = ch viii. 11

reff. = από,

Εξεκ. xiii.

2.

a = Heb. v. 7.

(ch v 2 al)

Dan. vi 20

Theod-B

F(not A).

Gen i. 10.

b ch xiv 8

(reff).

e = here only.

g ch. xix. 17, 21 only.

XVIII. ¹ Μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον ἄλλον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἔχοντα ἔξουσίαν μεγάλην, καὶ ἡ γῆ ^γ ἐφωτίσθη ^z ἐκ τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ. ² καὶ ἔκραξεν [ἐν] ἡ ἰσχυρᾷ φωνῇ λέγων ^b Ἐπεσεν [ἔπεσεν] ^b Βαβυλὼν ἡ ^b μεγάλη, καὶ ἐγένετο ^c κατοικητήριον ^d δαιμονίων καὶ ^e φυλακὴ παντὸς ^f πνεύματος ^f ἀκαθάρτου καὶ ^e φυλακὴ παντὸς ^{gh} ὄρ-

C παντός
ορν. ...

c Eph ii 22 only. Jer ix 11.

d ch ix. 20 al. Isa. xiii 21. Baruch iv 35.

e = here only. Hab. ii. 1. Baruch iii. 34. Xen Hell v. 4. 49

f ch xvi 13. Zech. xiii. 2.

h see Deut. xiv. 11. Acts x 14. Isa. xxxiv. 11 ff. xiii. 21, 22. Ξέρης. ii. 14.

CHAP. XVIII. 1. rec at beg ins καὶ, with h l m 1. 10-7. 34-5-6 (37-8 49 B^r, e sil) vulg Andr Primas: om A[P]N^b rel syr-dd copt Hip Andr-p Areth Tich Cassiod. rec om αλλον, with f 1. 33-4: ins A[P]N^b rel vulg syr-dd copt æth arm Hip Andr Areth lat-ff.—αγγέλον bef αλλον c 2. 4. 17 8-9. 32. 48-9 lips-6 Andr-coisl Areth: αγγέλον ετερον B^r.

2. ἐκείραξεν A. om εν N B b c d f g j l m 1. 2. 9 (16). 26-7. 32-3-4-5-8-9. 40-1-7-8. 50 Hip Andr-a Areth Primas. rec (for ισχυρα) ισχυι, with Andr-b, and aft φωνη ins μεγαλη, with 1: txt A[P]N^b rel am(with full lipss) syr-dd copt arm Andr-p.—ισχυρα φωνη a e k 16. 39. 40-7. 50-1. [om λεγων P.] om 2nd επεσεν N^b rel copt æth Andr-coisl Areth Primas: ins A [P(adding a third)] g h 10-7. 36 (1. 37. 41-7-9, e sil) vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Tich. ins η bef βαβυλων B f. rec δαιμονων (for -νιων), with [P] rel Hip Andr Areth: txt AN^b g. aft 1st ακαθαρτου ins και μεμισημενου A 16. om 4th to 5th και (homœotel) [P] 1. 48, and to end of ver c f l. for ορνου, θηριου A.

this verse, which this school of Commentators are fond of appealing to as decisive for them. Rather may we say that this verse, taken in connexion with what has gone before, stultifies their view entirely. If the woman, as these Commentators insist, represents merely the stone-walls and houses of the city, what need is there for *μυστήριον* on her brow,—what appropriateness in the use of all the Scripture imagery, long familiar to God's people, of spiritual fornication? And if this were so, where is the contest with the Lamb,—where the fulfilment of any the least portion of the prophecy? If we understand it thus, nothing is left for us but to say, as indeed some of this school are not afraid to say, that only the Seer's wish dictated his words, and that history has not verified them. So that this view has one merit: it brings us at once face to face with the dilemma of accepting or rejecting the book: and thereby, for us, who accept it as the word of God, becomes impossible. For us, who believe the prophecy is to be fulfilled, what was Rome then, is Rome now. Her fornications and abominations, as well as her power and pride, are matter of history and of present fact: and we look for her destruction to come, as we believe it is rapidly coming, by the means and in the manner here foretold.]

CH. XVIII. 1—XIX. 10.] THE DESTRUCTION OF BABYLON. And herein,

XVIII. 1—3.] *Announcement of the destruction.* The Seer does not see the act of destruction: it is prophesied to him in ch. xvii., and now announced, as indeed it had been by anticipation before, ch. xiv. 8, as having taken place. **After these things I saw another angel** (another besides the one who shewed him the vision in the last chapter: or, perhaps, as it is natural to join the ἄλλων in some measure with the participle following,—another besides the last who came down from heaven, ch. x. 1) **coming down out of heaven** (the Seer is still on the earth) **having great power** (possibly, as Elliott suggests, as the executor of the judgment that he announced. If so, the announcement is still anticipatory, see ver. 21), **and the earth was lighted up by his glory** (ἐκ, as the source of the brightness): **and he cried with (or, in) a mighty voice saying, Babylon the great is fallen [is fallen], and is become an habitation of demons** (see especially LXX, Isa. xxxiv. 14 ff.), **and a hold** (a place of detention: as it were an appointed prison) **of every unclean spirit, and a hold of every unclean and hated bird** (see the prophecy respecting Babylon, Jer. l. 39): **because by (out of, as source: or, according to the other reading, of) the wrath of her fornication all the nations have fallen** (or, according to the other reading, drunk: see on ch. xiv. 8. The use of the *θυμός* is even more remarkable here: of (or, by) that wine

νέου^h ἀκαθάρτου καὶ ¹μεμισημένου, ³ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ¹θυμοῦⁱ ⁱ = here only. see ch. xiv. 8
 τῆς ^{jk}πορνείας αὐτῆς ¹πέπ[τ]ωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, καὶ οἱ ^kch. ii. 21.
 βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς μετ' αὐτῆς ¹ἐπόρνευσαν, καὶ οἱ ^mἔμποροι ^mch. ii. 14 reff.
 τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ ⁿστρήνους αὐτῆς ^oἐπλού-
 τησαν. ⁿhere only. 4 Kings xix. 28 only. (νιάν, vv. 7, 9, καταστρη- νιάμ, 1 Tim. v. 11.)
⁴Καὶ ἤκουσα ἄλλην φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ λέγουσαν ^ow. ἐκ ver. 19 only. ἀπό, ver. 15.
 ῥ' Ἐξέλθατε ἐξ αὐτῆς, ὁ λαὸς μου, ἵνα μὴ ^aσυγκοινωνήσῃτε
 ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῆς, καὶ ⁱἐκ τῶν ^sπληγῶν αὐτῆς ἵνα μὴ
 λάβῃτε ⁵ὅτι ^tἐκολληθήσαν αὐτῆς αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ^uἄχρι τοῦ

...13.
 ACPN B
 a to m. 1.
 2. 4 9.
 10 16
 to 19. 26-
 7. 30.
 32 to 42.
 47 to 51.
 90 B.

p Isa. xlviii. 20. lu. 11. Jer. xxvii. (1) 8. xxviii. (h.) [6, 9], 45 F, &c. (not in ABN.) 2 Cor. vi. 17. q Eph.
 v. 11. Phil. iv 14 only t. (vos, ch. i. 9.) r = 1 John iv 13 Ezek. xliii. 20. see 2 John 4. u = Acts xi.
 s = ch ix. 18, 20 reff. t = here only. Baruch i. 20. see Acts viii. 29.
 5. ch. xiv. 20 (see Jonah i. 2. Jer. xxviii [h.] 9.)

3. rec ins του οινου bef του θυμου, with N B rel syr-dd copt Hip Andr-coisl Areth
 Primas Tich: aft τ. θ., [P] h m 1. 10-7. 36-7. 47-9 B^r copt arm æth-pl Andr: om AC
 am(with fuld lips-5-6, agst demid al) æth-rom Ansb.—της πορνείας bef του θυμου C:
 om τ. πορν. 33 syr. rec (for πεπ[τ]ωκαν) πεπωκε, with h 10-7 Hip Andr-a [πεποκεν
 P 1]: πεποτικε 18. 36-7: πεπωκασιν rel vulg Andr Areth Tich: πεπωκαν (sic) AC:
 πεπωκε B^r: πεπωκασιν N B b d e f g l 2. 13-6-9. 30. 35² (Del) 51. for 2nd της
 της, αυτης 1: aft 2nd γης, μετ αυτης επορνευσαν is repeated, but marked for erasure by
 N¹. for στρηνους, στρηνον C b 47 Andr.

4. αλλης φωνης C. rec εξελθετε, with [P] g h 1. 10-7. 32 (37-9. 40-1-9. 51 B^r,
 e sil) vulg spec syr-dd copt: εξελθε C B rel Andr-coisl Areth Cypr₂: txt AN.
 ο λαος μου bef εξελθε εξ αυτης C 38: bef εξ αυτης [P]N: om εξ αυτης 1. 12. συν-
 κοιν. AC[P]N. om last kai 1. 12. rec ινα μη λαβητε bef εκ των πληγων αυτης:
 [om kai εκ τ. πλ. αυτης (homæoteli) P:] txt ACN B rel vulg syr-dd Hip Andr Areth
 Tich.

5. rec (for εκολληθησαν) ηκολουθησαν (with 34, e sil): txt AC[P]N B 33(sic, Del)
 rel syr-dd copt æth Hip Andr Areth, pervenerunt vulg Cypr Primas, adpropin-
 quaverunt spec. [for αχρι, εως P.]

of her fornication which has turned into
 wrath to herself, and the kings of the
 earth committed fornication with her,
 and the merchants of the earth became
 rich out of the quantity (δύναμις, copia,
 as Vitringa, who remarks, "alludatur ad
 Hebræam vocem ἡν, cujus hæc significa-
 tionis vis est, Job xxxi. 25, Ezek. xxviii.
 4." We have πλούτου μεγάλου δύναμιν
 in Jos. Antt. iii. 2. 4) of her luxury
 (στρήνος, see reff. and note on 1 Tim.,
 seems properly to mean the exuberance of
 strength, the flower of pride).

4-20.] *Warning to God's people to
 leave her, on account of the greatness of
 her crimes and coming judgments (4-8);
 lamentations over her on the part of those
 who were enriched by her (9-20). And I
 heard another voice out of heaven (not
 that of the Father nor of Christ, for in
 such a case, as has been well observed, the
 long poetical lamentation would be hardly
 according to prophetic decorum; but that
 of an angel speaking in the name of God,
 as we have μου ch. xi. 3 also) saying,
 Come out of her, my people (in reff. Isa.,
 the circumstances differed, in that being a
 joyful exodus, this a cautionary one: and*

thus the warning is brought nearer to that
 one which our Lord commands in Matt.
 xxiv. 16, and the cognate warnings in the
 O. T., viz. that of Lot to come out of
 Sodom, Gen. xix. 15-22, when her de-
 struction impended, and that of the people
 of Israel to get them up from the tents of
 Dathan and Abiram, Num. xvi. 23-26.
 In reff. Jer., we have the same circum-
 stance of Babylon's impending destruction
 combined with the warning: and from
 those places probably, especially Jer. li.
 45, the words here are taken. The infer-
 ence has been justly made from them
 (Elliott iv. p. 40), that there shall be,
 even to the last, saints of God in the midst
 of Rome: and that there will be danger of
 their being, through a lingering fondness
 for her, partakers in her coming judg-
 ments, that ye partake not in her sins,
 and that ye receive not of her plagues
 (the fear, in case of God's servants re-
 maining in her, would be twofold: 1) lest
 by over-persuasion or guilty conformity
 they should become accomplices in any of
 her crimes: 2) lest by being in and of her,
 they should, though the former may not
 have been the case (and even more if it

οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἔμνημόνευσεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ἠδικήματα αὐτῆς.
 6 x ἀπόδοτε αὐτῇ ὥς καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ἀπέδωκεν καὶ διπλώσατε
 [τὰ] διπλὰ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς· ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ ἡ
 ἐκέρασεν ἡ κεράσατε αὐτῇ διπλοῦν. 7 ὅσα ἔδόξασεν
 αὐτὴν καὶ ἔστρηνιάσεν, ὅσοι οὖτοι δότε αὐτῇ βασι-
 νισμὸν καὶ πένθος, ὅτι ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς λέγει ὅτι
 κἀθήμαι βασιλίσσα καὶ χήρα οὐκ εἰμὶ καὶ πένθος οὐ
 μὴ ἴδω. 8 διὰ τοῦτο ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ ἤξουσιν αἱ πληγαὶ
 αὐτῆς, θάνατος καὶ πένθος καὶ λιμός· καὶ ἐν πυρὶ θανα-
 τος... ACFN B
 acc., Rom vi. 10, Gal. ii. 20 h = 2 Thess. i. 8. c ver. 10, ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov ix 2 d constr. ACFN B
 only +, see ver 3 reff. h = 2 Thess. i. 8. c ver. 10, ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov ix 2 d constr. ACFN B
 See ch. xxi 4. James iv. 9 only. Gen. i. 4. (-θείν, ver. 11) i ch. ix. 5. xiv 11 vv 10, 15 only +. 5 ver. 9. ACFN B
 m = (-είν) Isa. l. c. see Virg. Aen. i. 60. n = Matt. xii. 42. Acts viii. 27 only. Jer. xxxii. (xxix.) 2. 2 4 6. 9.
 o James i. 27 al. = Isa. l. c. p ver. 4. q here [ch. xvii. 16 (reff)] only. 10 16
 a ch. xiv. 10. b attr. 1 John iii. 24 reff. c ver. 10, ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov ix 2 d constr. ACFN B
 acc., Rom vi. 10, Gal. ii. 20 h = 2 Thess. i. 8. c ver. 10, ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov ix 2 d constr. ACFN B
 only +, see ver 3 reff. h = 2 Thess. i. 8. c ver. 10, ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov ix 2 d constr. ACFN B
 See ch. xxi 4. James iv. 9 only. Gen. i. 4. (-θείν, ver. 11) i ch. ix. 5. xiv 11 vv 10, 15 only +. 5 ver. 9. ACFN B
 m = (-είν) Isa. l. c. see Virg. Aen. i. 60. n = Matt. xii. 42. Acts viii. 27 only. Jer. xxxii. (xxix.) 2. 2 4 6. 9.
 o James i. 27 al. = Isa. l. c. p ver. 4. q here [ch. xvii. 16 (reff)] only. 10 16
 a ch. xiv. 10. b attr. 1 John iii. 24 reff. c ver. 10, ch. xiv. 10 only. Prov ix 2 d constr. ACFN B

6. rec (aft απεδωκεν) ins υμιν, with c h 1. 4. 10-7. 36 (47-8-9 B^r, e sil) Areth Promiss: ins arm Andr: om AC[P]N B rel am (with tol al, agst lipss al) syr-dd copt æth Hip
 ημιν arm Andr: om AC[P]N B rel am (with tol al, agst lipss al) syr-dd copt æth Hip
 Andr-coisl Tich spec. om 2nd και N. rec aft διπλώσατε ins αυτη, with [P] rel
 syr-dd copt Andr Areth: om ACN B a b d e f g j k 2. 9. 19 Andr Areth.—rec om τα,
 with A[P] B rel Andr Areth: ins CN a b d e f j k 26-7. 30-3. 42. 50. 90 Hip.—αυτα
 διπλα 38. aft διπλα ins ως και αυτη και B a b d e (f) j k 2. 9. 19. 26-7. 30. 51.
 (homeotel in m, τα εργα αυτης 1st and 2nd.) aft ποτηριω ins αυτης N B rel copt:
 om AC[P] g h 10 (c 4. 17-8. 27. 32, e sil). κερασατε 1 (Del: -σατε Treg). for
 αυτη, αυτην B.

7. rec (for αυτην) εαυτην, with N^{sc} rel Hip Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N B (supplied by
 corr) a b e j l 2. 9. 16. 27. 30-3. 49. 50-1. 90, αυτη 41-2. for τοςουτον δοτε,
 κερασατε 1. om και πενθος 1¹ (ins marg). 10-2. 37. 49. for 1st οτι, και 1.
 rec om 2nd οτι, with 1 (l 16-7. 39, e sil) vulg Hip Andr-p Tich: ins AC[P]N B
 rel Andr Areth Primas. for καθημαι, καθω B f: εειμι καθως b: καθως a d e k 2. 9.
 19. 26-7. 40-1-2. 50-1. 82 (Del). 90: καθως καθημαι 30-3.

8. om 1st και B a b d e j k m 2. 4. 6. 9. 26-7. 30¹-3-4-5-8. 40-1-7-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-

have), share in her punishment. It was through lingering fondness that Lot's wife became a sharer in the destruction of Sodom): because her sins (not as De W. the cry of her sins: but the idea is of a heap: see below) have reached (κολλᾶσθαι is put here after the analogy of the Heb. נָצַף, which, see Gesen. Lex. p. 312, is used for *assecutus est, proxime accessit ad*, Gen. xix. 19; Jer. xlii. 16, al. Gesenius compares *herere in terga hostium*, Liv. i. 14; in *tergis*, Tacit. hist. iv. 19; Curt. iv. 15. Bengel gives it well, *accumulata pervenerunt*) as far as heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities. Repay to her (the words are now addressed to the executioners of judgment) as she also repaid (cf. ref. Jer., καθὼς ἐποίησε, ποιήσατε αὐτῇ. The latter ἀπέδωκεν is used, not in its strict propriety, but as corresponding to the other. Hers was a giving, this is a giving back: we have exactly the same construction, which was probably in mind here, used also of Babylon, in ref. Ps., μακάριος ὁς ἀνταποδώσει σοι τὸ ἀνταποδομά σου, ὃ ἀνταπέδωκας ἡμῖν), and double [the] double according

to her works (so in reff. Isa. and Jer.). In the cup (see above, ch. xvii. 4, also xiv. 8, and our ver. 3) which she mixed, mix for her double (see ch. xiv. 10: a double portion of the deadly wine of God's wrath): in proportion as (lit., in as many things as) she glorified her (self: possibly ruled into this form αὐτῇ by the continual recurrence of the various cases of αὐτῇ in the context), and luxuriated (see above, ver. 3, and ref. 1 Tim. note), so much torment and grief give to her. Because in her heart she saith (that) I sit a queen (see ref. Isa., from which the sense and even the single words come, being there also said of Babylon. Similarly also Ezek. xxvii. 1 ff., of Tyre), and am not a widow (ref. as above), and shall never see sorrow (= οὐδὲ γνώσομαι ὀρφανίαν, Isa. l. c.). For this cause in one day shall come her plagues, death and mourning and famine (from Isa. xlvii. 9, where however we have ἀτεκνία καὶ χηρεία. The judgments here are more fearful: death, for her scorn of the prospect of widowhood; mourning, for her inordinate revelling; famine, for her

⁹ κατακαυθήσεται· ὅτι ¹ ἰσχυρὸς [κύριος] ὁ θεὸς ὁ ² κρίνας ³ αὐτήν. ⁹ Καὶ * κλαύσουσιν καὶ ⁴ κόφονται ⁵ ἐπ' αὐτήν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς οἱ μετ' αὐτῆς ⁶ πορνεύσαντες καὶ ⁷ στερη-
νιάσαντες, ὅταν βλέπωσιν τὸν ⁸ καπνὸν τῆς ⁹ πυρώσεως
αὐτῆς, ¹⁰ ὑπὸ ¹¹ μακρόθεν ἐστηκότες διὰ τὸν φόβον τοῦ
¹² βασανισμοῦ αὐτῆς, λέγοντες· Οὐαὶ οὐαὶ ἡ ¹³ πόλις ἡ
¹⁴ μεγάλη, Βαβυλὼν ἡ πόλις ἡ ¹⁵ ἰσχυρά, ὅτι ¹⁶ μὲν ὥρα
ἦλθεν ἡ ¹⁷ κρίσις σου. ¹⁸ καὶ οἱ ¹⁹ ἔμποροι τῆς γῆς ²⁰ κλαί-
ουσιν καὶ ²¹ πενθοῦσιν ²² ἐπ' αὐτήν, ὅτι τὸν ²³ λόγον αὐτῶν

...ἦλθεν
ἡ 33.
ACPN B
a 10m, 1.
2.4.6.9.
10.16
to 19.26-
7.30-2.
34 to 42.
47 to 51.
80 Br.

58 xxvii. 55 al. Ps. xxxvii. 12 AN^{3a}.

1 27. Ezek. xxvi. 17 A.

1 7 Hos. x. 5.

f Mark xvi. 10. Luke vi. 25.

h here bis

z ver. 7

c vv 16, 19.

Acts xxi. 3 only.

a ch. xvi. 19 reff.

d John xii. 31.

Exod. xxiii. 5 only.

x ver. 18. 1 Pet.

iv 12 only.

Prov. xxvii.

21 (ρουν,

ch. i. 15).

Rev. xv. 15,

17 only

Matt. xxvi.

b = 1 Cor.

Jer. xxxi. (xlviii.) 21.

g = ver. 9. ch.

coisl.—θανατοῦ B. om *kyrios* A g vulg æth: ins C[P]N^{3a} B rel syr-dd Hip Andr
Areth Cypr. (ο θς ο κς N¹: om δ θεος c k 6 Areth Primas.) rec *κρινων*, with
N^{3a} c 1. 4. 18. 33 (26-7. 30-2. 48, e sil) Andr Areth: txt AC[P]N¹ B rel Hip Andr-p.
(g doubtful.)

9. * rec *κλαύσονται*, with AN 1. 36. 51. 90 Hip Andr-p: *κλαουσουσιν* C[P] B
rel Andr Areth. rec adds *αυτην*, with [P] 1. 17-8. 35; *ταυτην* 36: om ACN B rel
syr-dd copt Hip Andr-coisl Areth Cypr. (om from *αυτην* ver 8 to *επ' αυτην* in this 33.)
rec επ αυτη, with A g j 1. 38 Andr a: om f: *αυτων* 16: txt C[P]N B rel Hip
Andr-coisl Areth. om και στερηνιασαντες (*hom*) N¹: ins N^{3a}: N^{3c} adds further
και στεναζουσιν. for βλεπ., ιδωσιν N. for καπνον, καρπον 1. πωσεως N¹.

10. rec ins εν bef μια ωρα, with 1. 38 syr-dd copt Andr Areth: om C[P]N B rel vulg
Hip Andr-coisl Tich Primas.—μιαν ωραν A.

11. aft γης ins σου N. κλαουσουσιν and πενθησουσιν B rel vss Hip Andr-coisl
Areth Primas: txt AC[P]N 1. 10-7 (g h 37. 49 B, e sil) Andr. rec επ αυτη,
with rel: επ αυτης m: επ αυτους B: εφ' εαυτους 12: εν εαυτοις 1: εν αυτη A: txt
C[P]N 162-8. 32-9 Hip.

abundance): and with fire shall she be burnt (the punishment of the fornicatress; see ch. xvii. 16 note. Whether this is to be understood of the literal destruction of the city of Rome by fire, Elliott iv. 43, is surely doubtful, considering the mystical character of the whole prophecy): because strong is [the Lord] God who hath judged her (a warrant for the severity of the judgment which shall befall her).

9—20.] *The mourning over her:* and first, 9, 10, *by the kings of the earth.* And there shall weep and mourn over her (when the catalogue of mourners has yet to begin, the fact of mourning is thrown forward by the verbs being placed first: but below, ver. 11, when we come to the second member, the persons, as the new feature, are put forward before the verbs. επ' αὐτήν, as the direction and converging of their lamentation) the kings of the earth, who committed fornication and luxuriated (see above, ver. 7) with her, when they see the smoke of her burning, standing afar off on account of their fear of her torment (this feature in the prophecy is an objection to the literal understanding of its

details. It can hardly be imagined that the kings should bodily stand and look as described, seeing that no combination of events contemplated in the prophecy has brought them together as yet), saying, Woe, woe, the great city, Babylon the strong city, because in one hour has come thy judgment. 11—16.] *Lamentation of the merchants.* And the merchants of the earth weep and lament (the construction passes into the graphic present, but resumes the future again below, ver. 15, in speaking of the same thing) over her, because no one any longer buys their cargo (reff.: so Eustath.

in Wetst.: φόρος νηός, δ καὶ γόμος. The description which follows is perhaps drawn, in its poetic and descriptive features, from the relation of Rome to the world which then was, rather than from its relation at the future time depicted in the prophecy. But it must not for a moment be denied, that the character of this lamentation throws a shade of obscurity over the interpretation, otherwise so plain from the explanation given in ch. xvii. ult. The difficulty is however not confined to the application of the pro

i ch. xvii. 4
(reff.).
k ver. 16. ch.
xix. 8 (bis),
14 only.
l Chron. xv.
27. Esth. i.
6. (-soos,
Lukæ xvi.
19).
l Mark xv. 17,
20. Luke
xvi. 19 only.
(-soús, ch.
xvii 4).
Exod. xxv. 4.
p ch. ii. 27 reff.
only t. Wisd. xii. 7 only
xxx. 23 al.

οὐδείς ἀγοράζει οὐκέτι, ¹² ἡ γόμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου
καὶ ¹ λίθου ¹ τιμίου καὶ ¹ μαργαρίτων καὶ ^k βυσσίνου καὶ
¹ πορφύρας καὶ ^m σηρικοῦ καὶ ⁿ κοκκίνου καὶ πᾶν ξύλον
οὐ θύϊνον καὶ πᾶν ^p σκευὸς ^q ἐλεφάντινον καὶ πᾶν ^p σκευὸς
ἐκ ^r ξύλου ^s τιμιωτάτου καὶ χαλκοῦ καὶ σιδήρου καὶ ^u μαρ-
μάρου, ¹³ καὶ ^v κιννάμωμον καὶ ^w ἄμωμον καὶ ^x θυμιάματα

13...
ACPN B
a to m, l.
2. 4. 6. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30-2.
34 to 42.
47 to 51.
90 B.

m here only +
q here only Ezek xxvii 15 al
u here only t. Epist Jer 72. (-rinos, Cant. v. 15.)
w here only t. ch v 8 reff.

n ch. lvi 3, 4 reff.
r here only t.
o here only t. 3 Kings x 11 Symm
s superl., ch. xxi 11
v here only. Exod.

12. γόμον χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου καὶ λίθους τιμίους καὶ μαργαρίτας C[P].—rec μαργαρί-
των, with B rel: μαργαρίταις A: txt N g m. for 3rd καὶ, οὐτε 1. rec (for
βυσσίνου) βυσσου, with h 1. 10-7-8. 36. 49 (37 B, e sil) Hip Andr: txt AC[P]
B rel Andr-coisl Areth, βυσσινίων N. καὶ πορφύρου B rel Andr-p Areth: om A
Ansb: txt C[P]N g m 16-8. 34 (35-6-9 B, e sil) Hip Andr. om καὶ σηρικοῦ 1.
for ξύλον, σκευὸς A [ξύλινον P]. om εκ C 18. for ξύλου, λίθου A vulg
æth. om καὶ μαρμαρου N 1.
13. rec (for κιννάμωμον) κινάμ., with k m 10: txt AC[P]N B rel.—ωμων B a b c e j²
k l Hip. rec om καὶ αμωμον, with N^{3a} rel copt Andr Areth Primas: ins AC[P]N¹
c m 6. 11-2-7. 34-5-6 am(with fuld tol lips) syr-dd æth Hip Andr-coisl.
θυμιάμα [for -ματα] 1: -ματος f.

phcey to Rome papal, but extends over the application of it to Rome *at all*, which last is determined for us by the solution given ch. xvii. ult. For Rome never has been, and from its very position never could be, a great commercial city. I leave this difficulty unsolved, merely requesting the student to bear in mind its true limits, and not to charge it exclusively on that interpretation which only shares it with any other possible one. The main features of the description are taken from that of the destruction of and lamentation over Tyre in Ezek. xxvii., to which city they were strictly applicable. And possibly it may be said that they are also applicable to the church which has wedded herself to the pride of the earth and its luxuries. But certainly, as has been observed, the details of this mercantile lamentation far more nearly suit London, than Rome at any assignable period of her history, a cargo of gold, and of silver, and of precious stone, and of pearls, and of fine linen manufacture (βυσσίνου is the neut. adj. from βύσσης), and of purple, and of silken stuff (in describing Vespasian's triumph, Jos., B. J. vii. 5. 4, says, *κακείνοι χωρὶς ὑπλων ἦσαν ἐσθήσεσι σηρικαῖς, ἐστεφανωμένοι δάφναις*) and of scarlet stuff, and (the accusative is now taken up instead of the genitive governed by γόμον, which latter is however resumed below at ἵππων, and again dropped at ψυχάς) all citron wood (the wood of the θύον, θύα, or θύια, the citrus of the Romans (Plin. iii. 29), probably the eu-

pressus thyioides, or the thya articulata. Theophrastus, Hist. Plant. v. 5, thus describes it: τὸ δὲ θύϊον, οἱ δὲ θύλαν καλοῦσι, παρ' Ἀμμωνιδι γίνεται, καὶ ἐν τῇ Κυρηναίᾳ τὴν μὲν μορφὴν θμοῖνον κυπαρίττω καὶ τοῖς κλάδοις καὶ τοῖς φύλλοις καὶ τῷ στελέχει καὶ τῷ καρπῷ . . . ἀσαπὶς . . . ὅλων τὸ ξύλον, οὐλότατον δὲ τὴν ῥίζαν ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τὰ σπουδαύτα ποιεῖται τῶν ἔργων. It was used for costly doors, with fittings of ivory, Ath. v. 205 B, 207 F, and for tables, Strabo iv. 310 A. It had a sweet smell, Plin. ut supra, "Nota etiam Homero fuit; θύον Græce vocatur, ab aliis thya. Hanc igitur inter odores uri tradit in deliciis Circes . . . magno errore eorum qui odoramenta in eo vocabulo accipiunt, cum præsertim eodem versu cedrum laricemque una tradat: in quo manifestum est de arboribus tantum locutum." But Pliny is clearly wrong: for Homer's words are *πῖρ μὲν ἐπ' ἐσχαρόφιν μέγα καίετο, τηλόθι δ' ὁδμὴ Κέδρου τ' εὐκείτοιο θύον τ' ἀνὰ νῆσον δδώδει Δαιομένων*, Od. ε. 60. See Wetst. for more illustrations, and Winer, Realw. art. Thinenholz), and every article of ivory, and every article of most costly wood, and of brass, and of iron, and of marble; and cinnamon (it is not certain, whether the κιννάμωμον or κίνναμον, *قinnamon*, of the ancients was the same as our cinnamon. Various accounts are given of its origin (see Winer, Realw. art. Zimmt, and Theophr. plant. ix. 4; Strabo xvi. p. 778; Diod. Sic. ii. 49, iii. 46), but Herodotus, who (iii. 111) ascribes it to the country where

καὶ ^γ μύρον καὶ ^z λίβανον καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἔλαιον καὶ ^a σεμί- ^γ John xi. 2.
 δαλιν καὶ σίτον καὶ ^b κτήνη καὶ πρόβατα καὶ ^c ἵππων καὶ ^γ Luke vii. 37,
^d ῥεδῶν καὶ ^e σωμάτων, καὶ ^f ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων. ¹⁴ καὶ ἡ ^γ 38, 46.
^e ὁπώρα σου τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπὸ σοῦ, ^z xxiii. 56
 καὶ πάντα τὰ ^h λιπαρὰ καὶ [τὰ] ⁱ λαμπρὰ ^j ἀπόλετο ^k ἀπὸ ^γ only. Exod.
 σοῦ, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὰ οὐ μὴ εὕρησουσιν. ¹⁵ οἱ ^k ἔμποροι ^a xxx. 25.
 b Luke x. 34. Acts xxiii. 24. 1 Cor. xv. 39 only. Num. xx. 4. c ch. vi. 2 reff. d here only+.
 e = Gen. xxxiv. 29. 2 Macc. viii. 11. Tobit x. 11. f Ezek xxviii 13. 1 Chron. v. 21.
 g here only. Jer. xxxi. (xlviii) 32. xlvii. (xl.) 10, 12 only. h here only. Neh. ix. 36. Isa. xxx.
 23 only. i = Luke xxiii. 11. James ii. 2, 3 ch. xix. 8 al+ (Wisd. vi. 12 al.) j Deut.
 iv. 26 al. k vv. 3, 11.

om και μυρον C. om και οινον B a b e (f?) j k l 2. 6. 9. 16-9. 26-7. 30. 50-1. 90.—
 κ. ελαιον bef κ. οινον c (f?) 32. κ. προβατα bef κ. κτηνη B rel-scr 2. 9. 34(-5, e sil)
 38 to 43. 47-8. 50-1 Andr-coisl Areth: txt AC[P]N g h rel Andr-coisl Areth.
 14. om ἡ C. rec τ. επιθυμ. τ. ψυχης bef σου, with B rel vss Hip Andr Areth :
 txt AC[P]N g 35 am(with fuld tol) Primas. ριπαρὰ N¹. om 2nd τα CN.
 rec (for ἀπόλετο) ἀπῆλθεν, with 1 Andr-a: ἀπόλωντο N d (appy) h l m 10-6.
 37-9. 49 Br: om 90: txt AC[P] B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Hip Andr-coisl Areth
 Primas. rec ου μη ευρ. bef αυτα, with rel syr-dd Andr Areth: ου μη αυτα ευρ.
 AN g 38 Hip: txt C[P] B a b d e f j l 16. 26-7. 30-9. 40-8. 50-1. 90.—rec (for ευρη-
 σουσιν) ευρησης, with 17. 26-7; ευρησεις h 1. 10. 37. 49: ευρης B rel Hip Andr Areth,
 ευρεis l: txt AC[P]N m 34-5-6. 51. 90 vulg syr-dd æth Andr-coisl

Dionysus was born, i. e. to India, seems to give the right statement, if at least it is the modern cinnamon, which comes from Ceylon. In ref. Exod. it is an ingredient in the holy oil for anointing: in Prov. vii. 17 it is one of the perfumes of the bed of the adulteress: in Cant. iv. 14 it is one of the plants growing in the garden of the beloved) and amomum (a precious ointment made from an Asiatic shrub, and used for the hair: see the numerous citations from Ovid, Martial, &c., in Wetst., and Plin. H. N. xii. 13 (28)), and odours (for incense), and ointment, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine meal (σεμίδαλις, the *simila* or *similago* of the Latins, the finest wheat meal: see Wetst. and Palm and Rost sub voce), and wheat, and cattle and sheep, and of horses and of chariots ("Rheda genus vehiculi iv. rotarum," Isidor. xx. 17 in Wetst., who also quotes Lampridius to the effect that Alexander Severus "rhedas senatoribus omnibus ut argentatas haberent permisit: interesse Romanæ dignitatis putans ut his tantæ urbis senatores versarentur." Quintilian, i. 5, ascribes to the word a Gallic origin: "plurima Gallica valuerunt, ut rheda et petorritum, quorum altero Cicero tamen, altero Horatius utitur") and of bodies (i. e. slaves. The expression is blamed by the Atticists as not used by the ancients: so Pollux, iii. 78, σώματα ἀπλῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποις, ἀλλὰ σώματα δοῦλα. And so Phrynichus, p. 378, σώματα ἐπὶ τῶν ὀνίων ἀνδραπόδων, οἷον σώματα πωλεῖται, οὐ χράνται οἱ ἀρχαῖοι.

Lobeck, in his note there, shews that Plato and Demosthenes use σώματα for any kind of men indefinitely (Plato, Legg. x. 114: Dem. p. 910), and it is the appropriating it to σώμ. δοῦλα alone which constitutes the later usage),—and (the accus. here comes in after genitives) persons of men (so the E. V. for οἱ τῶν ψῶν, ref. Ezek. which the LXX render as here, ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων. But in Gen. xxxvi. 6, for ἱνῶν ἰνῶν τῶν, they have πάντα τὰ σώματα τοῦ οἴκου αὐτοῦ, where also E. V. has persons. It seems vain to attempt to draw a distinction between the σώματα and ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων. If any is to be sought, the most obvious is that pointed out by Bengel, and adopted by Ewald, Hengstb., and Düsterd., that the σωμαίων expresses such slaves as belong to the horses and chariots, and ψυχὰς ἀνθρ. slaves in general). 14.] This verse takes the form of a direct address, and then in the next the merchants are taken up again. From this some have thought that it is not in its right place: e. g. Beza and Vitringa fancied it should be inserted after ver. 23: others, as Ewald, that it was originally a marginal addition by the Writer. But irregular as is the insertion, it need not occasion any real difficulty. It takes up the κλαύουσιν κ. πενθοῦσιν of ver. 11, as if αὐτῶν after those verbs had been ἡμῶν, which is not unnatural in a rhapsodical passage. And τοῦτων, ver. 15, refers very naturally back to πάντα τὰ λιπαρὰ κ.τ.λ., in this verse. And thy harvest of the desire of thy soul (i. e. the ingathering

1 w. ἀπό, here only.
 Sir. xi. 18.
 εκ, vv 3, 19.
 m see Matt. xv. 27.
 n ver. 10.
 o ver 7.
 p ver. 11.
 q ch. xvi 19
 reff.
 r ch. vii. 9 reff.
 s ver. 12
 t ch. xvii. 4
 ver 12.
 u ch. xvii. 4
 only. Exod. xxvi. 32, 37.
 v ver. 10
 w ch. xvii. 16
 reff.
 x Acts xxvii. 11 only
 Prov. xxiii 34. Ezek xxvii 8, 27, 28 only (—ᾧν, Prov. xii. 5. —ησις, 1 Cor. xii 28.) y Luke vii. 23. Acts xxi. 3. xxvii 2, 6, 24 only. Also 1. 39: for λεγοντες, λεγουσιν B 26. om 2nd ουαι B a b d e f j k 9. 10-3-6-8. 26-7. 39. 40-2-8. 50-1. 90. N¹ has πολισ μενη, omg η μεγαλη η περιβεβλη, which is supplied by N^{3a}. om 3rd η A. for βυσινον, βυσσον B a b e f j k 1 2. 6. 10-3-9. 26. 40-1 2-8. 50-1. 90 Andr-p: txt ACN rel Hip Andr Areth, [βυσινον P,] βυσσινον 1. (om -μενη to -μενη 9. 27.) κοκκ. κ. πορφ. κ. βυσσ. A. [πορφυραν P b m 40. om 2nd και P.] om 3rd και 1. κεχρυσωμενον N. om εν A[P] B rel Andr-coisl Areth: ins CN 1. 10-6. 36 (6. 37, e sil) Hip Andr. rec (for χρυσω) χρυσω, with N 1. 10-7. 36 (f 37. 49, e sil) Andr: txt AC[P] B rel Hip Andr-coisl Areth. om τιμιω B. rec μαργαριταις, with B rel vss Hip Andr Areth Tich: txt AC[P]N g Primas. ερημωθη 1(so ver 19). [om δ P g.]

17. rec (for ο επι τοπον πλεων) επι των πλοιων ο ομιλος, with 1 Hip Andr-a: δ επι των πλοιων πλεων h 4. 6. 17. 32-6-7. 49 Andr Areth Tich: επι των πλοιων πλεων [P] 10. 34. 48: πλεων επι των πλοιων c: ο επι πλοιων πλεων B¹: txt AC rel am(with fuld) syr-dl arm Primas, ο επι τον τοπον πλεων N B.

18. rec εκραζον, with N B rel Andr Areth: εκραυγαζον 9. 13. 27: om και εκραζαν 38: txt AC[P] g m 35, clamaverunt vulg Tich. rec (for βλεποντες) ορωντες, with 1. 34: txt AC[P] B rel Hip Andr Areth, λεγοντες (but corrd to txt eadem manu) N¹ for καπνον, τοπον A vulg: txt C[P]N B rel. om τις C.

of the dainties and luxuries which thy soul lusted after. It seems better on account of the following genitives to take *δπώρα* thus, than to understand it in the concrete of the fruit itself, though it frequently has this latter sense: see Palm and Rost's Lex. and the reff. here) has departed from thee, and all (thy) fat things and [thy] splendid things have perished from thee, and they (men) shall never more at all find them. The next two verses describe, in strict analogy with vv. 9, 10, the attitude and the lamentation of these merchants. The merchants of these things (viz. of all those mentioned in vv. 12, 13, which have been just summed up as *πάντα τὰ λιπαρά κ.τ.λ.*) who gained wealth from her, shall stand afar off by reason of their fear of her torment, weeping and mourning, saying, Woe, woe, the great city, which was lothed in stuff of fine linen and of

purple and of scarlet, and bedecked (lit. *gilded*; the zeugmatic construction carrying on the word to the other substantives besides *χρυσίω*, which we cannot do in English) in (or, if *ἐν* be omitted, *with*) golden ornament and precious stone and pearl: because (*ὅτι* gives a reason for the *οὐαὶ οὐαὶ*) in one hour hath been desolated all that wealth.

17—19.] *The lamentation of the ship-masters, &c.* And every pilot and every one who saileth any whither (the same expression, without the preposition, is found in Acts xxvii. 2. The words here import, all sailors from place to place), and sailors and as many as make traffic of the sea (*τ. θάλασσαν ἐργάζεσθαι*, 'mare exercere', to live by seafaring, is abundantly illustrated by Wetst. from the classics and later writers), stood afar off, and cried out when they saw the smoke of her burning, saying, Who is like to

ἤκουσα ^d ὡς φωνὴν ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ ὡς ^e φωνὴν ^e ὑδά- APN n b
 των ^e πολλῶν καὶ ὡς ^f φωνὴν ^f βρουτῶν ^g ἰσχυρῶν, ^h λέ- to m, 1.
 γοντες ^y Ἀλληλουῖα, ὅτι ⁱ ἐβασίλευσεν ^k κύριος ὁ ^k θεὸς ὁ 2. 4. G 9.
^k παντοκράτωρ. ^l ἡ χαίρωμεν καὶ ^{lm} ἀγαλλίωμεν, καὶ 10-13. 16
ⁿ δώσομεν τὴν ⁿ δόξαν αὐτῷ, ὅτι ἦλθεν ὁ ^o γάμος τοῦ to 19. 26-
 ἀρνίου καὶ ἡ ^p γυνὴ αὐτοῦ ^q ἠτοίμασεν ἑαυτήν. ^s καὶ 7. 30-2.
 ἐδόθη αὐτῇ ^r ἡ ^s περιβάλλεται ^t βύσσινον ^u λαμπρὸν 34 to 42.
 καθαρὸν, τὸ γὰρ ^t βύσσινον τὰ ^v δικαίωματα τῶν ^w ἁγίων 47 to 51.
 ἐστίν. 80 B.

^d ver. 1. ^e ch. i. 15 reff. ^f ch. v. 2 reff. ^g const., ch. i. 1. ^h ch. xi. 17. ⁱ ch. i. 8 reff. ^j Matt. v. 12. ^k 1 Pet. iv. 13. ^l see John viii. 56. ^m 1 Pet. i. 8. ⁿ act., Luke i. 47 only. ^o John v. 35. ^p viii. 56. ^q 1 Pet. i. 6, 8. ^r Ps. cxviii. 24. ^s Isa. lxi. 10. ^t n ch. xi. 13 reff. ^u o = Matt xxii. 2, &c. xxv. 10. ^v Luke xii. 36 al. ^w = ch. xxi. 9. ^x Matt. i. 20. ^y Deut. xxii. 24. ^z q = ch. xxi. 2. ^{aa} see Gen. xxiv. 14, 44. ^{ab} r const., John xxi. 4. ^{ac} ch. i. 4. ^{ad} i. 4. ^{ae} s ch. v. 9 reff. ^{af} t ch. xvii. 12 reff. ^{ag} u of clothing, Luke xxii. 11. ^{ah} Acts x. 30. ^{ai} James ii. 2, 3. ^{aj} ch. xv. 6 (xvii. 14. xxii. 1, 16) †. ^{ak} (Sir. xxi. 22 al) ^{al} y = here only. ^{am} see ch. xi. 4. ^{an} w = ch. xi. 13 reff.

6. om 1st *ws* c d(appy) m 1¹. 6. 12. 35, ins 1-corr: *φωνην* bef *ws* 36. om 2nd *ws* A b 12. Steph *λεγοντας*, with h 1. 10 6-7-9. 30-7. 47-9 Areth: elz *λεγοντων*, with A[P] g m 6. 18. 35-6-8 Andr-a, *λεγουσων* N, *dicentium* vulg Primas: *λεγοντος* 39: txt B rel Andr-coisl, *dicentes* Tich. aft *θεος* ins *ημων* [P]N^{3a} B rel vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Tich: om A g 1 (49. 50, e sil) copt.—o *ὅς ο* *κς* *ημων* N¹: om *kyrios* d 1. 12 æth Andr.

7. rec *αγαλλίωμεθα*, with B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N g m 1. 12-8 35-6. rec (for *δωσομεν*) *δωμεν*, with N¹ B rel Andr Areth: txt A[P]N^{3a} 36 Andr-p. for *αυται*, *αυτων* N¹: *αυτου* 1. for *γυνη*, *νυμφη* N^{3c}. om *αυτου* 1. 12-6. 39.

8. rec (for *λαμπρον καθαρων*) *καθαρον* και *λαμπρον*, with 1. 36 Andr: *καθαρον λαμπρον* 17-8: *λαμπρον και καθαρον* B rel Andr-coisl: txt A[P]N g 1 79 B^r am (with demid lips-4 lux) syr-dd copt æth Areth Primas. rec *εστι* bef *των αγιων*, with 1. 34. 40-1 vulg copt: txt A[P]N B rel syr-dd Andr Areth Primas.

Hengstb. Our Lord never spoke thus: cf. John xx. 17, note) saying, Give praise to our God, all His servants (cf. Ps. cxxxiv. 1), [and] ye that fear Him, the small and the great (cf. Ps. cxv. 13). And I heard as it were the voice of much multitude (cf. ver. 1), and as it were the voice of many waters, and as it were the voice of strong thunders, saying (nom. see ref.), Hallelujah, because the Lord God Almighty reigneth (here is a case where we cannot approach the true sense

* of the aor. *ἐβασίλευσεν* but by an English present: “reigned” would make the word apply to a past event limited in duration: “hath reigned” would even more strongly imply that the reign was over. It is well to note such cases, to shew the inadequacy of our past tenses to reproduce the Greek ones). Let us rejoice and exult, and we will give the glory to Him: because the marriage of the Lamb is come (these words introduce to us transitionally a new series of visions respecting the final consummation of the union between Christ and His Church, which brings about the end, ch. xxi. 1 ff.: the solemn opening of which now immediately follows in vv. 11 ff. This series, properly speaking, includes in itself the overthrow of the kings of the earth. the binding of Satan, the

thousand years’ reign, the loosing of Satan, the final overthrow of the enemy, and the general judgment: but is not consummated except in the entire union of Christ and His with which the book concludes. So that the aor. *ἦλθεν*, *ἠτοίμασεν*, are in a measure proleptic.

This figure, of a marriage between the Lord and His people, is too frequent and familiar to need explanation. Cf. in the O. T. Isa. liv. 1—8; Ezek. xvi. 7 ff.; Hos. ii. 19 f.: and in the N. T., Matt. ix. 15 || and note, xxv. 1 ff.; John iii. 29; Eph. v. 25 ff. Indeed it penetrates almost every where the thoughts and language used respecting Christ and the Church, and his wife hath made herself ready (is complete in her adornment, as in next verse).

And it was given to her (have we in these words still the voice of the celestial chorus, or are they merely narrative, written in the person of the Seer himself? It seems to me that the latter alternative is rendered necessary by the fact of the explanation, τὸ γὰρ κ.τ.λ., being subjoined. Düsterd. makes the song end at *λαμπρόν*: but this seems harsh and disjointed. Moreover the *ἐδόθη* is the regular formula narrandi of the book) that (a construction of St. John’s, see reff.) she should be clothed in fine linen raiment, bright

9 Καὶ λέγει μοι Γράψον ^x Μακάριοι οἱ εἰς τὸ δεῖπνον ^x τοῦ ὁ γάμου τοῦ ἀρνίου ^y κεκλημένοι. καὶ λέγει μοι Οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οἱ ^z ἀληθινοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσιν. 10 καὶ ἔπεσα ἔμ- προσθεν τῶν ^a ποδῶν αὐτοῦ ^a προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ. καὶ λέγει μοι ^b Ὅρα μὴ ^c σύνδουλός σου εἶμι καὶ τῶν ἀδελ- φῶν σου τῶν ^d ἐχόντων τὴν ^e μαρτυρίαν ^e Ἰησοῦ· τῷ θεῷ

d ch. vi. 9 reff.

^x Luke xiv. 15.
^y = Matt. xxi. 2.
^z John ii. 2
al. Esth. v.
12.
^a = ch. xxii. 6.
12.
^a here only
see ch. xxii.
8.
^b ch. xxi. 9.
see Matt. vii.
4.
^c Heb. viii.
5.
^e ch. vi. 11 reff.
e ch. i. 2 reff.

9. om γραψον 1 vulg-ms Andr-a. for το, τον B 16. om του γαμου [P]N¹
1. om 2nd και λεγει μοι N¹ (6 ?) 38. rec om οἱ (aft λόγοι), with [P](N^{3a}) B
rel Andr Areth: for οι, μου N¹: txt A 4. 48.—του θεου bef αληθ. N^{3a} g k. rec
εισιν bef του θεου, with N¹ 1. 17 (a h 37-8. 49, e sil) Andr: txt A[P](N^{3a}) B rel vulg
syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth Primas.
10. (επεσα, so A[P]N¹ b h¹ j l m 1. 2. 10-6-7. 26-7. 35-6-9. 42-9. 50 Andr-a. (d def.))
for εμπροσθεν, ενωπιον B. [for προσκυνησαι, και προσεκυνησα P.] for
αυτω, αυτον B. om 2nd σου N¹ 6. ins και bef των εχοντων 1. 12. rec
ins του bef 1st ιησου, with 51 (2. 39. 40-7, e sil): om A[P]N¹ B rel Andr Areth.

(and) pure ("Vides hic cultum gravem ut matronæ, non pompaticum qualis meretricis ante descriptus." Grot.), for the **fine linen raiment** is (imports, see Matt. xxvi. 26 reff.), the righteousness of the saints (i. e. their pure and holy state, attained, as in the parallel description ch. vii. 14, is declared by the elder, by their having washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. The plur. -ματα is probably distributive, implying not many δικαιώματα to each one, as if they were merely good deeds, but one δικαιώμα to each of the saints, enveloping him as in a pure white robe of righteousness. Observe that here and every where, the white robe is not Christ's righteousness imputed or put on, but the saints' righteousness, by virtue of being washed in His blood. It is *their own*; inherent, not imputed; but their own by their part in and union to Him).

9, 10.] The Bride in this blessed marriage being in fact the *sum of the guests* at its celebration, the discourse passes to *their blessedness, and an assurance of the certainty of that which has been foretold respecting them. The Apostle, moved by these declarations, falls down to worship the angel, but is forbidden. And he saith* (who? the only answer ready to our hand is, the angel of ch. xvii. 1. Some, as Ewald and Ebrard, suppose some one angel to have been constantly with St. John throughout the visions: but there seems no reason for this) *to me, Write* (cf. ch. xiv. 13) **Blessed are they who are bidden** (see reff.: and bear in mind, throughout, our Lord's parables on this matter: Matt. xxii. 1 ff., xxv. 1 ff. Our ch. iii. 20 furnishes us with a link binding

on the spiritual import to the figure) **to the supper of the marriage of the Lamb. And he saith to me** (the solemn repetition of this formula shews that what follows it is a new and important declaration), **These sayings** (cf. ch. xvii. 17. If we understand that the speaker is the angel of ch. xvii. 1, then οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι will most naturally include the prophecies and revelations since then) **are the true** (we should hardly be justified, in a book where ἀληθινός has repeatedly occurred in a sense hardly distinguishable from ἀληθής, in pressing it here to its more proper meaning of "*genuine*" (as Düsterd.), which would very well suit the sense in this place) **(sayings) of God** (are the very truth of God, and shall veritably come to pass).

And I fell down before his feet to worship him (out of an overweening reverence for one who had imparted to him such great things: see also ch. xxii. 8, where the same again takes place at the end of the whole revelation, and after a similar assurance. The angel who had thus guaranteed to him, in the name of God, the certainty of these great revelations, seems to him worthy of some of that reverence which belongs to God Himself. The reason given by Düsterd., that in both cases John imagined the Lord Himself to be speaking to him, is sufficiently contradicted by the plain assertion, here in ch. xvii. 1, and there in ch. xxii. 8 itself, that it was not a divine Person, but simply an angel): **and he saith to me, Take heed not (to do it): I am a fellow-servant of thine, and (a fellow-servant) of thy brethren who have the testimony of Jesus** (as in reff.: on the former of which see note): **worship**

f see 1 Cor. xii.

10. 1 Pet. i.

10. 11. 2 Pet.

i. 21.

g Matt. vi. 16

|| L. John. i.

52. Acts

(vii. 56) x.

11. Ezek. i.

1.

h ch. vi. 2 reff.

i ch. iv. 2 reff.

and note.

j ch. iii. 14 reff.

k Acts xvii. 31.

Ps. xcv. 13.

προσκυνήσων ἡ γὰρ ὁ μαρτυρία ὁ Ἰησοῦ ἐστὶν τὸ πνεῦμα
τῆς προφητείας.

APN B b

fo m. 1.

2. 4. 6. 9.

10-3. 16

to 19. 26-

7. 30-2.

34 to 42.

47 to 51.

90 Br.

11 Καὶ εἶδον τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠνεωγμένον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ ἵπ-
πος λευκός, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ' αὐτὸν [καλούμενος]

πιστὸς καὶ ἀληθινός, καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ κρίνει καὶ
πολεμεῖ. οἱ δὲ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτοῦ [ὡς] φλόξ πυρός, καὶ

i ch. ii. 16 reff.

m ch. i. 14 (reff.).

rec ins του bef 2nd Ἰησου, with rel Andr-coisl: om A[P]N B f g 1. 16. 36 Andr. (d def.)
—του υἱου 48 Areth. (f is now defective from this point, but its readings are
given from old collations made before the loss of the portion xix. 10 to xx. 15.)

11. rec ἀνεωγμενον, with B 1(-ων) rel Orig Andr Areth: txt A[P]N 42² Hip
Andr-p. λευκος 1. om καλουμενος A[P] c 1. 4. 6. 17¹. 32. 48 Hip Andr
Areth: ins aft πιστος N: txt B rel vss Orig Andr-coisl Iren-int Cyr Vict Jer P^rimas.

12. οἱ is repeated aft δε in N. om ως [P]N B rel arm Hip Andr: ins A g m

God (both words are emphatic: let προσ-
κύνῃς be reserved for *Him*), for (these
words following are those of the *angel*,
not of the Apostle, as Düsterd.: ver. 8,
and ch. v. 8, where the Apostle gives ex-
planations, are no rule for this place,
where the explanation of necessity comes
from the speaker, whose reason for pro-
hibiting the offered homage it renders)
the testimony of Jesus (the gen. Ἰησοῦ is,
as before, *objective*: the testimony borne to
Jesus by these σύνδουλοι, men and angels)
is the spirit of prophecy (there is no real
difficulty in this saying: no reason for
destroying its force by making Ἰησοῦ
subjective, and ἡ μαρτ. Ἰῆσ. to mean
“the witness which proceeds from Jesus”
(Düst.). What the angel says is this:
Thou and I and our brethren are all
ἐχόντες τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ (= μάρ-
τυρες Ἰησοῦ, as uniformly in this book);
and the way in which we bear this wit-
ness, the substance and essence of this
testimony, is, the spirit of prophecy;
ἐν πνεύμα ἐποτίσθημεν. This Spirit,
given to me in that I shew thee these
things, given to thee in that thou seest
and art to write them, is the token that
we are fellow-servants and brethren.
Thus Vitringa: “Idem ille Spiritus qui
loquitur agitur per eos qui prædicant
testimonium Christo, quod agebant Apo-
stoli, idem ipse est, qui per me loquitur,
qui missus sum a Domino ut res venturi
temporis tibi declararem. Tanta itaque
tua quanta mea est dignitas, sumusque
adeo conservi ad officia non disparia ho-
noris et gradus a Domino appellati.” It
does not follow that every one of those
ἐχόντων τὴν μαρτυρίαν Ἰησοῦ has, in the
same distinguished degree, the Spirit of
prophecy: but every such one *has* the
same Spirit, and that one Spirit, and no
other, is the Spirit of prophecy).

11—XXII. 5.] THE END: beginning
with the triumphal coming forth of the
Lord and His saints to victory (vv.
11—16), then proceeding with the great
defeat and destruction of the beast and
false prophet and kings of the earth (vv.
17—21), the binding of Satan and the
millennial reign (ch. xx. 1—6), the un-
binding of Satan and his destruction and
that of the deceived nations (xx. 7—10),
the great general judgment (xx. 11—15),
and terminating with the vision of the new
heavens and earth, and the glories of the
new Jerusalem (xxi. 1—xxii. 5).

11—16.] The triumphal coming forth
of the Lord and His hosts to victory.
And I saw heaven opened, and behold a
white horse (the same words, including
the five following, as in ch. vi. 2. It is
wonderful that this striking identity, in a
book where symbolism is so constant to
itself, has not prevented the mistakes
which have been made in interpreting
that place. This horse and Rider are
(symbolically) the same as there: the
νικῶν καὶ ὅσα νικήσῃ is on the point of its
completion: the other horses and their
riders, dark forms in His great world-
long procession to victory, will now for
ever vanish, and war and famine and
pestilence be known no more), and He
that sitteth upon him [called] faithful
and true (see reff.), and in righteousness
He judgeth and warreth (both those acts
being his concern in his present triumph-
ant progress. Notice that the very con-
struction with the participles καθήμενος
and καλούμενος is the same as that in ch.
vi. 2). His eyes (the δε, as often, is best
given in English by an asyndeton, mark-
ing a break in the sense, passing from the
subjective to the objective description)
[were as] a flame of fire (ch. i. 14 ver-
batim, again beyond question identifying

b ch. ii. 27. ¹ ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ² ἐν ³ ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ καὶ αὐτοὺς ⁴ πατεῖ ⁵ θηρὶν ⁶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ⁷ οἴνου τοῦ ⁸ θυμοῦ ⁹ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ ¹⁰ θεοῦ ¹¹ τοῦ ¹² παντοκράτορος. ¹³ καὶ ἔχει ἐπὶ τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ¹⁴ μηρὸν αὐτοῦ ¹⁵ ὄνομα ¹⁶ γεγραμμένον ¹⁷ Βασιλεὺς βασιλέων καὶ Κύριος κυρίων.

17 Καὶ εἶδον ¹ ἕνα ἄγγελον ἑστῶτα ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ, καὶ ἔκραζεν [ἐν] φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων πᾶσιν τοῖς ² ὀρνέοις τοῖς ³ πετομένοις ἐν ⁴ μεσουρανήματι Δεῦτε ⁵ συνάχθητε ⁶ εἰς τὸ ⁷ δεῖπνον τὸ μέγα τοῦ θεοῦ, ⁸ ἵνα ⁹ φάγητε ¹⁰ σάρκας

b ch. ii. 27. xii. 5. Psa. ii. 9. c ch. xv. 20 (reff.). d ch. (xiv. 8. 10) xvi. 19. e ch. i. 8 reff. f here only. Ps. xlv. 3. g ver. 12. h ch. xvii. 14. (DAN. ii. 47.) see 1 Tim. vi. 15. i ch. viii. 13 reff. k ch. xviii. 2. ver. 21 only. Deut. xiv. 11. l so (-o-) ch. iv. 7 reff. m ch. viii. 13. xiv. 6 only. n ch. xvi. 14, 16 reff. (Ezek. xxxix. 17, 18) p ch. xvii. 16. James v. 3. Levit. xxvi. 29. o ver. 9. Luke xiv. 16 al. Dan. i. 16 (v. 1 Theod.) only.

rec ins και bef της οργης, with 1 (g, e sil) Andr: om A(N) B rel vulg cop. æth arm Orig Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int Tich.—της οργης bef του θυμου N(marks of erasure have been put over της οργης, but removed). om last του 1.

16. om επι το ματιον και Α æth-rom Cassiod. (for ματιον, μετωπον g.) om 2nd επι N. for τον, των 1. rec ins το bef ονομα, with 1 Andr-a: om A[P]N B rel Orig Andr Areth.

17. for ενα, αλλον N: om B rel syr-dd Andr-a Tich: ενα αλλον m 35 Andr-coisl: txt A[P] g h l 17. 38 (1. 37. 41-7-9 Br, e sil) vulg Andr Areth Primas.

ἐκραζεν B g tol. aft ἐκραζεν ins εν N B b e f j k l m 2. 13. 26-7. 42. 50-1. 90. om λεγων 1. 12. 36. 49. rec πετωμενοις, with [P] c k l 32 (2. 37-9. 40-1. e sil): txt AN B rel Andr Areth. μεσουρανισματι 1. 33[; μεσουρανηματι P].

rec (for συναχθητε) και συναγεσθε: om 1: txt A[P]N B rel am(with demid fuld lipss tol, agst lips-6) syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth. rec (for το μεγα του) του μεγαλου, with 1. 36 (49, e sil) lips-6 Andr-a: txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Primas Tich. (τον μεγα k 4. 6. 16. 26. 34-5-9. 40-1-8. 90: τον μεγαν b c m 32.—τον δειπνον το μεγα d e g h, τον δ. τον μεγαν 38.)

emphasis in this and the following clause on αὐτός, which however would be too strongly rendered by "himself") shall rule (see ch. ii. 27, xii. 5, and note) them (masc.; their component members being in the Writer's mind) with a rod of iron: and He (and none other, as we know from Isa. lxiii. 3) treadeth (it is His office to tread) the winepress of the wine of the fierceness of the wrath (of the outbreaking of the anger: see on ch. xvi. 19) of Almighty God. And He hath upon His vesture and upon His thigh a name written (i.e. most naturally, written at length, partly on the vesture, partly on the thigh itself; at the part where, in an equestrian figure, the robe drops from the thigh. The usual way of taking the words is to suppose the καὶ epexegetic or definitive of the former words, "on His vesture," and that on the part of it covering His thigh. So De W., Düsterd., al. Others imagine (so Grot., al.) a sword, on the hilt of which the name is inscribed. But there is no trace of this in the text. Wetst. quotes Cicero, Verr. iv. 43, "Signum Apollinis pulcherrimum, cujus in femore literulis minutis argenteis nomen Myronis erat inscriptum:" and Pausanias,

Elia. extr., ἀνδρῆμα . . . ἀνδρὸς εἰκὼν . . . ἐλεγείον δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸ γεγραμμένον ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ μηροῦ, Ζῆνι θεῶν βασιλεῖ. See also Herod. ii. 106, where the inscription runs across the chest from shoulder to shoulder), King of Kings, and Lord of Lords (ch. xvii. 14).

17—21.] Defeat and destruction of the beast and the false prophet and the kings of the earth: preceded by (17, 18) an angelic proclamation, indicating the vastness of the slaughter.

And I saw an (one) angel standing in the sun (not only as the place of brightness and glory becoming the herald of so great a victory, but also as the central station in mid-heaven for those to whom the call was to be made): and he cried with a great voice, saying to all the birds which fly in mid-heaven, Come, be gathered together (see, on the whole of this proclamation, Ezek. xxxix. 17 ff, of which it is a close reproduction; also Matt. xxiv. 28) to the great banquet of God, that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains of thousands, and the flesh of strong men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit

βασιλέων καὶ ὁ σάρκας ὁ χιλιάρχων καὶ ὁ σάρκας ὁ ἰσχυ-
 ρών καὶ ὁ σάρκας ἱππων καὶ τῶν καθημένων ἐπ' αὐτούς,
 καὶ ὁ σάρκας πάντων ὁ ἐλευθέρων τε καὶ ὁ δούλων καὶ
 ὁ μικρῶν καὶ ὁ μεγάλων. ¹⁹ καὶ εἶδον τὸ θηρίον καὶ τοὺς
 βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ ὁ στρατεύματα αὐτῶν ὁ συν-
 ηγμένα ὁ ποιῆσαι τὸν ὁ πόλεμον μετὰ τοῦ ὁ καθημένου ὁ ἐπὶ
 τοῦ ἱππου καὶ μετὰ τοῦ ὁ στρατεύματος αὐτοῦ. ²⁰ καὶ
 ὁ ἐπιάσθη τὸ θηρίον, καὶ [ὁ οἱ] ὁ μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὁ ὁ ψευδοπρο-
 φήτης ὁ ὁ ποιήσας τὰ ὁ σημεῖα ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, ὁ ἐν οἷς
 ὁ ἐπλάνησεν τοὺς λαβόντας τὸ ὁ χάραγμα τοῦ θηρίου καὶ
 τοὺς προσκυνούντας τῇ ὁ εἰκόνι αὐτοῦ, ὁ ζῶντες ἐβλήθησαν
 οἱ δύο εἰς τὴν ὁ λίμνην τοῦ ὁ πυρὸς τῆς ὁ καιομένης ἐν
 ὁ θείῳ. ²¹ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ὁ ἀπεκτάνθησαν ὁ ἐν τῇ ὁ ῥομφαίᾳ

...36.
 APN B b
 40 m, 1.
 2. 4. 6. 9.
 10-3. 16
 to 19. 26-
 7. 30.
 32 to 35.
 37 to 42.
 47 to 51.
 90 B.

40 al.
 20 (reff.).
 f so Num. xvi. 30, 33. Ps. liv. 16.
 h as above (cf. Luke v. 12 viii. 22, 23, 33 only. Ps cvi 35.
 also ch. xiii. 8. Heb. xii. 18. pres., John xv. 6.
 m see ver. 15. ch. i. 16.

z ch. xvi. 13.
 d ch. xiii. 16, 17 reff.

a ch. xiii. 13 reff.
 b ch. xiii. 23.
 e ch. xiii. 14, 15 reff. DAN. iii. 18.
 g ch. xx. 10, 14 (bis), 15. xxi. 8 only. (DAN. vii. 11)
 i = ch. xxi. 8
 k ch. ix. 17, 18 reff.

q ch. vi. 15 reff.
 r = Matt xii.
 29 J. Josh.
 x 2.
 s ch. xiii. 16
 reff.
 t ver. 5 ch. xi.
 18 xii. 16.
 xx 12. Ps
 cxxx. 13 (21).
 u ver 14.
 v ch. xi. 7 reff
 w ch. iv. 2 reff.
 and note
 x = John vii.
 30 (xxi. 3,
 10) al. Acts
 xii. 4. (iii. 7)
 2 Cor. xi. 32
 only. (Cant.
 i. 16.) Sir.
 xxiii. 21 BN
 F (not A)
 only.
 y ch. xiii. 14
 Matt xii. 3.
 4. xxvii. 51.
 Mark i. 36. ii.
 25 v 40.
 Luke vi. 4.
 Tit. ii. 15.
 see John ix.
 1 ch. vi. 8 (reff.).

18. om from 1st καὶ to 2nd 1. 49. rec επ' αυτων, with [P] B rel Andr Areth: επ
 αυτοις N: txt A f. om παντων 1. rec (aft ελευθερων) om τε, with 1 (9. 26 ?):
 ins A[P]N B (Tischdf) rel Andr-a-coisl Areth. om και (bef μικρων) B f k 9. 30-6.
 47: ins A[P]N rel. aft μικρων ins τε B rel: om A[P]N g m 1. 34-5. 51 (4. 6. 32
 48, e sil) Andr Areth. ins των bef μεγαλων N g.
 19. for [3rd] και, κατα N¹. for αυτων, αυτου A c 6. 11: txt [P]N B rel vss
 Andr Areth Tich Primas. rec om τον (bef πολεμον), with [P] B (Del) rel Synops
 Andr: ins AN B (Mai) d e f k l 9. 13-6. 26-7. 39. 41-9. 51 Areth.
 20. rec (for οι μετ' αυτου ο) μετα τουτου ο, with 1. 30 Andr-a: μετ' αυτου ο N h 32-7.
 49² B, μετ' αυτου ο 38 vulg Synops Andr-p Primas: ο μετ' αυτου B rel: ο μετ' αυτου ο
 [P] (Tischdf, expr) 33: txt A 34(omg δ) 41. for τη εικονι, το χαραγμα B, την
 εικονα N¹ 38. βληθησονται 1. 38. rec την καιομενην, with B rel, stagnum
 ardens igne Promiss: txt A [P] (Tischdf, expr) N, ignis ardentis vulg, ignis ardentis
 igne Primas. rec ins τω bef θεω, with d(perhaps) m 1. 30²-4-6 (c 6. 32. 49, e sil)
 Andr: om A[P]N B rel Andr-p Areth.

on them, and the flesh of all, free as well as bond, both small and great (this proclamation is evidently not to be pressed into a place in the prophecy, nor are its details to be sought in the interpretation, as has been done by Andreas and Primasius, who hold the birds to be angels, and Brightm., who holds them to be nations and churches. The insertion is made, as above, to shew the greatness and universality of the coming slaughter). And I saw the beast (ch. xiii. 1) and the kings of the earth and their armies gathered together (as above under the sixth vial, ch. xvi. 12 ff., on the field of Harmagedon) to make their war (viz. that predicted above, ch. xvi. 14, xvii. 14) with Him that sitteth upon the horse and with his army (στρατεύματος, sing. probably as being one, and having one Head, whereas they are many, and under various leaders). And the beast was taken (reff.), and

those with him (to wit, the ψευδοπροφήτης, and οἱ λοιποὶ, ver. 21: or, and with him the false prophet),—the false prophet who wrought the miracles in his presence (cf. ch. xiii. 11—17, by which it clearly appears that this false prophet is identical with that second beast), with which he deceived those who received (not necessarily nor probably, who had received, as E. V.: the aor. part. is contemporary, as usual, with the aor. verb: and is probably here used because the receiving the mark is one act, the worship (προσκυνούντας) a continued habit) the mark of the beast and those who worshipped his image (cf. ch. xiii. 14, 16): the two were cast alive into the lake of fire which burneth (the extraordinary concord, τοῦ πυρὸς τῆς καιομένης, appears to have been in the original text, and must be simply accepted as it stands) with brimstone (viz. into

n ver. 17. τοῦ καθημένου ἐπὶ τοῦ ἵππου τῇ ^m ἐξεληούση ^m ἐκ τοῦ
 o Rev., here only. John
 v. 26. Matt. στόματος αὐτοῦ καὶ πάντα τὰ ⁿ ὄρνεα ^o ἐχορτάσθησαν ἐκ
 v. 6. xiv. 20. τῶν σαρκῶν αὐτῶν.
 al. Ps. ciii. 13.

XX. ¹ Καὶ εἶδον ἄγγελον καταβαίνοντα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρα-
 nou, ἔχοντα τὴν ^p κλεῖν τῆς ^q ἀβύσσου καὶ ^r ἄλυσιν μεγά-
 λην ^s ἐπὶ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ. ² καὶ ^t ἐκράτησεν τὸν ^u δρά-
 κοντα, ^u ὃς ^v ὄφεις ὁ ^v ἀρχαῖος, ὃς ἐστὶν διάβολος καὶ ὁ
 Σατανᾶς, καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν χίλια ἔτη, ³ καὶ ἔβαλεν αὐτὸν
 p ch. i. 18 reff. ...σαρ-
 q ch. ix. 1, 2 P. ...εχον 6.
 r Rev., here only. Mark AN b b
 v. 3, 4; L. do m. 1.
 Acts xii. 6. 2 4 9.
 7 al. r. Wisd. 10-3 16
 xvii. 17 only. to 19 26-
 s = ch. v. 1 7. 30.
 2 Cor. iii. 15 32 to 35.
 see ch. iii. 20 37 to 42.
 t = Rev., here only. Mark xiv. 49, 51 al. Ps. cxxxvi. 9. u nom., ch. 1. 5. v ch. xii. 9. 47 to 51.
 90 B^a.

21. rec (for ἐξελευση) εκπορευομενη: txt A[P]N B rel Andr Areth.

CHAP. XX. 1. aft εἶδον ins αλλον N^{3a} 32: aft αγγελον 39. (λoν of αγγελον is
 not in the text of Tischd's edn of N.) om εκ του ουρανου N¹. rec κλειδα,
 with l 1 (f and 92) 13. 39, e sil) Andr Areth: κλειδαν 16: txt AN B rel Andr-coisl.
 αλυσειν N¹. for επι τ. χειρα, εν τη χειρι N 38.

2. rec τον οφιν τον αρχαιον, with N B rel Andr Areth: txt A. for os, o N.
 ins o bef διαβ. N j 38. rec om δ (bef σατανas), with rel Andr: ins AN B
 c h j m 9. 10-3-8. 27. 34-5-7-8. 41-2-7. 90. add o πλανων την οικουμενην
 ολην (from ch xii. 9) B rel syr-dd Andr Areth: om AN c g 1(e sil) 32. 47 vulg copt
 Andr-a Viet Aug Tich Promiss Primas. homœotel in N αυτον to 1st αυτον
 ver 3.

Gehenna, or hell properly so called, Matt. v. 22; where also, after the millennium, Satan himself is cast, ch. xx. 10, and when their work is finally accomplished, Death and Hades, ib. 14 a. This lake of fire constitutes the second death, ib. 14 b, xxi. 8. These only, and not the Lord's human enemies yet, are cast into eternal punishment. The latter await the final Judgment, ch. xx. 11 ff.). And the rest (the βασιλεις and their στρατεύματα) were slain with the sword of Him that sitteth on the horse, which (sword) goeth forth out of His mouth (see Isa. xi. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 8. De Wette remarks, that it is a hint of the spiritual nature of this victory, that no battle seems actually to take place, but the Lord Himself, as in 2 Thess., destroys the adversaries with the sword out of his own mouth. But clearly, all must not be thus spiritualized. For if so, what is this gathering? what is indicated by the coming forth of the Lord in glory and majesty? Why is His personal presence wanted for the victory?): and all the birds were satiated with (out of, as the material of the satiety) their flesh.

CH. XX. 1—10.] THE VICTORY OVER SATAN. The next enemy now remaining is the Arch-fiend himself, who had given his might and his throne and great power (ch. xiii. 2) to the beast: whose instruments the other enemies were. The blow given to him by their overthrow is followed by his binding and incarceration for 1000 years (vv. 1—3): during which period the

Saints live and reign with Christ, and judge the world, and the first resurrection takes place (vv. 4—6). But his malice and his power are not yet at an end. One final effort is permitted him at the end of that time (ver. 7), and he once more succeeds in deceiving the nations (ver. 8), who come up against the camp of the saints, and are destroyed by fire from heaven (ver. 9). He is then cast into the lake of fire with the beast and false prophet, there to be tormented for ever (ver. 10).

1—3.] *The binding of the dragon.* And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven (not Christ himself, as Aug., Andr., Calov., Vittr., Hengstb., al.: nor the Holy Spirit, as Joachim, Cocceius (al.): but a veritable angel, as always before in this book) having the key of the abyss (of hell, the abode of the devil and his angels: see ch. ix. 1. For this abyss apparently is distinct from the lake of fire, a further and more dreadful place of punishment: see on ver. 10. This key had been for the purposes of God's judgments given to Satan (= Abaddon, Apollyon), and by him the locusts were let forth, ch. ix. 1—11. Now it is entrusted to other hands, and for another purpose), and a great chain in (so in English: Gr., resting on, hanging upon, as a chain naturally would be: see reff.) his hand. And he laid hold of the dragon (already well known from ch. xii. 3 ff., 9; xiii. 2, 4; xvi. 13), the ancient serpent (for the expres-

εἰς τὴν ¹ ἄβυσσον, καὶ ἔκλεισεν καὶ ^w ἐσφράγισεν ^x ἐπάνω ^w = John iii. 33 only. (cf. Matt. xxvii. 66.) Dan. vi. 17.
αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ^y πλανήσῃ ἔτι τὰ ἔθνη, ἄχρι ^z τελεσθῇ τὰ ^z Rev. ch. vi. 8 only (reff.).
χίλια ἔτη· μετὰ ταῦτα ^a δεῖ ^b λυθῆναι αὐτὸν ^c μικρὸν ^y ch. ii 20 reff.
^c χρόνον. ^z = ch. x. 7 ieff.

⁴ Καὶ εἶδον ^d θρόνους, καὶ ἐκάθισαν ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ ^a = Matt. xxiv. 6 i. xxvi. 54. Dan. ii. 28.
^{ef} κρίμα ^f ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς· καὶ τὰς ^g ψυχὰς τῶν ^h πεπελε- ^b Mark vii. 35. Luke xiii. 16. John xi. 44. ver. 7. Ps. civ. 20.
κισμένων ⁱ διὰ τὴν ⁱ μαρτυρίαν ^{i'} Ἰησοῦ καὶ διὰ τὸν ⁱ λόγον ^c John vii. 33. xii. 35. ch. vi. 11. Isa. lvi. 7.
τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ^k οὔτινες οὐ ^l προσεκύνησαν τὸ θηρίον οὐδὲ ^d Dan. vii. 9. Matt. xix. 25.
τὴν εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἔλαβον τὸ ^m χάραγμα ἐπὶ τὸ ^g = Acts ii. 27 (from Ps. xv. 10). 31. Ca.
^{mn} μέτωπον καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ^m χεῖρα αὐτῶν, καὶ ^o ἔζησαν καὶ ^h here only. 3 Kings v. 18 Aid. (Tromm. -κεῖν, AB).
^h = ch. i. 9. ^k = ch. i. 7 reff. ^l w acc., ch. xii. 8 reff. ^m ch. xiii. 16 (reff.).
ⁿ ch. vii. 3 reff. ^o = Rom. xiv. 9. ch. ii. 8. 4 Kings xiii. 21.

c see Acts xxiv. 25. ch. xvii. 1.

f Dan. vii. 22.

g = Acts ii. 27 (from Ps. xv. 10). 31. Ca.

vi. 9 only. Wisd. iii. 1. Jos Antt. vi. 14. 2.

h here only. 3 Kings v. 18 Aid. (Tromm. -κεῖν, AB).

i = ch. i. 9.

k = ch. i. 7 reff.

l w acc., ch. xii. 8 reff.

m ch. xiii. 16 (reff.).

n ch. vii. 3 reff.

o = Rom. xiv. 9. ch. ii. 8. 4 Kings xiii. 21.

3. for εκλεισεν, εδησεν 1. 12. rec aft εκλεισεν ins αυτον, with 1: om AN B rel
vulg syr-dd arm Synops Andr Areth. for επαν αυτου, εμμενωσ αυτον A.
πλανα (for πλανηση) B rel Andr Areth: txt A g 1. 17 (appy) Andr-a, πλανησει N.
rec τα εθνη bef ετι: om ετι f(perhaps, not 92) 1. 40 Andr-a Tich: txt AN B rel
vulg syr-dd Andr Areth Primas. om τα (bef χιλια) 1. rec ins kai bef
μετα, with h 1. 4. 10-7. 51 (c k m 13. 26-7. 37-9. 41-2-8-9 B^r, e sil) copt Andr Areth:
om AN B rel am(with fuld lips-4-5 tol) Vict Aug Tich Promiss Primas. rec αυτον
bef λυθηναι, with N h 1. 10-7 (c 49. 51 B^r, e sil) Andr: αυτον λυθηναι αυτον 40: txt
A B rel Areth.

4. for πεπελεκισμένων, πεπολεμημένων A: πεπελεκημένων b: txt N B rel.
for kai οιτινες, ειτινες ουν N: κ. οιτινες (sic) 1. ou is written over the line by N¹.
rec τω θηριω, with rel Andr Areth: txt AN B b d f j k m 30-3-5-8. 40-2-
7-8. 50. rec ουτε, with rel Andr: txt AN B e f g 12. 9. 13-6. 26-7. 30-3-5-8.
40-1-2-7-8. 50. 90 Areth. elz (for την εικονα) τη εικονι, with c e f(? not 92)
g h l 9. 10-6. 33-7-9. 49. 51 Andr-a² p Areth: txt AN B rel Andr-coisl Areth.
rec aft μεταπον ins αυτων, with 1. 10-3-7 (h 2. 37. 49 B^r, e sil) copt: om AN B rel

sion and the construction, see reff.), who is the devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut and sealed over him (shut the door or cover at the top, and sealed it down. Notice, that the same absolute use of σφραγίζω in the active is found in ref. John, and apparently there only: see Palm and Rost, sub voce), that he might deceive the nations no more (there does not appear to be the least ground for Düsterd.'s idea, that the reading πλανῆ was adopted in order to suit the views of the later Fathers who regarded the millennium as present), until the thousand years shall be (shall have been: futurus exactus) accomplished: after that he must (the δεῖ of prophecy; must, according to the necessity of God's purposes) be loosed for a little time (see below, ver. 7).

4—6.] *The Millennial reign.* And I saw thrones (combine the two passages in the reff.), and they sat upon them (who? the Apostles, as in ref. Matt.: the Saints, as in 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3,—οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι οἱ

ἅγιοι τὸν κόσμον κρινούσιν; . . . οὐκ οἶδατε ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρινόμεν; Notice well, that there is nothing to hinder this in the souls of the saints not being seen till the next clause: for there is no mark of temporal sequence connecting the two verses: nay, such an idea is precluded by the specification at the end of ver. 4, that those very souls of the saints are they who reigned with Christ, and were His assessors in reigning and judging, during this time), and judgment (κρίμα, the act and decision of judgment) was given to them (so in ref. Daniel (Theod.), ἔως οὗ ἦλθεν ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμερῶν, καὶ τὸ κρίμα ἔδωκεν ἁγίοις ὑψίστου. That is, they were constituted judges). And I saw the souls of them who had been beheaded (the word πελεκίζω, to smite with the axe, is found in Polybius* (i. 7. 12, xi. 30. 2), Strabo, Plutarch, and Diodorus Siculus, in the sense of beheading) on account of the testimony of Jesus and on account of the word of God (reff.), and (of those) the which did not worship (during life) the beast nor yet his image, and did not

ρ = Rom v. 17 (b). 1 Cor. iv. 8. ch. v. 10 xxii 5. q w gen., ch. ix. 20 reff. r ver. 3 s here (bis) only. t = John xiii. 8 only (see Luke xi 36. xii. 46 Acts viii. 21.) u = ch. xxi. 8. x xii 19. Eccl. v 18. v see ch. ii. 26 reff. w ver. 14. ch. ii. 11. xxi. 8. x ch. i. 6.

ρ ἑβασίλευσαν μετὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ χίλια ἔτη. ⁵ οἱ ^a λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν οὐκ ὀξῆσαν ἄχρι ¹ τελεσθῆ τὰ χίλια ἔτη. αὕτη ἡ ^s ἀνάστασις ἡ ^s πρώτη. ⁶ μακάριος καὶ ἅγιος ὁ ^t ἔχων τὸ μέρος ἐν τῇ ^s ἀναστάσει τῇ ^s πρώτῃ· ^v ἐπὶ τούτων ὁ ^w δευτέρως ^w θάνατος οὐκ ἔχει ^v ἔξουσίαν, ἀλλ' ἔσονται ^x ἱερεῖς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ, καὶ ^ρ βασιλεύ[σ]ουσιν μετ' αὐτοῦ [τὰ] χίλια ἔτη.

vulg(with am demid fuld, agst lips-4 tol) syr-dd Andr Areth Cypr Viet Aug. Steph om του (bef χριστου), with 1. 32 Andr-p: ins AN B rel Andr Areth. rec ins τα bef χιλια, with B rel Areth: om AN h 1. 12-7. 32-4. 49 B^r Andr. 5. homotel, ετη at end of ver 4 and in this ver, N b d e f j k l 2. 9. 13-6¹-8-9. 27. 30-3. 9. 40-1 2-7. 50-1. 90 syr-dd. rec aft oi ins δε, with rel aeth: ins και bef oi B c g h 1. 4. 10-6-7. 26. 32-4-7-8. 48-9 B^r copt Andr Areth: om A vulg(with am fuld tol lipss, agst demid lips-4) Vict Aug Primas. for νεκρων, ανθρωπων B 32-4 Andr-coisi; eorum Vict Aug Primas. rec ανεζησαν, with rel aeth: ανεστησαν 1 Andr-a: txt A B c g h m 4. 10-2-3-6-7-8. 26. 32-4-5-7-8. 48-9 B^r vulg copt Andr Areth Aug Primas. rec (for αχρι) εως, with rel: txt A B c g h m 1. 10-3-6. 26. 32-4-7-8. 48-9 B^r.

6. rec ο θανατος ο δευτερος, with 1 (49, e sil) syr-dd copt: δευ. ο θαν. B^r: txt AN B rel Hip Andr Areth. αλλα N. ins και bef του θεου N. rec βασιλευσουσιν, with N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Areth Vict Aug Primas Fulg: βασιλευουσιν A. ins τα bef χιλια N B 38. 92 syr-dd.

receive the mark (mentioned ch. xiii. 16) on their forehead and upon their hand: and they lived (i. e. "lived again;" ἐζησαν = ἀνέζησαν, as in reff.: and, as the act is presently described as the first resurrection, with their bodies, perfect and complete) and reigned with Christ (took part in His Kingdom; see ch. i. 6; 2 Tim. ii. 12: also 1 Cor. iv. 8 and note) a thousand years (it would certainly appear that this reigning includes the office of judgment. Many interpreters suppose that these saints are the judged: so recently Düsterd.: but there is nothing in the context, nor in other parts of Scripture, to favour this idea. Nay, it is expressly negatived by our Lord's saying in John v. 24, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὅμιν ὅτι ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν (ζωήν). The rest of the dead lived not (again, as above) until the thousand years be completed. This (αὕτη) is not the subject, as De Wette, but the predicate, as in all such cases: the reduction of the proposition to the logical form requiring its inversion) is the first resurrection (remarks on the interpretation of this passage will be found in the Prolegomena, § v. par. 33. It will have been long ago anticipated by the readers of this Commentary, that I cannot consent to distort words from

their plain sense and chronological place in the prophecy, on account of any considerations of difficulty, or any risk of abuses which the doctrine of the millennium may bring with it. Those who lived next to the Apostles, and the whole Church for 300 years, understood them in the plain literal sense: and it is a strange sight in these days to see expositors who are among the first in reverence of antiquity, complacently casting aside the most cogent instance of consensus which primitive antiquity presents. As regards the text itself, no legitimate treatment of it will extort what is known as the spiritual interpretation now in fashion. If, in a passage where two resurrections are mentioned, where certain ψυχὰς ἐζησαν at the first, and the rest of the νεκροὶ ἐζησαν only at the end of a specified period after that first,—if in such a passage the first resurrection may be understood to mean spiritual rising with Christ, while the second means literal rising from the grave;—then there is an end of all significance in language, and Scripture is wiped out as a definite testimony to any thing. If the first resurrection is spiritual, then so is the second, which I suppose none will be hardy enough to maintain: but if the second is literal, then so is the first, which in common with the whole primitive Church and many of the best modern expositors, I do maintain,

...λυθη-
σεται 33.
AN B D
10 m, 1.
2. 4. 9.
10-3. 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30-2-
4-5. 37
to 42
47 to 51.
10 Br.
P. πολιν
...
y ver. 3.
z = Acts xii. 4,
5 al. fr
Gen. xl. 4
a ch ii 20 reff.
b ch vii. 1.
Ezek. xliii.
20 (vii. 2)
c Ezek. xxxviii.
2.
d ch xvi. 14,
16 xxi. 17.
1 Kings xlii.
5.
e constr. ch.
iii 8 reff.
f ch xii. 18
reff.
g Hab. i. 6
h Eph. iii. 18. ch. xxi. 16 (bis) only.
i here only + 2 Kings v. 23 Symm. (Λοῦν,
k = Heb. xii. 11, 13 (Acts xxi 34, 37. xxi. 24. xxi. 10, 16, 32 Heb. xi.
34) only Exod. xxxix. 14
68. lxxvi. 2. Hos. ii. 23 B. 1 = ch. xi. 13 reff. m here only. see Ps. lxxvii.

7. for σταν τελεσθη, μετα B b e f j l 2. 4. 9. 13-6-9. 26-7. 30-3-9. 40-1-2-7-8. 50-1. 82. 90-2 arm Areth: στε ετελεσθησαν 1: txt AN rel vulg syr-dd copt Andr Aug Jer Primas.—N¹ wrote τελεσθησε but marked σε for erasure.

8. aft πλῆνῃ ins παντα N 79. om 2nd τα N e m. om tais f(Mill &c.)
1. 37. τετρασι N: τεσσαρι 1. om της γης τον N¹. rec ins τον bef
μαγωγ, with N^{2a} B rel Andr Areth: om AN¹ 1. aft μαγωγ ins και N c (11) 12.
32 vulg. rec om τον (bef πολεμον), with 1. 10-7². 35 (c 32. 49, e sil) Andr: ins AN
B rel Areth. rec om αυτων, with h 1. 10. 34-8 (c 4. 17. 37. 48-9 Br, e sil) Andr
Areth: ins AN B rel.

9. rec εκκυλωσαν, with N rel Andr Areth: txt A B b d e h k 2. 9. 10-3-7¹. 9. 27.
30-7. 40-2-7-9. 50. 90-2. aft αγιον ins και την πολιν των αγιων B j.

and receive as an article of faith and hope). Blessed (see ch. xiv. 13, xix. 9) and holy is he that hath part in (ref., the expression is peculiar to St. John) the first resurrection: over such persons the second death (see reff.: and bear in mind what is said of our Lord Himself, Rom. vi. 9) hath not power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and they [shall] reign with Him (Christ) a (or, the) thousand years.

7—10.] *Loosing of Satan at the end of the millennium: gathering together and destruction of the nations: final condemnation of Satan.*

And when the thousand years are completed, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison (see ver. 3. The prophetic future is here used: but in ver. 9 the historic form with aorists is resumed) and shall go forth to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth (there will be nations on earth besides the saints reigning with Christ, who during the binding of Satan have been quiet and willing subjects of the Kingdom, but who on his being let loose are again subjected to his temptations, which stir them into rebellion against God), Gog and Magog (compare Ezek. xxxviii. and xxxix. throughout. This which is here prophesied is the great final fulfilment of those chapters. And the names Gog and Magog, taken from there, had been used in the rabbinical books to signify the nations which should in the latter days come up to Jerusalem against

the Messiah. So the Jerus. Targum on Num. xi. 27, in Wetst., "In fine extremi-
tatis dierum Gog et Magog et exercitus eorum adscendent Hierosolyma et per manus regis Messiae ipsi cadent et vii. annos dierum ardebunt filii Israel ex armis eorum:" and Avoda sara, 1: "quando videbunt bellum Gog et Magog, dicet ad eos Messias: ad quid huc venistis? Respondebunt, Adversus Dominum et adversus Christum ejus." This name Magog occurs Gen. x. 2, as that of a son of Japhet, in company with brethren whose names mostly belong to northern and north-eastern nations: Gomer (Kimmerians), Madai (Medians), Meshech (Muscovites), &c. With these however are joined in Ezek. xxxviii. 5, Persians, Ethiopians, Libyans. Josephus renders the word Σκύθαι (Antt. i. 6. 3), Μαγώγης δὲ τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Μαγώγας ὀνομασθέντας ἔκτισε, Σκύθας δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν (τ. Ἑλλήνων) προσ-
αγορευομένους, and so Jerome: Suidas, "Persians (Μαγώγ, ἡ Πέρσης)." It seems to be a general name for the northern nations, and Gog, if at least we may follow the analogy of Ezekiel, xxxviii. 2, is their prince, to gather them together to the (well-known) war: of whom the number (of them) is as the sand of the sea. And they went up (the historical aor. is here resumed) upon the breadth of the earth (i. e. entirely overspread it; see ref.) and encompassed the camp of the saints, and the beloved city (by these two is probably meant one and the same thing, the

n ch. xiii. 13.
Ezek
xxviii. 22.
xxix. 6.
o 4 Kings i. 10.
12, 14. see
8 Kings xviii.
38
p ch. x. 9, 10
reff.
q ch. xix. 20
vv. 14 (bis),
15. ch. xxi.
8
r ch. ix. 17, 18
reff.
s ch. xvi. 13.
xix 20.
t ch. ix. 5 reff
u ch. ii. 8 reff.
v isa. vi. 1.
w = Ps. xcvi
6. see Acts iii. 19.

πημένυν· καὶ ^{no} κατέβη ^{no} πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ^{op} κατέφαγεν αὐτούς· ¹⁰ καὶ ὁ διάβολος ὁ ^a πλανῶν αὐτοὺς ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν ^a λίμνην τοῦ ^a πυρὸς καὶ ^t θείου, ὅπου καὶ τὸ ^s θηρίον καὶ ὁ ^s ψευδοπροφήτης, καὶ ^t βασιανισθήσονται ^u ἡμέρας καὶ ^u νυκτὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων.

¹¹ Καὶ εἶδον ^v θρόνον μέγαν λευκὸν καὶ τὸν ^v καθήμενον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, οὗ ^w ἀπὸ τοῦ ^w προσώπου ἔφυγεν ἡ γῆ καὶ ὁ οὐρανός, καὶ ^x τόπος οὐχ ^x εὐρέθη αὐτοῖς. ¹² καὶ εἶδον τοὺς νεκροὺς τοὺς ^y μεγάλους καὶ τοὺς ^y μικροὺς ἐστῶτας

x ch. xii. 8 reff.

y ch. xi. 18 reff.

...τοπος
E. APN B b
to f, h to
m. 1. 2.
4. 9 10-
3 16 to
19. 26-7.
30-2-4-5.
37 to 42.
47 to 51.
80 B^r.

rec ins απο του θεου bef εκ του ουρανου, with [P]N^{3a} g l (27, e sil) vulg syr-dd Jer: aft εκ τ. ουρ., B rel copt arin Andr Areth Vict Aug Tich₁: om A 12-8 lips-4 Andr-a Primas Tich₁.—for εκ, απο 18.—εκ του θεου απο του ουρανου 1.—om from πυρ το λιμνην next ver N¹.

10. om δ (bef διαβολος) 1. ins του bef θειον N g l (omg και) m 32-4-5-9. 47. rec om 3rd και, with N 1. 18 (B^r, e sil) copt Andr (and some lat-ff): ins A[P] B rel vulg (with am lipss, agst demid tol) syr-dd Andr Areth Vict Aug Primas. ins σπου bef ο ψευδοτ. N. om εις τ. αιωνας τ. αιωνων 1.

11. rec λευκον bef μεγαν, with 1. 34 (c 32. 49, e sil) Ephr Andr Iren-int: μεγαν και λευκον 50: om μεγαν 26. 51. 90: txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Areth Aug Primas. επ' αυτον [P] B rel Ephr₂ Andr^a Areth: επ' αυτω Ephr₁ Andr-p: επανω αυτου N 33: txt A g 1. rec om του (bef προσωπου), with B rel Ephr Andr Areth: ins A[P]N g.

12. rec μικρους και μεγалους, omg the articles, with (39. 40-1, e sil) spec copt, τους μικρους κ. τους μεγ. B c 4. 26. 32. 48: om b d e j k 1. 2. 9. 19. 27. 42. 50. 90: τους μεγ. και μικρους B^r: txt A[P]N^{3a} rel vulg syr-dd æth arm Andr Areth Iren-int Aug

καὶ being epexegetical; or at all events the camp must be conceived as surrounding and defending the city. The πόλις ἡ ἡγαπημένη is Jerusalem (reff.): not the new Jerusalem, but the earthly city of that name, which is destined yet to play so glorious a part in the latter days). And there came down fire out of heaven (so in reff. Ezek.), and devoured them: and the devil that deceiveth them (the pres. part. merely *designates*: the devil their deceiver) was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where also are the beast and the false prophet (ch. xix. 20). And they shall be tormented by day and by night to the ages of the ages.

11.—15.] *The general judgment.* And I saw a great white throne (great, in distinction from the thrones before mentioned, ver. 4: white, as seen in purest light, and symbolizing the most blameless justice), and Him that sitteth on it (viz. God: the Father: see ch. iv. 3, xxi. 5. It is necessary to keep to the well-known formula of the book in interpreting τὸν καθήμενον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, even though some expressions and sayings seem better to belong to the Son. Be it also remembered that it is the Father who giveth all judgment to the Son: and

though He Himself judgeth no man, yet He is ever described as present in the judgment, and mankind as judged before Him. We need not find in this view any difficulty, or discrepancy with such passages as Matt. xxv. 31, seeing that our Lord Himself says in ch. iii. 21, ἐγὼ . . . ἐκάθισα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ αὐτοῦ. Nor need we be surprised at the sayings of our Lord, such as that in ch. xxi. 6 b, being uttered by Him that sitteth on the throne. That throne is now the throne of God and of the Lamb, ch. xxii. 1. Cf. also ch. xxi. 22), from whose face the earth and the heaven fled, and place was not found for them (these words again seem to indicate the presence of One who has not hitherto appeared: whereas Christ in glory has been long present on earth. This fleeing away of heaven and earth is elsewhere described as their consumption by fire, 2 Pet. iii. 10—12. Both descriptions indicate the passing away of their present corruptible state and change to a state glorious and incorruptible). And I saw the dead (viz. the λοιποὶ τῶν νεκρῶν of ver. 5: those who rose as described below, ver. 13), the great and the small, standing before the throne, and books were opened (see ref. Dan.), and another

^z ἐνώπιον τοῦ θρόνου, καὶ ^a βιβλία ^{ab} ἡνοιχθησαν· καὶ ἄλλο ^z ch. i. 4 reff
^c βιβλίον ἡνοιχθη, ὃ ἐστὶν ^c τῆς ζωῆς· καὶ ἐκρίθησαν οἱ ^a DAN vii. 10.
νεκροὶ ἐκ τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις ^a κατὰ τὰ ^b plur., ch. i.
ἔργα αὐτῶν. ¹³ καὶ ^e ἔδωκεν ἡ θάλασσα τοὺς νεκροὺς ^c see ch. iii. 5
τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ, καὶ ὁ ^f θάνατος καὶ ὁ ^f ἄδης ^e ἔδωκαν τοὺς ^{ref.}
νεκροὺς τοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐκρίθησαν ἕκαστος ^d κατὰ τὰ ^d Rom. xi. 6.
ἔργα αὐτῶν. ¹⁴ καὶ ὁ ^f θάνατος καὶ ὁ ^f ἄδης ἐβλήθησαν ² Cor. xi. 15
εἰς τὴν ^g λίμνην τοῦ ^g πυρός. οὗτος ὁ ^h θάνατος ὁ ^h δεύ- ^{al.} Ps.
τερὸς ἐστίν, ἡ ^g λίμνη τοῦ ^g πυρός. ¹⁵ καὶ εἴ τις οὐχ ^{xxvii. 4.}
^z here only.
see Matt.
xiii 8. Mark
iv. 7, 8. Ps.
lxxi. 6.
ch. i. 18.
^g ver. 10.
^h ver. 6. ch. ii.
11. xxi. 8.

Primas.—και μεγ. και τ. μ. Ν¹. for ενωπιον, επι Ν¹ : ενωπιον επι Ν^{2a}. rec (for
θρονου) θεου, with 1 (k, e sil) Andr : txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth spec.
rec ηνεωχθησαν, with (47, e sil) Andr : ηνεωχθη Ν : ανεωχθησαν 10-7. 37-8.
49 Br : ηνοιξαν b d e j k 2. 19. 26. 40-1-2. 50-1. 90, ανοιξαν 30 : ηνοιγεν 9. 13-6. 27.
39 : txt A[P] B c f m 1. 4. 18. 32-4(-5, e sil). 48. 92 Andr-coisl Areth. om και
αλλο βιβλιον ηνοιχθη Ν¹ 1. rec βιβλιον bef αλλο : txt A[P]N^{2a} B rel vulg syr-dd
copt Andr Areth Primas spec. rec ηνεωχθη, with Ν^{2a} B rel Andr-coisl : ανεωχθη
h j 10-8. 37-8. 49 Br : txt A[P] e m 17. 35. 40.

¹³. rec τους εν αυτ. νεκρους (twice), with h 1. 10-7 (41-9, e sil), 1st (e sil) 37
Andr Promiss : txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt Meth Andr-coisl Areth Iren-int spec.
—for αυτη, αυτοις 1.—τους εαυτων νεκρους (2nd) 37. (om from 1st τους εν to 2nd 38;
from 2nd και to 3rd 39 : homœotet in Br, αδης in this ver and next.) τα is
written bef θανατος but marked for erasure by Ν¹. for εδωκαν, εδωκεν A 12. 48 :
txt [P]N B rel vss Meth Andr Areth Iren-int Aug Primas. κατεκριθησαν Ν.
for αυτων, αυτων b c d e f j k l 2. 18-9. 30-2. 47. 51. 90-2 Andr-p-coisl.

¹⁴. homœotet in b c j 41-2 copt Primas Promiss, πυρος 1st and 2nd : homœotet 18,
τ. λ. τ. πυρος vv. 14, 15. ins και bef ουτος Ν. om ουτος ο θ. ο δε. εστιν b c j
1. 18(?) 41-2. rec εστιν ο δευτερος θανατος, with lips-4 : εστιν ο θ. ο δευ. h 10. 37.
49 : ο δευτ. θαν. εστιν Ν 38 : ο δευ. εστιν, omg θ., e : ο δευ. k : txt A[P] B rel am(with
fuld lips-5 tol) syr-dd Andr-coisl. rec om η λιμνη του πυρος, with 1. 39 : ins A[P]N
B rel vss Hip Andr Areth Iren-int Fulg.—εν τη λιμνη του πυρος k, in stagno ignis am :
stagnum et ignis lips-4.

book was opened, which is (the book)
of life (Düsterd. remarks that the order
of proceedings indicated seems to be that
the contents of the books in which were
written the works of men indicated whether
they were to be found in the book of life.
But this could hardly be: for in that case,
what need for the book of life at all?
Rather should we say that those books
and the book of life bore independent wit-
ness to the fact of men being or not being
among the saved: the one by inference
from the works recorded: the other by
inscription or non-inscription of the name
in the list. So the 'books' would be as
it were the vouchers for the book of life):
and the dead were judged out of the
things written in the books according
to their works (reff.: and 2 Cor. v. 10).
And the sea gave forth the dead that
were in her (the citation in Wetst. from
Achilles Tatius, v. p. 313 B, λέγουσι δὲ
τὰς ἐν ὕδασι ψυχὰς ἀντηρμήνας μηδὲ
εἰς ἄδου καταβαίνειν ὄλως, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ
περὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἔχειν τὴν πλάνην, is no

illustration of this passage, which simply
imports that the dead contained in (the
sea shall rise), and Death and Hades (see
ch. i. 18, vi. 8) gave forth the dead which
were in them (i. e. all the dead, buried
and unburied, rose again), and they were
judged each according to their (his)
works. And Death and Hades were cast
into the lake of fire (Death and Hades
are regarded as two dæmons, enemies of
God. So in 1 Cor. xv. 26, ἔσχατος ἐχθρὸς
καταργεῖται ὁ θάνατος : and in Isa. xxv.
8, Heb. and E. V., not LXX, "He will
swallow up death in victory," cf. 1 Cor.
xv. 54. Hades, as in ch. vi. 8, is Death's
follower and the receiver of his prey. The
punishment of sin is inflicted on both,
because both are the offspring of and
bound up with sin). This is the second
death, the lake of fire (thus then our
Lord's saying, ch. ii. 11, and that of the
Apostle in our ver. 6, are explained. As
there is a second and higher life, so there
is also a second and deeper death. And
as after that life there is no more death

i ch. iii. 5 reff
k 2 Pet. iii. 13.
lxxv. 17.
lxxv. 22.
i Heb. viii. 13.
vi. 4, 5
m = ch. ix. 12.
xi. 14. ver. 4
only.
n ch. xi. 2 reff.
o ch. iii. 12.
see Gal. iv.
26. Heb. xi.
22.
p = ch. xix. 7.
q ver. 9 ch.
xxii. 17.
r Matt xii. 44
|| L. xxii. 29.
xxv. 7. Luke
xxi. 5. 1 Tim.
ii. 9 Tit. ii.
10. 1 Pet. iii. 5. ver 19 only. Ezek. xvi. 11.
xxxvii. 27. xliii. 7.)

εὐρέθη ἐν τῇ ¹βίβλῳ τῆς ¹ζωῆς γεγραμμένος, ἐβλήθη εἰς τὴν ²λίμνην τοῦ ²πυρός.

XXI. ¹Καὶ εἶδον ^kοὐρανὸν ^{kl}καινὸν καὶ ^kγῆν ^{kl}και-
νὴν ὃ γὰρ ¹πρῶτος οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ ¹πρώτη γῆ ^mἀπὸ ἡλ-
θαν, καὶ ἡ θάλασσα οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι. ²καὶ τὴν ⁿπόλιν τὴν
^aἁγίαν εἶδον, ὃ ¹Ιερουσαλὴμ ὃ ¹καινὴν ὃ ¹καταβαίνουσας ἐκ
τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ^pἡτοιμασμένην ὡς ^qνύμφην
^rκεκοσμημένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς. ³καὶ ἤκουσα φωνῆς
μεγαλῆς ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου λεγούσης Ἰδοὺ ἡ ^sσκηνὴ τοῦ

...f
APN n b
c d e h
to m. 1.
2. 4. 9
10-3 16
to 19. 26-
7. 30-2
1-5 37
to 42
47 to 51.
90 Br.

15. *εὐρεθησεται* N¹. for *τῇ βίβλῳ*, *τῷ βιβλίῳ* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N
h l 10-7. 38 (1. 37-9. 41-2-9. 51, e sil) Andr. *εγεγραμμενος* (i. e. *εγγεγραμ.*?) I.

CHAP. XXI. 1. rec (for *απηλθον*) *παρηλθε*, with h l 1. 10-7. 49. 51 (16. 37-9 Br, e sil) Andr(Del): *απηλθεν* [P] c k m 2. 4. 35. 47: *απηλθον* B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt AN.

2. rec aft kai ins *εγω ιωαννης*: om A[P]N B rel am(with demid tol) syr-dd copt aeth Andr Areth Iren-int. rec *ειδον* bef *την πολιν τ. α.*, with copt: *ιερ. καινην* bef *ειδον* [P]N¹(Del, expr) Br: txt A B rel am(with demid fuld tol) syr-dd aeth gr-lat-ff.

rec απο του θεου bef *εκ του ουρανου*, with [P] h l 1. 10-7. 49 (37 Br, e sil) Andr-a: om *απο τ. θεου* 41: txt AN B rel vss Andr Areth lat-ff.

3. *φωνη μεγαλη . . λεγουσα, ους ηκουσα*, N¹. rec (for *θρονου ουρανου*, with [P] B rel vss Andr Areth: txt AN 18 vulg arm-ed-marg Iren-int Ang Ambr.

(ch. xxi. 4), so after that death there is no more life, ver. 10; Matt. xxv. 41). And if any was not found written in the book of life, he was cast into the lake of fire (there was no intermediate state).

CH. XXI. 1—XXII. 5.] *The new heavens and new earth: the glories of the heavenly Jerusalem.* The whole of the things described in the remaining portion of the book are subsequent to the general judgment, and descriptive of the consummation of the triumph and bliss of Christ's people with Him in the eternal kingdom of God. This eternal kingdom is situated on the purified and renewed earth, become the blessed habitation of God with his glorified people. And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first (i. e. old, see ref.) heaven and the first earth were departed: and the sea exists no longer (see on the whole, Isa. lxxv. 17. The vision does not necessarily suppose the annihilation of the old creation, but only its passing away as to its outward and recognizable form, and renewal to a fresh and more glorious one. And though not here stated on the surface, it is evident that the method of renewal is that described in 2 Pet. iii. 10 ff.; viz. a renovation by fire. This alone will account for the unexpected and interesting feature

here introduced, viz. that the sea exists no longer. For this the words mean (see ver. 4), and not as Düsterd., that the (former) sea, as well as the former heaven and earth, had passed away). And I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem (see especially ref. Gal., ἡ ἄνω Ἰερουσα., and note), coming down out of heaven from God (Schöttg. quotes from the remarkable Jewish book Sohar, Gen. f. 69, c. 271, "R. Jeremias dixit, Deus S. B. innovabit mundum suum, et ædificabit Hierosolymam, ut ipsam descendere faciat in medium sui de coelo, ita ut nunquam destruat." See Schöttg.'s dissertation "de Hierosolyma cœlesti," in his vol. i. 1205 ff.), prepared as a bride adorned for her husband (as in our common discourse, so here with the Evangelist, the name of the material city stands for the community formed by its inhabitants. But it does not follow in his case, any more than in ours, that both material city and inhabitants have not a veritable existence: nor can we say that the glorious description of it, presently to follow, applies only to them. On the figure, see Isa. lxi. 10—lxii. 5). And I heard a great voice out of the throne saying, Behold, the tabernacle (i. e. dwelling: the allusion being to the tabernacle in the wilderness, in which God dwelt in symbol only) of God

θεοῦ μετὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ σκηνώσει μετ' αὐτῶν, καὶ αὐτοὶ ὡς λαοὶ αὐτοῦ ἔσονται, καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔσται, αὐτῶν θεός. ⁴ καὶ ὁ ἐξαλείψει [ὁ θεός] πᾶν ὄντα ῥυον ἐκ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν, καὶ ὁ θάνατος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, οὔτε ὁ πένθος οὔτε ἡ κραυγὴ οὔτε ὁ πόνος οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, [ὅτι] τὰ ἅπαντα ἀπῆλθαν. ⁵ καὶ εἶπεν ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ Ἰδοὺ ὁ καινὰ ποιῶ πάντα. καὶ λέγει Γράψον ὅτι οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι ἀπιστοὶ καὶ ἀληθινοὶ εἰσιν. ⁶ Καὶ εἶπέν μοι Ἐγὼνα [ν.] ἐγὼ [εἰμι] τὸ ἄλφα

z ch. xvi. 10, 11 ref.

19. (Jer. xxxviii. [xxxix] 22.)

f ch. i. 8. xxii. 13. see Isa. xlv. 6.

a = ver. 1 (reff.).

d ch. iii. 14 reff.

b w. dat., ch. v. 13 reff.

[e = Luke xiv. 22. ch. xvi. 17.]

c Isa. xliii.

w sing. -ον, ch. vii. 17 only. Eccl. iv. 1. Isa. xxv. 8 only. x James iv. 9. ch. xviii 7. (bis), 8 only. (Isa. xxxv. 10.) Jer. xxxviii. (xxxix.) 13. (-θεῖν, ch. xviii. 11.) y = Heb. v. 7 (ch. xiv. 18 reff.). Isa. lxv. 19.

ἐσκηνώσεν ^N1 lips.4. λαός B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr Areth Aug Primas: txt A[P]^N 1. 18 (42. 92, e sil) Andr Iren-int. om last καὶ ^N. rec εσται bef 2nd μετ' αὐτῶν, with [P]^N h 1. 10-7. 34. 47-9 (c 2. 9. 32-7 Br, e sil) copt Andr Aug Primas: txt A B rel vulg syr-dd Areth Iren-int Ambr. rec θεός bef αὐτῶν, with [P] 17¹. 34. 47 (c j 13. 37, e sil) vss Andr-a: om αυ. θ. ^N B rel copt Andr Areth lat-ff: txt A vulg syr-dd Iren-int Ambr.

4. ἀπ' αὐτῶν (for ο θεός) B b (d?) e j m 16. 30-5-9. 41-2. 50-1. 90-2: εἰς αὐτῶν k: om [P]^N rel syr-dd copt æth arm Andr Areth Iren-int, Ambr₄: ο θεός A 34 (1 Br, e sil) vulg Andr-p Aug Primas. δακρυ ^N1. rec (for ἐκ) απο, with [P] B rel vulg: txt AN: εἰς tol. (om απο των οφθ. αὐτῶν 41-2.) om ο θάνατος c h l: om ο [P]^N. om ουτε πένθος, reading πένθος for πόνος below, ^N. homeotet in k m, εἰς to εἰς. om 2nd εἰς 1: om οτι A[P]: ^N1 seems to have written εἰς and to have altered it to οτι. προβατα ^N1. rec απηλθεν, with [P] rel Andr: απηλθεν ^N B b c e j k 2. 4. 13-6. 26-7. 32-4-8. 42-7-8. 82: txt A.

5. rec του θρονου, with h 1. 10 (18-9. 37 to 40. 42-9 Br, e sil): εν τω θρονω m 35 Andr-a: txt A[P]^N B rel Andr Areth. ins kai bef ιδου A: ιδου ιδου 41. rec καινα παντα bef ποιω, with 1 Andr: καινοποιω παντα 17. 36(Del) Andr-p: παντα καινα ποιω B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]^N h m 10. 35-7-8. 49 Br Iren-int Aug Primas. rec aft λεγει ins μοι, with [P]^N 1. 10-8-9. 34-8. 47 (c h 26. 35-7. 41-2-8-9 Br, e sil) fuld copt æth Andr Areth Tich: om A B rel am(with tol al) syr-dd Iren-int. rec αληθινοι και πιστοι, with [P] 1. 10-7. 34. 49 (c h 32-7 Br, e sil) Andr: txt AN B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Areth Iren-int. at end ins του θεου B c 2. 4. 9. 13-6-9. 26-7. 32. 92: ins του θ. bef εἰς 30-5-9. 41-2-8. 50-1. 90.

6. for εἶπεν, λεγει ^N 47. rec γεγоне, with (b 41, e sil): γεγωνα 17: so, omg εἰμι follg, [P]^N1(^N3a added ν, making γεγοναν, but afterwards erased ν, and disapproved the whole word) B c d e h j k l m 30-2. 47-8 syr-dd Andr-a Areth, and, omg εγω εἰμι, 1. 10. 37. 40-2-9. 50-1. 90-2 Br: γεγονασι 38; γεγοναν A, facta sunt vulg Iren-int. rec [for αλφα] α', with e 1. 10: txt A[P]^N B b c d h k m 8. 13. 34(-5?) 51.

is with men, and He shall dwell (tabernacle) with them, and they shall be his people (plur., because, as in ver. 24, many nations shall now partake in the blessed fulfilment of the promise), and He shall be God with them (the name Emmanuel, μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, first then being realized in its full significance), their God (so the ancient promises are fulfilled, Exod. xxix. 45; Lev. xxvi. 11; Ezek. xxxvii. 27): and [God] shall wipe away every tear from their eyes (reff.): and death shall exist no longer (ch. xx. 14), and (Gr. nor) mourning (Isa. lxx. 19) and (nor) crying and (nor) pain shall exist no longer: [because] the first

(former state of) things are passed away. And He that sitteth on the throne (see note, ch. xx. 11) said, Behold, I make all things new. And he (probably the angel, or voice from heaven, that gave the Seer similar commands before, ch. xiv. 13, xix. 9. This seems probable on account of the change to the formula λέγει, as well as from the nature of the command: for we have εἶπέν μοι resumed immediately with the ἐγὼ, leaving no doubt Who speaks) saith, Write: because these words are faithful and true. And He said to me (viz. ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου), [They are fulfilled (viz. οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι: or, but I prefer the other, πάντα.)] I am (or,

g ch. xxi 17 καὶ τὸ Ω, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. ἐγὼ τῷ ^ε διψῶντι δώσω APN B h
 John v. 13, 14. vi 37 c d e h
 Isa lv 1. io m, 1.
 h constr., ch. 2. 4. 9.
 vi. 4 reff. 10-3. 16
 1 ch. vii 17 reff. to 19. 26-
 k Matt. x. 8. 7. 30-2.
 (John xv. 25 4-5. 37
 (from Ps. to 42.
 lxviii. 4). 47 to 51.
 Rom. iii. 24. 90 B.
 2 Cor. xi. 7.
 Gal ii. 21.
 2 Thess. iii.
 8 ch. xxii.
 17 only. Isa.
 li. 3.
 1 ch. ii. 7 reff.
 m Rev., here
 only = Matt.
 v. 6. xix. 29
 al. fr. Isa.
 lviii. 13.
 n see Heb. i. 5, from 2 Kings vii. 14. o Matt vii 26 # Mk. only. Judg vii. 3. ix. 4 B. (-λία, 2 Tim. i. 7. -λιών, q = here (Rom. John xiv. 27.). p = Matt xvii. 17.). Lukex 46. John xx 27. (Isa. xviii 10 bis only.) r 1 Pet. iv 15 reff. s Eph v 6
 u ch. xxii 15
 u ch. xxii 15
 w = ch ii.
 z constr., Matt.
 c ch. iv 6 reff.
 1. 22) only. Hos. ix 10. (-υκτός, Tit i. 16. -υγμα, ver 27.) t ch. xxii. 15. 1 Cor. v 10, 11. vi. 9. Eph. v. 5. u ch. xxii 15
 al.† Sir. xxiii. 16, 17 only. t ch. xxii. 15. 1 Cor. v 10, 11. vi. 9. Eph. v. 5. u ch. xxii 15
 only. Exod. vii. 11 al. (see ch xviii. 23 reff) v as above (t). 1 Cor. x. 7 only†. y ch xix. 20 (reff.). z constr., Matt.
 2. Acts vi 13 only. Prov. xxx. 9. x see ch. xx. 6 reff. y ch xix. 20 (reff.). z constr., Matt.
 xii. 4 (Col. ii. 17). a ch. ii. 11. xx. 6, 14 only. b ch. v. 8 reff. c ch. iv 6 reff.
 d ch. xv. 1.

[om ἡ and 3rd το P c h 32-7. 48-9 Areth : om το 46. om τω P.] rec om
 αὐτα, with A[P]N 1 (h k l h 32-7-9. 47-9. 51, e sil) Andr : ins b rel Andr-coisl Areth.
 om της πηγης A. δωρεας N'.
 7. for κληρονομήσει, δώσω αὐτῶ B rel Andr-coisl Areth : txt A[P]N 1 l. 10-2-7. 37-8.
 47-9 (h 9, e sil). rec (for ταῦτα) πάντα, with 1 : txt A[P]N B rel vss gr-lat-ff.
 for αὐτῶ, αὐτῶν A 1. αὐτοὶ ἐσονται μοι υἱοὶ 1.—om αὐτὸς A. rec ins o bef
 υἱος, with (but see Delitzsch i. p. 49) 34 (37. 40-1, e sil) : om A[P]N B rel Andr Areth.
 8. rec δειλοὶς δε, omg τοῖς (with B, e sil) : so 1, but with an abbreviated τοῖς written
 above the line in red : [τοῖς δειλοῖς, omg δε, P:] txt AN B rel Andr Areth.—N¹ has
 written and erased ως bef δειλοῖς and π bef φονεῦσει (sic). aft αἰσιόσιν ins και
 αμαρτωλοῖς B rel syr-dd Andr Areth : om AN 1. 51. om 2nd και 1. 12. rec
 φαρμακεῦσι : txt A[P]N B rel Andr Areth. for ψευδεσιν, ψευσταῖς A.
 rec (for δ θ. δ δευ.) δευτερος θανατὸς, with 1 Andr-a : θαν. δευ. 92 : ο δευ. θαν
 17. 49 Andr-p(Del) : θαν. ο δευτ. (omg 1st δ) 41-2-8 : [θανατος (only) P (Tischdf expr) :]
 txt AN B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl.
 9. rec aft ἡλθεν ins προς με, with (37-9. 41-2, e sil) arm : om A[P]N B rel vulg(with
 am fuld, agst lips-4). rec om εκ, with 1. 47 (30. 40, e sil) Andr : ins A[P]N B rel
 vulg syr-dd copt Andr-coisl Areth.—for eis εκ, ο πρωτος m 35-8. rec (for των γεμον-
 των) τας γεμουσας, with l m 1. 34 (37. 40-1-2-7 B, e sil) Andr-a : γεμουσας (only) B
 rel Areth : τας εχουσας 35 : txt A[P]N¹ 12. 79 Andr-b : των γεμουσων N^{3a}. om
 4th των B b c d e j k 2. 9. 13. 26-7. 30-2¹ 8-9. 40-7-9. 51. 92 Andr-coisl Areth : ins

excluding the portions in brackets, I have become) the Alpha and the Omega (see above, ch. i. 8), the beginning and the end ("the Unchangeable and Everlasting One, by Whom the old was and the new shall be, by Whom the old is fulfilled in the new, and with it all hope and all promise." De Wette). I to him that thirsteth will give [to him] of the fountain of the water of life freely (cf. ch. vii. 17, and reff. Isa. and John : cf. also Matt. v. 6). He that conquereth shall inherit these things (the glories to be shewn in the heavenly Jerusalem), and I will be to him (a) God, and he shall be to me a son (this will be the full performance to the sons of God of the promise in ref. 2 Kings : which being first made to Solomon, received its chief fulfilment in the great Son of David and of God (ref. Heb.),

and now in Him to them (that are His). But to the cowardly (the contrast to νικῶντες : the ὑποστελλόμενοι of Heb. x. 38 : those who shrink timidly from the conflict), and the unbelievers, and the polluted with abominations (those who have partaken of the βδελύγματα in ch. xvii. 4,—of idolatries, &c.), and murderers, and fornicators, and sorcerers (the form φαρμακός, found only in ref. in the N. T., is the common one in the LXX. See besides ref. and other places in Exodus, Deut. xviii. 11 ; Dan. ii. 2 ; Mal. iii. 5. The form φαρμακεύς does not occur in the LXX), and idolaters, and all the false (i. e. all liars), their part (the construction is changed : instead of οὐκ ἔσται μέρος ἐν κ.τ.λ., it proceeds in the affirmative, implying that negative and expressing more) (shall be) in the lake that burneth with

^a ἐσχάτων, καὶ ἐλάλησεν μετ' ἐμοῦ λέγων ^e Δεῦρο, δείξω σοι τὴν ^f νύμφην τὴν ^g γυναῖκα τοῦ ἀρνίου. ¹⁰ καὶ ^h ἀπ-
 ἤνεγκέν με ^h ἐν πνεύματι ἐπὶ ⁱ ὄρος μέγα καὶ ⁱ ὑψηλόν,
 καὶ ἔδειξέν μοι τὴν ^k πόλιν τὴν ^k ἁγίαν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ^k κατα-
 βαίνουσαν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ¹¹ ἔχουσαν τὴν
^l δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ· ὁ ^m φωστήρ αὐτῆς ὅμοιος ⁿ λίθῳ ^{no} τιμω-
 τάτῳ, ὡς λίθῳ ^p ἰάσπιδι ^q κρυσταλλίζοντι, ¹² ^r ἔχουσα ^s τετ-
 ρὰς ^s μέγα καὶ ὑψηλόν, ἔχουσα ^t πυλῶνας δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπὶ
 τοῖς ^t πυλῶσιν ἀγγέλους δώδεκα, καὶ ^u ὀνόματα ἐπιγεγραμ-

o superl., ch. xviii. 12.

p ch. iv. 3. vv. 18, 19 only.

Ezek. xxviii. 13.

q here only†. (-los,

ch. xviii. 1)

r constr., ch. iv. 1 al. fr.

s here, &c. (6 times) only, exc. Acts ix. 25.

2 Cor.

xi. 33.

t Heb. xi. 30. from Josh. vi. 20.

t Matt. xxvi. 71.

Luke xvi. 20 al. 3 Kings

xvii. 10.

u Ezek. i. c.

Ezek. xi. 2.

Ezek. xi. 2.

A[P]N rel Andr.

rec την νυμφην του αρνιου την γυναικα, with 1 lips-5 Andr: την

γυναικα την νυμφην του αρνιου B rel Areth: txt A[P]N m 17. 34-5-8.

10. (επι, so AN: εν 92.) rec ins την μεγαλην bef την αγιαν, with c h (1) 10-7.

32-4 (35-7. 49 B^r, e sil) Andr-p: om A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Areth Cyr

Primas.—τ. μεγ. και τ. αγ. c, τ. μεγ. και αγ. 1. for απο, εκ B c d e j k m 2. 4. 9.

11-3-6-9. 26-7. 32-4-5. 40-1-2-8. 50-1. 90: txt A[P]N rel Andr. (but for εκ, απο c 32-4.

51. 90.)—om απο του θεου 92.

11. om εχ. την δοξ. τ. θεου (homœotel) A k 30.

ins απο bef του θεου N.

rec ins ka bef o φωστηρ, with 1. 35 (1 m, e sil) æth Andr: om A[P]N B rel am(with

fuld lips-5 tol) Andr-coisl Tich.—om ως λιθω 1.

12. rec (for 1st εχουσα) εχουσαν τε, with m 34 (35. 41, e sil) Areth: εχουσαν 42

B^r: εχουσα τε 1: εχοντι N: txt A[P] B rel Andr.—homœotel k 30-9, εχ. 1st and 2nd.rec (for 2nd εχουσα) εχουσαν, with l m 34 (35 B^r, e sil): εχουσας N^{3a}: εχονταςN¹: txt A[P] B rel Andr-a. for τοις πυλ., τους πυλῶνας N: τοις πυλεωσιν 1.

om from δωδεκα to δωδεκα A fuld.

aft 1st ονομ. ins αυτων N.

for επιγεγρ.,

fire and brimstone, which is the second death (reff.).

9—XXII. 5.] *More particular description of the heavenly Jerusalem.* And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, which (namely the angels, however strange it may seem) were full of the seven last plagues (one of these angels had before shewn the Apostle the great harlot, ch. xvii. 1. The contrast to that vision is maintained throughout these opening verses), and he talked with me, saying, Hither, I will shew thee (hitherto verbatim as in ch. xvii. 1) the bride, the wife of the Lamb (here likewise note the contrast to the succeeding context in ch. xvii. 1,—in the faithfulness and purity implied in these words). And he carried me away in the spirit (ch. xvii. 3) to (ἐπὶ, as we say in some parts of England, on to, combining motion towards and position upon) a mountain great and high (so likewise when the vision of the heavenly city is vouchsafed to Ezekiel, Ezek. xl. 1, 2), and shewed me the holy city Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God (this vision had begun in ver. 2, but the Apostle is now carried to this

“specular mount” to have a nearer and fuller view of it. The city must not be conceived of as on or covering the mountain, but as seen descending to a spot close by it: so in Ezek. xl. 2, whether we read “by” or “upon” as in our margin, having the glory of God (i.e. not merely brightness of a divine and celestial kind, but the glorious presence of God Himself, the Shechinah, abiding in her: see ver. 23: also ch. xv. 8): her brightness (henceforward the description goes on independent in construction of ἔδειξεν, and changes several times: so in ch. i. 15 ff. See Winer, edn. 6, § 59. 11. φωστήρ, from ver. 23, is the effect of the divine glory shining in her: see reff. Gen., where it is used of the heavenly bodies) (was) like to a stone most precious, as it were to a jasper stone, crystal clear (Wetst. quotes from Psellus, ἡ ἱάσπις φύσει κρυσταλλοειδής. See this “crystallizing” jasper discussed in note on ch. iv. 3. Ebrard thinks it is the diamond); having (on the construction, see above) a wall great and high, having (also) twelve gates (see Ezek. xlviii. 30 ff., where the same features are found in the description), and at the gates (dat. after ἐπὶ, of close

v Luke xlii. 29. μένα, ἃ ἔστιν [τὰ ὀνόματα] τῶν δώδεκα φυλῶν υἱῶν Ἰσ-...ισραηλ
 Ezek 1 c. ραήλ, 13 ἀπὸ ^{vw} ἀνατολῆς πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ ^v βορρᾶ ΑΡΝ β b
 w Matt. viii. 11. (πρός.) πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ ^v νότου πυλῶνες τρεῖς, καὶ ἀπὸ c d e h j
 x = πρὸς θάλασσαν, πυλῶνες τρεῖς. 14 καὶ τὸ ^s τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως k l 1. 2.
 y ver. 19. wx δυσμῶν πυλῶνες τρεῖς. 14 καὶ τὸ ^s τεῖχος τῆς πόλεως 3 16 to
 Heb. xi. 10. ἔχων ^v θεμελίους δώδεκα, καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα ὀνόματα 19. 26-7.
 Pa. lxxxvi 1. (neut., Acts xvi. 26. Isa. xxviii. 16) τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρνίου. 15 καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετ' 30-2-4-5.
 z = Matt. vii. 2 αὐτῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τοῦ ἀρνίου. 15 καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετ' 37 to 42.
 al. Ezek. xliii. 3. ἐμοῦ εἶχεν ^z μέτρον ^a κάλαμον χρυσοῦν, ἵνα ^b μετρήσῃ τὴν 47 to 51.
 a ch. xi. 1 reff. πόλιν καὶ τοὺς ⁱ πυλῶνας αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ ^s τεῖχος αὐτῆς. 90-2. B.
 b ch. xi. 1, 2 16 καὶ ἡ πόλις ^c τετράγωνος κείται, καὶ τὸ ^{de} μήκος αὐτῆς
 c here only. reff
 Ezek. xliii. 16. xliiii. (16) 20. d here (bis) and Eph. in. 18 only. e Eph. as above. e 3 Kings vi 2.

γεγραμμένα N lipss. rec om τα ονοματα, with [P]N h 1. 10-7. 34 (37-9. 47-9 B, e sil): om τα B rel Andr-coisl: ins A m 35 (vulg) syr-dd copt. rec ins των bef uian, with [P] h l 1. 10-7. 30² (37-9. 41-9 B², e sil): om AN B rel Andr-c Areth. (d illeg.)—om των uian 12. 27.—for τ. vi., του b 32 Andr.

13. rec (for 1st απο) απ', with 1. 2. 4. 13-9. 27. 30-2: txt A[P]N B rel Andr Areth. ανατολων B rel Andr-coisl Areth: txt A[P]N 1 (13. 32, e sil) Andr. rec om και (thrice), with 1 (32, e sil) fuld (with demid tol lips-4) Andr Primas Tich: ins A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth (but om 1st) arm Andr-coisl Areth Jer. transp vor. and δυσμ. A (1) am arm: om κ. απο vor. c 79: δυσμ. . . κ. α. βορ. κ. α. vor. b 40 B²: απο vor. . . κ. α. βορ. . . κ. α. δυσμ. k: txt [P]N^{3a} B rel.—N¹ reads βορρα (repeated) for vorou, and vorou for δυσμων: for vor., μεσημβrias 1.

14. τα and -χος (of τειχος) are written above the line in 1. rec εχον, with N^{3a} rel: ειχε 38: om N¹: txt A[P] B j k l 1. 32. rec (for επ' αυτων) εν αυτοις, with vulg: txt A[P]N B 1-marg rel syr-dd copt Andr Areth Tich Primas.—om και επ αυτων l 1-txt. rec om 2nd δωδεκα, with l 1-txt: ins A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd arm Andr Areth, ιβ' b 1-marg 37. 92; δεκαδυο 18-9: δωδεκα τα 42.

15. rec om μετρον, with 1 (k B², e sil) copt Andr-a: ins A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd æth Andr Areth Primas (arundinem auream ad mensuram, ut . .). καλαμου N^{3a} c (11) vulg. μετρησει b 1. om from 1st to 2nd αυτης (homæotel) b rel: ins A[P]N c (1, e sil) 38.—om 1st αυτης also d.

16. aft πολις ins αυτης, N (omg it aft μηκος). om 2nd to 4th και 1. rec

juxtaposition, primarily of *addition*) **twelve angels, and names inscribed** (contrast to the *ὀνόματα βλασφημίας*, ch. xvii. 3), which are [the names] of the twelve tribes of the sons of Israel (it does not follow from this description either, 1. that the angels must necessarily be guardians, seeing that no foes remain to be guarded against: they are for the completeness and adornment of the city after the idea of a beautiful fortress, adopted to set it forth:—or, 2. that, as in the Jewish books (see De Wette here), each gate is to be imagined as used by each tribe: the twelve tribes of Israel represent the whole people of God, and the city the encampment of Israel: see below). From (on the side entering from) the sun-rising three gates (Joseph, Benjamin, Dan, in Ezek. xlviii. 32. In ch. vii. 6, Manasseh is substituted for Dan, which is omitted. See there), from the north three gates (Reuben, Judah, Levi), from the south three gates (Simeon, Issachar, Zebulun), from the sun-setting

three gates (Gad, Asher, Naphtali: Ezek. ibid. In Numbers ii., the order of encampment is thus set down: *East*,—Judah, Issachar, Zebulun: *South*,—Reuben, Simeon, Gad: *West*,—Ephraim, Manasseh, Benjamin: *North*,—Dan, Asher, Naphtali). And the wall of the city (the wall surrounding the city) having (had: for masc. of the part., see ch. iv. 1 reff.) twelve foundation-stones (i. e. probably, each portion of the wall joining two gates had a conspicuous basement, of one vast stone. Four of these, as Düsterd. observes, would be corner-stones, joining the third gate on one side to the first gate on the next), and upon them (gen. over them, perhaps extending all their length) twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb (cf. Eph. ii. 20, where however the ruling idea is a different one, see the interpretation in the note. No inference can be drawn as has been drawn by some from this that the Writer was not himself an Apostle: see prolegg. § i. 84 ff.). 15—17.] *Its measurement*: cf. Ezek. xl. 3—5. And he that

ὅσον [καὶ] τὸ ^{ef} πλάτος. κα ^b ἐμέτρησεν τὴν πόλιν τῷ ^{f ch. xx. 9 reff.}
^a καλὰ μω ^g ἐπὶ ^h σταδίους δώδεκα χιλιάδων τὸ ^{de} μήκος ^{see Acts iv.}
 καὶ τὸ ^{ef} πλάτος καὶ τὸ ^{ei} ὕψος αὐτῆς ^k ἴσα ἐστίν. ¹⁷ καὶ ^{so of}
^b ἐμέτρησεν τὸ ^s τεῖχος αὐτῆς ἑκατὸν τεσσαρακοντατεσσά- ^{iv. 25. Acts}
 ρων ¹ πηχῶν, ^z μέτρον ^m ἀνθρώπου, ὃ ἐστὶν ἀγγέλου. ^{h ch. xiv. 20}
¹⁸ καὶ ἡ ⁿ ἐνδόμησις τοῦ ^s τεῖχους αὐτῆς ^o ἴασις καὶ ἡ ^{reff.}
^{6 only. Ezek. xl. 5. 1 Matt. vi. 27. Luke xii. 25. John xxi 8 only. Ezek. l. c. m = ch. xiii.}
^{18. Isa. viii. 1. n here only t. Jos. Antt. xv. 9. 6. o ch. iv. 3. ver. 11 only. Isa. liv. 12.}

ins τοσουτον εστιν bef οσον, with vulg Primas: om A[P]N B rel syr-dd æth Andr
 Areth.—om οσον as well B^r. om 3rd και [P]N B rel Andr Areth: ins A (32. 40-2,
 e sil) vulg syr-dd copt Primas Jer. ins εν bef τω καλ. [P] c 1 (11). 12. 32 Andr.

Steph σταδιων, with N¹ 1. 35 Andr: σταδιου(sic) N^{3a}: txt A[P] B rel Andr-
 coisl Areth. for δωδεκα, δεκαδυω rel Andr-coisl: txt A[P]N h 10. 92 (1 37, e sil)
 Andr-a-p Areth: ιβ' B 1. 17. 32. ins και bef χιλιάδων B 92. aft χιλ. ins
 δωδεκα B rel (ιβ' B 92 al) syr-dd: om A[P]N l 1. 17-8. 35-7-8-9.

17. om μετρησεν B rel Andr-coisl: ins A[P]N h l 4 (1. 16. 32-7-9. 49, e sil) Andr
 Areth Primas. for τειχος, χιλος(sic) N. πηχεων N.

18. rec (aft και) ins ην, with B rel Andr Areth Primas: om A[P]N^{3a} syr-dd æth
 Tich.—for η, ην N¹. ενδομησις AN^{3a} j: ενδωασι N: εκδομησις k. om from

spoke with me had as a measure a golden
 reed (reff.) that he might measure the
 city, and her gates and her wall. And
 the city lieth four-square (so E. V. well;
 is in shape tetragonal), and her length is
 as great as [also] her breadth (see below).
 And he measured the city with the reed
 to the length of stadii of the amount
 of twelve thousands (such appears to
 be the construction. On the ἐπὶ, 'over,'
 of extent, see Winer, edn. 6, § 49, l. 3,
 a. We have it in the adverbial phrase ἐφ'
 ὅσον, Rom. xi. 13. The 12,000 stadii are
 in all probability the whole circumference,
 1000 to each space between the gates);
 the length and the breadth and the
 height of it are equal (the supposition of
 many expositors, that the city thus formed
 a monstrous cube, 3000 stadii in length,
 in breadth, and in height, really does not
 appear to be necessarily included in these
 words. Nay, it seems to be precluded by
 what next follows, where the angel mea-
 sures the height of the wall. For Düster-
 dieck's idea that the houses were 3000
 stadii in height, while the wall was only
 144 cubits, is too absurd to come at all
 into question. The words are open, this
 last consideration being taken into ac-
 count, to two interpretations: 1) that the
 city, including the hill or rock on which
 it was placed, and which may be imagined
 as descending with it, formed such a cube
 as seems here described: or 2) that there
 is some looseness of use in the word ἴσα,
 and that we must understand that the
 length and breadth were equal to each
 other and the height equal all round:
 nearly so De Wette, al. Of these two

I prefer the former, as doing no violence
 to the words, and as recalling somewhat
 the form of the earthly Jerusalem on its
 escarpment above the valley of the Ke-
 droun. Some such idea seems also to be
 pointed at in the rabbinical books, e.g.
 Bava Bathra, f. 75. 2, "Dixit Rabba, R.
 Jochananem dixisse, Deum S. B. tempore
 futuro Hierosolyma evecturum in altitu-
 dinem xii. milliarium S. D. Zach. xiv. 10.
 Quid est 'in loco suo?' talem esse futu-
 ram superne, qualis est infra. Rabba
 dixit, senex mihi narravit, se vidisse Hiero-
 solymam priorem, quæ xii. milliarium erat.
 Dices, difficilem fore adscensum? sed scrip-
 tum est, Isa. lx. 8." And in Schir R. vii.
 5, "Jerusalem tempore futuro dilatabitur
 ita ut pertingat usque ad portas Damasci,
 Zach. ix. 1. . . . et exaltabitur ut per-
 tingat usque ad thronum gloriæ, donec
 dicatur, locus mihi angustus est." See
 more citations in Wetst.). And he mea-
 sured the wall of it (i. e. the height
 of the wall of it), of an hundred and forty-
 four cubits, the measure of a man, which
 is that of an angel (meaning that in this
 matter of measure, men and angels use the
 same. The interpretation, that in this
 particular case, the angel used the measure
 current among men (De Wette, al.), is
 ungrammatical. As to the height
 thus given, it may be observed that the
 height of Solomon's porch, the highest
 part of his temple, was 120 cubits, 2 Chron.
 iii. 4, and the general height of his
 temple, 30 cubits, 1 Kings vi. 2).
 18—27.] Material, and further descrip-
 tion of the city. And the building-work
 (Jos. in ref. is speaking of the harbour of

^f ὑάκινθος, ὁ δωδέκατος ^{ve} ἀμέθυστος. ²¹ καὶ οἱ δώδεκα ^f here only+. Ezek. xvi. 10
^h πυλῶνες δώδεκα ⁱ μαργαρίται· ^{kl} ἀνὰ ^l εἰς ^l ἕκαστος τῶν
^h πυλῶνων ἦν ἐξ ἑνὸς ⁱ μαργαρίτου. καὶ ἡ ^m πλατεῖα
^g here only. Ezek. as above (v) only.
^h τῆς πόλεως ⁿ χρυσοῖον ⁿ καθαρὸν ὡς ⁿ ὕαλος ^o διαυγής.
^h ver. 12. 1 ch xvii. 4
²² καὶ ναὸν οὐκ εἶδον ἐν αὐτῇ· ὁ γὰρ ^p κύριος ὁ ^p θεὸς ὁ
^k Luke ix 3
^p παντοκράτωρ [ὁ] ναὸς αὐτῆς ἐστίν, καὶ τὸ ἄρνιον.
^{al.} John ii. 6. ch. iv. 8.
²³ καὶ ἡ πόλις οὐ ^a χρεῖαν ^a ἔχει τοῦ ἡλίου οὐδὲ τῆς
^l here only. m sing., ch. xi. 8. xii. 2
^{seλήνης}, ἵνα ^r φαίνωσιν αὐτῇ· ἡ γὰρ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ ^s ἐφά-
^{8. xii. 2 only. Esth. vi. 9, 11. plur., Matt. vi. 5. xii. 19.)}
^{ti} σεν αὐτῇ, καὶ ὁ ^t λύχνος αὐτῆς τὸ ἄρνιον ²⁴ καὶ

αμεθυστος (for -στος) ^N3a b c e h j l 1. 13. 32-7-8. 40-1-7-8-9. 82, αμεθυστινος ^N1.

^{21.} om 2nd δωδεκα ^N1. for ανα, ινα A. [add και P.] aft πυλωνων ins
^{ων} ^N1 (^N3a disappointing). aft ην ins ως [P] v 92. rec (for διαυγης) διαφανης :
^{txt} A[P](N) v rel Andr Areth.—διαυγης is corr'd to txt in N.

^{22.} for ο γαρ κ. ο θ., οτι ο κς ο θς ^N1 : ο γαρ ο κς θς (sic) ^N3a : ει μη κς ο θ. 90.
^{rec} om ο (bef ναος), with [P]N v rel Andr Areth : ins A.

^{23.} rec aft φαίνωσιν ins εν, with ^N3a h 17. 30² (37. 49 Br, e sil) vulg : om A[P]N¹ v
^{rel} Andr Areth Primas.—om αυτη 92. γαρ bef η v rel : txt A[P]N¹ h 10-7. 38 (1.
^{37.} 49, e sil).

γλαυκίζων μὲν ἐστὶ θαλασσοβαφής, ἔχων
^{ειδος} καὶ τῆς ὑδαρεστέρας ὑακίνθου : and
^{Pliny} xxxvii. 20, “viriditatem puri maris
^{imitantur,”} Winer, ut supra, 11), the
^{ninth,} topaz (τῆψ, reff. and al. Strabo
^{describes} it as διαφανής, χρυσοειδὲς ἀπο-
^{λάμπων} φέγγος, xvi. p. 770, Wetst.,
^{where} see more testimonies. But Plin.
^{xxxvii.} 32, says “egregia etiamnum to-
^{pazio} gloria est, suo *virenti* genere :”
^{whence} some have supposed it our chry-
^{solith :} see above. Cf. Job xxviii. 19 :
^{and} Winer ut supra, 2), the tenth, chry-
^{soprasus} (this word is found only in
^{Pliny,} xxxvii. 20, “vicinum genus huic
^(beryllo) est pallidius, et a quibusdam
^{proprii} generis existimatur, vocaturque
^{chrysoprasus :}” and 21, “amethysti ful-
^{gens} purpura”), the eleventh, jacinth
^{(ὑψ :} so alii apud Tromm. in Exod.
^{xxviii.} 19, where the LXX have λιγύριον,
^{which} again occurs in Ezek. xxviii. 13,
^{where} ὑψ is not found : while in Exod.
^{xxviii.} 20 Symm. renders ὑψ by ὑάκινθος.
^{The} word is not found in LXX as the
^{name} of a gem. Pliny, xxxvii. 41 :
^{“ille} emicans in amethysto fulgor vio-
^{laceus} dilutus est in hyacintho”), the
^{twelfth,} amethyst (τῆψ reff. Pliny,
^{xxxvii.} 40, reckons the amethyst among
^{the} purple stones, and says of the best,
^{the} Indian, “absolutum felicitis purpuræ
^{colorem} habent . . . perlucent autem om-
^{nes} violaceo colore.” So that it seems to

be the stone now known by that name).
^{And} the twelve gates, twelve pearls (Isa.
^{liv.} 12, “carbuncles.” Wetst. quotes from
^{the} Rabbinical Bava Bathra, f. 75. 1 :
^{“Deus} S. B. adducet gemmas et margari-
^{tas,} triginta cubitos longas totidemque
^{latas :} easque excavavit in altitudinem xx
^{cubitum,} et latitudinem x cubitorum,
^{collocabitque} eas in portis Hierosolymo-
^{rum.”} See many more in Wetst. and
^{Schöttgen),} each one separately (reff.) of
^{the} gates was (made) out of one pearl.
^{And} the street (generic : the street-ma-
^{terial,} throughout) of the city (was) pure
^{gold} like transparent glass (see above on
^{ver.} 18). And a temple I saw not in it :
^{for} the Lord God Almighty is the temple
^{of} it, and the Lamb (i. e. the inhabitants
^{need} no place of worship or sacrifice, the
^{object} of all worship being present, and
^{the} great Sacrifice Himself being there).
^{And} the city hath not need of the sun
^{nor} yet of the moon, that they should
^{shine} on her (αὐτῇ, dat. commodi) : for
^{the} glory of God (the brightness of His
^{presence,} the Shechinah : see above, ver.
¹¹⁾ lightened her, and her lamp was the
^{Lamb} (see Isa. lx. 19, 20. No assignment
^{of} the members of the sentence must be
^{thought} of, such as that ἡ δόξα τ. θεοῦ is
^{her} Sun, and τὸ ἄρνιον her Moon : so
^{Grot.} and Ewald (not De Wette, as Düs-
^{terd.,} who only thinks that φωτίζειν cor-
^{responds} to the sun and λύχνος to the

u ch. ii. 1. iii. 4. u περιπατήσουσιν τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ φωτὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ οἱ
 Isa. lx. 9. βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς φέρουσιν τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν εἰς αὐτήν,
 v Isa. lx. 11 ff. w
 w ver. 12. 25 καὶ οἱ w πυλῶνες αὐτῆς οὐ μὴ v κλεισθῶσιν v ἡμέρας, νύξ
 x Isa. xxxv. 8. γὰρ οὐκ ἔσται ἐκεῖ, 26 καὶ v οἴσουσιν τὴν δόξαν καὶ τὴν
 y 1 John ii. 21. τιμὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰς αὐτήν. 27 x καὶ y οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ εἰς
 z = Acts x. 14. αὐτήν y πᾶν z κοινὸν καὶ abc ποιῶν bd βδέλυγμα καὶ c ψεῦδος,
 xi 8 al. † εἰ μὴ οἱ f γεγραμμένοι ἐν τῷ 18 βιβλίῳ τῆς 18 ζωῆς τοῦ
 1 Macc. i. 47, ἀρνίου.
 a constr. masc., ch. iv. 1 al. XXII. 1 Καὶ ἔδειξέν μοι ποταμὸν h ὕδατος h ζωῆς
 b Jer. vii. 12. i λαμπρὸν ὡς k κρύσταλλον, l ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου
 c ch. xxii. 15. (not in ABN). g see ch. iii. 5 reff. h ch. vii. 17 reff. i ch. xv. 6. xvi. 14. xix.
 d ch. xvii. 4. e constr., ch. ix. 4. f see ch. xx. 15. g see ch. iii. 5 reff. h ch. vii. 17 reff. i ch. iv. 5 al. fr. Εξεκ. xlvii. 1.
 8 al. † Num. x. 1. 7. Ezek. i. 22.

24. rec (for περιπατ. το φωτος αυτης) τα εθνη των σωζομενων εν τω φωτι αυτης περιπατησουσι, with 18 Andr-comm: και περιπατησουσι αυτης 39: τα εθ. των σωζ. τω φωτι αυτης περιπ. (τα in red) εθνη δια του φωτος αυτης 1(sic): txt A[P]N B rel vulg copt Andr Areth lat.-ff.—aft περιπ. N¹ wrote δ but marked it for erasure. for την (bef δοξαν), αυτω B rel: αυτων 5: om 92: txt A[P]N h l 1. 10-7-8. 34-8 (17-8. 35-7. 47-9 B^r, e sil). rec (aft δοξαν) ins και την τιμην, with B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth (but of these B b c d e j k 19. 39. 40-1-2-8. 51. 92 Areth om την): om A[P]N h l 1. 17-8. 38. 47 B^r. for αυτων, των εθνων B rel syr-dd Andr-coisl: txt A[P]N h l 1. 10-7-8. 38 (37. 47-9 B^r, e sil) vulg copt Andr Areth Ambr Primas

25. for ημερας, ημερα (sic) N¹.
 26. (om ver B^r?) at end add ινα εισελθωσιν B rel Areth: om A[P]N h l 2. 10. 34 (1. 35-7. 47-9, e sil).

27. εισελθωσιν N. rec κοινουν, with 26-7: κοινων 1: txt A[P]N B rel. rec ποιουν, with [P] B c h 1. 2. 4. 10-7. 34 (26. 32-5-7. 42-8-9, e sil) Andr Areth: ο ποιων rel copt: ο ποιωσει (sic) N¹: txt AN^{3a} 18. 41. 92. for αρνιου, ουνου (sic) N.

CHAP. XXII. 1. rec ins καθαρων bef ποταμον, with 1: aft ποτ., c h l 4. 10-7. 26. 32-4-8. 48-9 B^r Andr Areth: om A[P]N B rel Hil Primas. om 1st του N.

moon, but protests against applying these to the divine Persons separately): and the nations shall walk by means of her light (i. e. she shall be so bright as to serve for light,—for sun and moon both,—to the world that then is, and her inhabitants. For such inhabitants are clearly supposed; see below, and ch. xxii. 2). And the kings of the earth (no longer hostile to Christ) bring (pres. of habit and certainty, as so often in this prophecy) their (the kings', not the nations', as ver. 26) glory (cf. Isa. lx. 3: all in which they glory) into her: and her gates shall never be shut by day (i. e. in meaning, shall never be shut, seeing it will always be day: shall never be shut, for if they were, they must be shut by day): for night shall not exist there. And they (men) shall bring the glory and the costliness of the nations into her (Isa. lxvi. 12. Among the mysteries of this new heaven and new earth this is set forth to us: that, besides the glorified church, there shall still be dwelling on the renewed earth nations, organized under kings, and (ch. xxii. 2) saved by means of the in-

fluences of the heavenly city). And there shall never enter into her, every thing unclean, and working abomination and falsehood, but only (lit. except) they that are written in the book of life of the Lamb (if then the kings of the earth, and the nations, bring their glory and their treasures into her, and if none shall ever enter into her that is not written in the book of life, it follows, that these kings, and these nations, are written in the book of life. And so perhaps some light may be thrown on one of the darkest mysteries of redemption. There may be,—I say it with all diffidence,—those who have been saved by Christ without ever forming a part of his visible organized Church).

CH. XXII. 1—5.] *The end of the description*: the means of healing for the nations (1, 2): the blessedness, and eternal reign of the glorified servants of God (3—5).

And he shewed me a river of water of life, bright as crystal, coming forth out of the throne of God and of the Lamb (which throne is one and the same: see ch. iii. 21, and note on ch. xx. 11. The

τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἄρνιου. ² ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ^m πλατείας αὐτῆς ^m ch. xxi. 21
καὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ ⁿ ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ⁿ ἐκεῖθεν ⁿ ξύλον ⁿ ὡζῆς, ⁿ see John xix.
^p ποιοῦν ^p καρποὺς δώδεκα, κατὰ μήνα ἕκαστον ^a ἀποδιδούς ¹⁸ Dan. xii.
τὸν ^a καρπὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὰ ^r φύλλα τοῦ ⁿ ξύλου εἰς ^s θερα- ^{5.} Ezek. xl.
πείαν τῶν ἐθνῶν. ³ καὶ ^t πᾶν ^u κατάθεμα ^t οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι. ^{34, 37}
καὶ ὁ θρόνος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἄρνιου ἐν αὐτῇ ἔσται, καὶ οἱ ^o ch. ii. 7 ref.
^v δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ^w λατρεύσουσιν αὐτῷ, ⁴ καὶ ^{xy} ὄψονται τὸ ^p Matt. iii. 8 &
^y πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῶν ^z μετώπων ^{passim}
αὐτῶν. ⁵ καὶ ^a νῦξ οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι, καὶ οὐχ ^b ἔξουσιν ^b χρεῖαν ^r Matt. xxi. 19
φωτὸς ^b λύχνου καὶ φωτὸς ἡλίου, ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ^{||} (bis), xxiv.
^{bc} φωτιεῖ ἐπ' αὐτούς, καὶ ^a βασιλεύσουσιν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας ^{32 || only.}
τῶν αἰώνων. ^{Gen. 1. 5.}
⁵ = Luke ix.
11 (xii 42,
Matt. xxiv.
45 v. r.)
only? see
Matt. xxvi.

Euth. ii. 12. EZEK. xlvii. 12.
74. ZECH. xiv. 11. ^v ch. i. 1. ii. 20, vii. 3 al. Ps. xxxiii. 22. ^u here only +. see Matt. xxvi.
vii. 7 (from Exod. iii. 12) al. ^x 1 John iii. 2 ref. ^y — here only. (Acts ix. 25) see
Ps. xvi. 15 ^z ch. vii. 3 ref. ^a ch. xxi. 25. ZECH. xiv. 6, 7. ^b ch. xxi. 23
ch. xviii. 1 ref. constr., here only. ^d = ch. xx. 4, 6 ref.

2. ἐμμεσῶ A: ἐκ μεσου 92. txt [P]N B rel. rec (for ἐκεῖθεν) ἐντεῦθεν, with h
1.10-7-8-9. 35 (37. 47-9 Br, e sil) Andr: om και ἐκεῖθεν 92: txt A[P] B rel syr-dd arm
Andr-coisl Areth.—N^{3a} has ἐνθεν και ἐνθεν και, N¹ ἐνθεν και (once only), both omitting
ξύλον ὡης. ποῖον A 18: ποιοῦντα e: txt N B rel Andr Areth. [P def.]
μήναν A. [P def.] rec (aft μήνα) ins ενα, with 1 (j, e sil) Andr-p(Del) Areth: om
AN B rel Andr. [P def.] εκαστω B 39. 40; εκαστος d: om 35: txt AN rel Andr
Areth. [P def.] rec αποδιδου, with A b 32-4 (30. 47, e sil) Andr: αποδιδοντα e 1.
19 am fuld Primas: txt N B rel Areth. [P def.] αποδ. bef εκαστ. B b d e k l 9.
17-9. 32-9. 40-1-2. 92 syr-dd: txt A [P(from the space)] N rel Andr Areth. τους
καρπους N: om τον 1. 40. 90. [P def.] των ξυλων N. om των (bef εθων) N.
3. rec καταναθεμα: καταγμα (sic) N¹: txt A[P]N^{3a} B rel Andr Areth. for ετι,
εκει 1: om N¹. om ο N.
4. ins και bef επι N.
5. rec (for ετι) εκει, with h l 1. 4. 10-7-8. 34 (16. 32 5-7-9. 47-8-9 Br, e sil) Andr
Areth: om rel copt Promiss: txt A[P]N B 2. 19 vulg syr-dd lat-ff(some). rec
χρειαν ουκ εχουσιν, with [P] 1. 4. 10-7. 34 (c h 32-7. 47-8-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth: ουκ
εχουσιν χρεῖαν N: ου χρεῖα B rel (syr-dd) Primas Promiss: txt A vulg. rec om
φωτος (bef λυχνου), with [P] B rel Andr Areth Ambr₂: ins AN 18 (38) 47 vulg syr-dd
copt æth Andr-a Ambr₁ Tich Primas. λυχνον(sic) 1. for 2nd φωτος, φως
A[P] 32-5. 48 am: om lips-5. om ηλιου B rel: ins A[P]N c h 1. 10. 30-4. 48 (4
17-8-9. 35-7-8. 47-9 Br, e sil) gr-lat-ff. rec φωτιει, with c 4. 34 (32. 48, e sil) am
syr-dd Andr-coisl Areth: φωτισει A[P] 12. 42: txt N B rel (vulg copt) Andr (Primas
Ambr). rec om επ, with [P] B rel Andr Areth: ins AN Ambr Tich Primas.
for τους, αυτους 1.

O. T. passages in view are Gen. ii. 10; Ezek. xlvii. 1 ff.). In the midst of the street of it (the city), and of the river, on one side and on the other (the gen. ποταμοῦ is governed by ἐν μέσῳ as Ewald and Düsterd. al., not by ἐντεῦθεν κ. ἐκεῖθεν, as De Wette; the meaning being that the trees were on each side in the middle of the space between the street and the river. See Ezek. xlvii. 7), (was) the tree of life (ch. ii. 7; Ezek. ut supra ff., i. e. trees of the kind described: as in Ezek.), producing twelve fruits (kinds of fruit, Ezek. xlvii. 12), according to each month yielding its fruit (Ezek. ut supra): and the leaves of the tree (are) for healing of the nations

(so exactly, Ezek. ver. 12: "and the leaf thereof (φύλλον is read for ἀνάβασις, in LXX, by "alii apud Tromm.") for medicine." On the sense of ἐθνῶν, the nations outside, see above, ch. xxi. end). And every curse (accursed thing, see below. κατάθεμα, another form of κατανάθεμα; in ref. Matt. we have the verb καταθεματί-ζω) shall exist no longer (cf. ref. Zech. There shall no more be those accursed things which bar the residence of God among His people: see Josh. vii. 12, which shews that these words are in close connexion with what follows): and the thrones of God and of the Lamb shall be in her, and His servants shall serve Him (in

6 Καὶ εἶπέν μοι Οὗτοι οἱ ^eλόγοι ^{ef}πιστοὶ καὶ ^fἀληθινοί, καὶ ὁ κύριος ὁ ^gθεὸς τῶν ^{gh}πνευμάτων τῶν ^hπροφητῶν ⁱἀπέστειλεν τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ⁱδεῖξαι τοῖς ^vδούλοις αὐτοῦ ἃ ⁱδεῖ ⁱγενέσθαι ἐν ⁱτάχει. 7 καὶ ἰδοὺ ⁱἔρχομαι ^{...εν Ρ.} ^{AN B b} ^{c d h j} ^{k l i. 2.} ^{4. 9. 10-} ^{3. 16 to} ^{19. 26-7.} ^{30-2-4-5.} ^{37 to 42.} ^{47 to 51.} ^{90-2 Br.} ^{ταχύ·} μακάριος ὁ ^kτηρῶν τοὺς ^{kl}λόγους τῆς ^lπροφητείας τοῦ ^lβιβλίου τούτου. 8 Κἀγὼ Ἰωάννης ὁ ἀκούων καὶ βλέπων ταῦτα· καὶ ὅτε ἤκουσα καὶ ἔβλεψα ἔπεσα ^mπροσκυνῆσαι ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ποδῶν τοῦ ἀγγέλου τοῦ δεικνύοντός μοι ταῦτα. 9 καὶ λέγει μοι ^mὉρα μή· ^mσύνδουλός σου εἰμὶ καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ τῶν ^kτηρούντων τοὺς ^{kn}λόγους τοῦ

n ver. 19. see above (1).

6. for εἶπεν, λέγει B rel: txt A[P]N 4. 34 (1. 32. 48, e sil) vss gr-lat-ff. rec om o (bef κυριος), with [P] B rel Andr Areth: ins AN 92. rec (for πνευματων των) αγων, with 1. 34 Andr: των πν. των αγ. 35(Del) Andr-coisl: txt A[P]N B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Andr-comm Areth Frimas Idac. aft απεστ. ins με N¹(N³⁴ disapproving).

7. rec om και, with h 1. 4. 10-7. 34-8 (37. 40-8-9 Br, e sil) copt Andr Primas: ins AN B rel vulg syr-dd æth Andr-a Areth. ερχονται N³⁵.

8. rec και εγω, with rel Andr-coisl Areth: om εγω 92: txt AN B b d h j k 9. 10-3-6. 26-7. 35-8. 47-9. 50. 90 Br Dion Andr. rec o βλεπων ταυτα και ακουων, with 1: o βλ. κ. ακ. ταυτα N c 4. 32-4. 48 copt Dion Andr Areth: txt A B rel vulg syr-dd Andr-p lat-ff. οτε ειδον (for εβλεψα) B rel; ειδον (alone) b k 16. 38: txt N 1. 4. 10-7. 34 (c h 18. 32-7. 48-9 Br, e sil) Andr Areth; εβλεπον A: vidi vulg Primas. elz πεσοον, with B rel: txt AN 1. 16-8. 30-5. for εμπροσθεν τωι, προ A. δικνυντος N h j l 49. 50.

9. rec (aft σου) ins γαρ, with 30²: om AN B rel vulg syr-dd copt æth Ath Andr Areth Cyp. om 2nd και 1. om last και b c h 1. 12. 32¹-7. 47-8-9.

ministration and holy service, see ch. vii. 15), and they shall see His face (be close to Him, and know Him even as they are known, Matt. v. 8), and His name (shall be) on their foreheads (ref.). And night shall not be any more (ch. xxi. 25), and they shall have no need of the light of a lamp or (and) of the light of the sun (ch. xxi. 23), because the Lord God shall shine (shed light) upon them: and they shall reign (De Wette well remarks, in a higher sense than in ch. xx. 4, 6) to the ages of the ages.

6—21.] CONCLUDING ASSURANCES AND EXHORTATIONS: and herein, 6, 7, assurance by the angel of the truth of what has been said, in the terms of ch. i. 1. And he (the angel) said to me, These sayings (the whole book, by what follows) are faithful and true (see on ref.): and the Lord (Jehovah) the God of the spirits of the prophets (i. e. of those spirits of theirs, which, informed by the Holy Spirit, have become the vehicles of prophecy) sent His angel to shew to His servants what things must come to pass shortly (on the whole of this see on ch. i. 1, from which place it is repeated at the close of the book of which that is the opening). And behold,

I come quickly (the speech passes into the words of Christ Himself, reported by the angel: so in ver. 12, and in ch. xi. 3): Blessed is he that keepeth the sayings of the prophecy of this book (the speech is a mixed one: in τοῦ βιβλίου τούτου, the Writer has in view the roll of his book now lying all but completed before him: but the words are the saying of the angel: τῆς προφητείας ταύτης would express it formally). And I John (was he) who heard and saw these things (pres. participles without temporal significance—was the hearer and seer of these things): and when I heard and saw, I fell down (as in ch. xix. 10, where see notes) to worship before the feet of the angel who shewed me (pres. part. as above) these things. And he saith to me, Take heed not: I am a fellow-servant of thine, and (a fellow-servant) of thy brethren the prophets, and of those who keep the sayings of this book: worship God (the same feeling again prevailed over the Apostle as before, and is met with a similar rebuke. I hardly can with Düsterd. see any real distinction implied, in the ἀδελφῶν σου τῶν προφητῶν here, between the situation of the Seer then and now. D. thinks, the

¹⁰ βιβλίου τούτου. τῷ θεῷ προσκύνησον. ¹⁰ καὶ λέγει μοι ^{o = ch. x. 4.} ^{Dan. vii. 26} ^{Theod. xii.} ^{4, 9.} ^{p ch. i. 3.} ^{Matt. xxvi.} ^{18, see Luke} ^{xxi. 8.} ^{q = John ii. 23.} ^{Phil. iv. 5.} ^{Zeph. i. 7.} ^{r = Col. iii. 25.} ^{Ps. cv. 6.} ^{see Ezek. iii.} ^{27.} ^{s James ii. 2.} ^{only. Zech.} ^{iii. 4, 5 only.} ^{(-τος, 1 Pet.} ^{iii. 21.)} ^{-παρία,} ^{James i. 21.)} ^{there only +.} ^{w vv. 7, 20, ch} ^{x Matt.} ^{b ch. i. 8. xxi. 6.} ^{Luke xv. 22. ch. vi. 11. vii.} ^{usages of} ^{ἐξουστ. w. ἐπὶ 4.}

Μὴ ὁ σφραγίσῃς τοὺς ¹ λόγους τῆς ¹ προφητείας τοῦ ¹ βιβλίου τούτου, ὁ ² καιρὸς γὰρ ² ἐγγύς ἐστιν. ¹¹ ὁ ¹ ἄδικων ¹ ἄδικησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ² ῥυπαρὸς ² ῥυπανθήτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ³ δίκαιος ³ δικαιοσύνην ποιησάτω ἔτι, καὶ ὁ ἅγιος ³ ἁγιασθήτω ἔτι. ¹² ἰδοὺ ⁴ ἔρχομαι ⁴ ταχύ, καὶ ὁ ⁴ ^{xy} μισθός μου ⁴ μετ' ἐμοῦ ⁴ ἀποδοῦναι ἐκάστῳ ὡς τὸ ⁴ ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ. ¹³ ἐγὼ τὸ ⁵ ἄλφα καὶ τὸ ⁵ Ω, [ὁ] ⁵ πρῶτος καὶ [ὁ] ⁵ ἔσχατος, ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος. ¹⁴ μακάριοι οἱ ⁶ πλύνοντες τὰς ⁶ στολὰς αὐτῶν, ἵνα ⁶ ἔσται ἡ ⁶ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ⁶ ἐπὶ τὸ ⁶ ἔξυλον

^u 1 John ii. 29. ^{iii. 7, 10.} ^{Matt. vi. 1.} ^{v Rev., here only. see Dan. xii. 10.} ^{y Isa. xl. 10. lxii. 11.} ^{a = Heb. vi. 10. 1 Pet. i. 17 al.} ^{e Mark xii. 38 || L. xvi. 5.} ^{Luke xv. 22. ch. vi. 11. vii.} ^{9, 13, 14 bis only. Isa. lxiii. 1.} ^{f constr., ch. iii. 9 reff.} ^{g usages of} ^{ch. ii. 26 reff.} ^{h ver. 2.}

10. om και 1. aft λογους ins τουτους N¹ (but marked for erasure). rec ins
οτι bef ο καιρος (omg γαρ), with 1. 10-7 (37. 49 B^r, e sil) 91 aeth Andr-p Cypr₂ Primas:
ο γαρ καιρος 18. 40 Andr-a: ο καιρος (only) 4. 16. 27. 39. 48: txt AN B rel.
11. homeotel in A j 34-5. 68 Andr-coisl from 1st ετι και to 2nd: in 1 from 1st to
3rd. rec ρυπων ρυπωσασα: ρυπαρωθητω 92: ρυπαρευθητω B rel Andr Areth: txt
N 18¹. 32 Orig₂. rec (for δικ. ποιησ.) δικαιωθητω, with 38 (37, e sil) vulg-ed
ep-of-ch-of-Lyons (in Eus) Aug₃: txt AN B rel am (with demid fuld tol lips-4) syr-dd
copt Andr Areth Cypr₂. (ποιητω l)
12. rec at beg ins και, with 1 aeth Andr-p: om AN B rel vulg syr-dd copt arm Andr
Areth Cypr. αποδοθηναι N¹. rec εσται, with B (Mai) rel Andr Areth: om
39: txt AN B (Tischdf) 38 syr-dd. (d illeg.)—rec αντου bef εστ., with l 1. 4. 17. 34-8
(32-5. 48, e sil) Andr Areth: txt AN B rel syr-dd. (d illeg.)
13. rec aft εγω ins εμει, with 34 (10. 37-9. 40, e sil) vulg Orig₂ (γεγονα₁) lat-ff (some);
δε 16: om AN B rel am (with fuld²) Ath Andr Areth Cypr-ms Primas. rec a
(for αλφα), with B rel Orig Ath Andr: txt AN B c d h j l 9. 32. 90 Andr-coisl Areth.
rec ins o (twice, bef πρῶτος and bef εσχ.), with N B rel Andr-coisl: bef πρ.
(only) h 32: om A d 9.—rec om η bef αρχη and το bef τελος, with 1. 19 (c h 10.
32 B^r, e sil) om το bef τελος 34: ins AN B rel.—rec αρχη κ. τελος bef ο πρῶτ. κ. ο
εσχ., with 1. 4. 17-8 (c h 10. 32-7. 41-8-9 B^r, e sil) Orig₂ Andr Areth: txt AN B rel
vulg syr-dd aeth Orig₁ Ath Cypr.
14. rec (for πλυνοντες τας στολας αυτων) ποιουντες τας εντολας αυτου, with B rel
syr-dd copt (Andr Areth) Cypr Tert Tich: (for αυτου, εμου Andr-p-c Areth-ms:) txt
AN (πλυναντες) 33 (πλυνοντες) vulg aeth arm-ming Ath Fulg Primas. aft 2nd

intention now is to exalt his prophetic office and character). And he saith to me, Seal not up the sayings of the prophecy of this book (cf. ch. x. 4, where the command is otherwise: also reff. Daniel): for the time is near (in Dan. viii. 26, the reason for sealing up the vision is that the time shall be for many days). Let him that is unjust (pres. part. as above) commit injustice (aor. of acts, not of a state, which would be pres.) still: and let the filthy (reff.: morally polluted) pollute himself (in the constant middle sense of passive verbs when the act depends on a man's self) still: and let the righteous do righteousness still, and the holy sanctify himself still (see Ezek. iii. 27: and cf. Matt. xxvi. 45, "Sleep on now, and take your rest: behold, the hour is at

hand:" also Ezek. xx. 39. The saying has solemn irony in it: the time is so short, that there is hardly room for change—the lesson conveyed in its depth is, "Change while there is time"). Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me (reff. Isa.) to render (this infin. may be either of purpose, dependent jointly on ἔρχομαι and ὁ μισθ. κ.τ.λ., or epexegetic of that which is wrapped up in the word μισθός itself. No very satisfactory account is given of this last construction in Winer, edn. 6, § 44. 1) to each as his work is (these words sound as if spoken by our Lord Himself: perhaps at the conclusion, the Apostle puts together, in prophetic shortness, many divine sayings of warning and consolation, with the replies to them). I am the Alpha and the

i ch. xxi. 12
 reff. dat. see
 James ii. 25
 j = Phil. iii. 2.
 Matt vii. 6
 (Luke xvi.
 21. 2 Pet. ii.
 22, from
 Prov. xxi.
 11) only.
 Ps xxi. 16.
 k ch. xxi. 8
 (reff.).
 l ch. xxi. 27.
 m constr., ver.
 20. ch. i. 2.
 1 Tim. vi. 13.
 n dat., = Heb.
 x. 15. Gen.
 xlii. 2 Ed-vat
 (B def.).
 o = Matt xxiv.
 33 John iv.
 6 v. 2. Acts
 iii. 11. ch. ix.
 14. xxi. 12.
 r ch. ii. 28 only.
 v ch. xxi. 6 reff.

τῆς ἡ ζωῆς, καὶ τοῖς ἰ πυλῶσιν εἰσέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν.
 15 ἔξω οἱ ἰ κύνες καὶ οἱ κ φαρμακοὶ καὶ οἱ κ πόρνοι καὶ οἱ
 κ φονεῖς καὶ οἱ κ εἰδωλολάτραι καὶ πᾶς φιλῶν καὶ ἰ ποιῶν
 ἰ ψεύδος. 16 ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἔπεμψα τὸν ἄγγελόν μου ἢ μαρ-
 τυρῆσαι ἢ ὑμῖν ἢ ταῦτα ὁ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις. ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ῥίζα
 καὶ τὸ ἡ γένος Δαυεὶδ, ὁ ἰ ἀστὴρ ὁ δ ἰ λαμπρός, ὁ ἰ πρῶνός. ...τον
 17 καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν Ἔρχου καὶ ὁ ἰ
 ἀκούων εἰπάτω Ἔρχου καὶ ὁ ἡ διψῶν ἐρχέσθω, ὁ θέλων
 λαβέτω ὕδωρ ἡ ζωῆς ἡ δωρεάν. 18 ἡ Μαρτυρῶ ἐγὼ ἡ παντὶ
 τῷ ἀκούοντι τοὺς ἡ λόγους τῆς ἡ προφητείας τοῦ ἡ βιβλίου

p ch v. 5. see Rom. xv. 12, from Isa. xi. 1, 10. q = Acts xvii. 28, 29. Jer. xlii. (xxxvi.) 31.
 s ver. 1 reff. t Ep Jer. 60 t Hos. xiii. 3. u ch. xxi. 2, 9.
 w dat., = ver. 16 reff. or Rom. 2 Gal. iv. 15. x vv. 7, 10. 90-2 B^r.

αὐτων ins *ως δε η εξουσια* N¹(N³ disapproving). *πυλωσιν* 1.

15. rec aft *εξω* ins *δε*, with (d?) lips-5 copt Fulg Primas: om AN B (k?) rel Hip
 Ath Andr Areth Cyp Tich. *αι πορναι* 12: om oi 1 Hip. rec aft *πας* ins *ο*,
 with 1. 4. 30². 8. 41-8 Andr Areth: om AN B rel Hip. *ποι. και φιλ. Ν* e 4. 32-4.
 48 Hip Ath Andr-coisl Areth.—for π. ο φ. κ. ποι., οι ποιουντες το 18.

16. for *επι, εν* A 18. 21. 38 vulg copt Ath Andr: om c 1. 4. 47-8 arm Andr-p Areth
 Primas: txt N B rel syr-dd. rec ins *του bef δαυειδ*, with d e l 1. 9. 13. 30²: om
 AN B rel Ath Andr Areth.—*δαδ bef και το γεν. b*: in 1 του *δαδ* is written above the
 line in red. rec aft *λαμπρος* ins *και*, with A (k?) vulg: om N B rel vss Ath Andr
 Areth Tich Idac. rec (for ο πρωινος) *ορθρινος*: txt A(προ-) N B rel Ath Andr.—om
 ο *λαμπ.* 35.—ο *πρω.* bef ο *λαμπ.* c (d?) 4. 32. 40-8 Andr-coisl Areth.

17. om *το* and *η* N.—N¹ wrote π in place of *το* but marked it for erasure.
 rec (for *ερχου*, twice) *ελθε*, and (for *ερχεσθω*) *ελθεω*: txt AN B rel Ath Andr Areth.
 rec ins *και bef ο θελων*, with 34 (d 40, e sil) vulg syr-dd arm Primas: om AN B
 rel am(with tol lips-5-6) copt æth Ath Andr Areth. rec (for *λαβετω*) *λαμβανετω* *το*,
 with 34(omg *το*) (4. 17, e sil): txt AN B rel Ath Andr Areth.

18. rec (for *μαρτ. εγω*) *συμμαρτυρομαι γαρ*, with vulg: *μαρτυρομαι γαρ* 34-5 spec
 Andr-coisl Areth, *μαρτυρομαι εγω* c 48: txt A(N) B rel Andr.—ins *η bef μαρτ. Ν*.
 rec om 1st *τω*, with d h 10-7 B^r (26-7. 37. 49. 51, e sil) Andr-p: ins AN B rel Andr

Omega, the first and the last, the beginning and the end (these words have hitherto been said by the Father: see above, ch. i. 8, xxi. 6, and notes. And in all probability it is so here likewise, whether we assume the words to be spoken by Christ in God's name, or by the Eternal Father Himself). Blessed are they that wash their robes (see the digest. The vulg. addition "in sanguine agni," after ch. vii. 14, is of course the right supplement), that they may (on *ἵνα* with fut. see reff., and ch. xiv. 13 note. It is a mixed construction: between "that they may have" and "for they shall have") have the power (licence) over the tree (to eat of the tree: *ἐπὶ* of the direction of their reaching for the fruit) of life, and may enter by the gates into the city. Outside are the dogs (impure persons, reff.), and the sorcerers, and the fornicators, and the murderers, and the idolaters, and every one loving and practising falsehood (see on these, ch. xxi. 8).

I Jesus (our Lord now speaks directly in His own person) sent my angel to testify these things to you in (the *ἐπὶ* of addition by juxtaposition, see reff.) the churches. I am the root (reff.) and the race (the *offspring*, as E. V. So Virg. *Æn.* iv. 12, "genus esse Deorum") of David, the bright morning-star (that brings in the everlasting day).

And the Spirit (in the churches, and in the prophets) and the Bride (the Church herself) say Come (see on ch. vi. 1, &c.): and let him that heareth (the cry of the Spirit and Bride) say Come: and let him that thirsteth come; let him that will, take the water of life freely (this verse is best understood as a reply of the Apostle to our Lord's previous words).

18—20.] Final solemn warning of the Apostle. I (emphatic) testify to every one (or, "of every one," by a very common N. T. construction: see reff. for both usages) who heareth the sayings of the prophecy of this book, if any one add

τούτου, ἐάν τις ὅ ἐπιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά, ὁ θεὸς ἐπ' αὐτὸν τ = here only.
 τὰς ^a πλῆγας τὰς γεγραμμένας ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. ¹⁹ καὶ = προστίθ:
 ἐάν τις ^b ἀφέλῃ ^b ἀπὸ τῶν ^c λόγων τοῦ ^c βιβλίου τῆς z = Luke x. 30.
 προφητείας ταύτης, ^b ἀφελεῖ ὁ θεὸς τὸ ^d μέρος αὐτοῦ Acts xvi. 23.
^b ἀπὸ τοῦ ^e ξύλου τῆς ^e ζωῆς, καὶ [ἐκ] τῆς ^f πόλεως τῆς Deut vii. 15.
 ...των d. ^f ἀγίας, τῶν γεγραμμένων ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ. ²⁰ Λέγει a ch. ix. 18, 20
 ὁ ^g μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα ^h Ναί, ⁱ ἔρχομαι ⁱ ταχύ. ^k Ἀμὴν ἔρχου, b Luke x. 42
 κύριε Ἰησοῦ. xvi. 3. Deut. i. 2 xii. 32.
 ὁ ^g μαρτυρῶν ταῦτα ^h Ναί, ⁱ ἔρχομαι ⁱ ταχύ. ^k Ἀμὴν ἔρχου, e ver. 2. d ch. xx. 6 reff.
 κύριε Ἰησοῦ. f ch. xi. 2.
²¹ Ἡ ^k χάρις τοῦ ^k κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ^{kl} μετὰ τῶν ^l ἀγίων. xxi. 2, 10.
 Matt. iv. 5.
 xxi. 33.
 Isa. xlviii. 2.
 Dan. ix. 24.
 Theod
 g constr., ver.
 16 reff.
 h ch. i. 7.
 i Cor. i. 20.
 l see note.

ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ ΙΩΑΝΝΟΥ.

1 ch. iii. 11. vv. 7, 12.

k Rom. xvi. 20 [24]. 1 Cor. xvi. 23 al.

Areth. rec (for ἐπιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά) ἐπιτιθῇ προς ταυτα: ἐπιθῇ προς ταυτα 27: ἐπιθῇ
 ἐπ' αὐτῷ k 30: ἐπιθήσει ἐπ' αὐτῷ Andr-a: ἐπιθήσει ἐπ' αὐτά Ν^{3a}: ἐπιτιθῇ ἐπ' αὐτά 34:
 txt A B rel Andr.—N¹ has passed from ἐπιθ. to ἐπιθ. ἐπιθήσει b c d h j k l 9.
 10-3-6. 26-7. om ἐπ' αὐτῶν A¹: ἐπ' αὐτῷ A² 11². 92.—ἐπ' αὐτῶν bef o θεος N h 10.
 30-4-7. 48 B^r Andr (but Andr-a has αὐτῶν) Areth Ambr. ins ἐπτα bef πλῆγας B c
 h 10. 32-4-7. 48-9 B^r arm Andr Areth: om AN rel vss Ambr Tich Primas. rec
 om 2nd τῶ: ins AN B rel Andr Areth.

19. for εἰ, αν Ν. rec (for ἀφελῇ) ἀφαιρῇ: ἀφελεῖται B: ἀφελοῖ 47. 51: txt
 AN rel Andr Areth. aft λόγων ins τούτων Ν. rec (for τοῦ βιβλίου) βιβλου:
 txt AN B rel Andr (but b Andr-a have τ. προφ. bef τ. βιβλ. τούτου) Areth. rec
 (for ἀφελῇ) ἀφαιρῇ: ἀφελοῖ rel Andr-p: ἀφελαι j 9. 16. 27. 41: txt AN B 4. 92
 Andr Areth, ἀφελῇ e¹ k 26. 39. 42-8. rec (for τοῦ ξύλου) βιβλου, with vulg-ed
 (and fuld lips-4-5) Andr-p Ambr Primas: txt AN B rel am (with demid lips-6) syr-dd
 copt aeth arm Andr Areth Tich. om εκ A 10. 38: ins N B rel vulg syr-dd Andr
 Areth Tich Primas. rec aft αγίας ins και, with (d ?) 34(-5 ?) vulg: om AN B rel
 syr-dd copt aeth arm Andr Areth Tich Primas. rec om last τῶ: ins AN B rel Andr
 Areth.

20. aft ταυτα ins εἶναι Ν¹. om αμην Ν Primas. rec ins ναι bef ερχου,
 with rel Andr-a-p (Primas ?): και l: om AN B c 2. 4. 18. 32. 48. 92 Andr-coisl Areth.
 aft ιησ. ins χε Ν^{3a}.

21. rec aft κυριον ins ημων, with 30-2. 41 vulg syr-dd copt Andr-p: om AN B rel
 vulg-yps aeth Andr.—om κυρ. ιησ. c Areth.—rec aft ιησ. ins χριστου, with B rel vulg
 syr-dd copt Andr Areth (see above): om AN 10. 26.—χριστου (alone) 32. rec (for
 των αγιων) παντων μων, with vulg-ed (and fuld &c): παντων των αγιων B rel Andr
 Areth: παντων (alone) A am: txt N. rec at end adds αμην, with N B rel vss Andr
 Areth-txt: om A fuld Andr-a Areth-comm.

SUBSCRIPTION. om B b h j l: αποκαλυψις του αγιου ιωαννου του θεολογου 9: ιωαν.
 αποκ. 18: txt A N (-ψεις).

(aor. = futurus exactus, *shall have added*)
 to them, God shall add to him (lay upon
 him, as he has laid his own additions upon
 them: the verb being from ref. Deut.,
 where the plagues of Egypt are threatened
 to the Israelites in case of their disobe-
 dience) the plagues which are written in
 this book: and if any one shall take
 away from the sayings of the book of
 this prophecy, God shall take away his
 portion from the tree of life (strike out
 his portion from the aggregate of those of
 which the whole participation of that tree

is made up), and [out of] the holy city,
 which are written in this book (see Deut.
 iv. 2; xii. 32. The adding and taking
 away are in the application and reception
 in the heart: and so it is not a mere formal
 threat to the copier of the book, as that
 cited from Irenæus in Eus. H. E. v. 20,
 ὁρκίζω σε τὸν μεταγραφάμενον τὸ βιβλίον
 τοῦτο . . . ἵνα ἀντιβάλῃς ὃ μετεγράψω,
 καὶ κατορθώσῃς . . . All must be received
 and realized. This is at least an awful
 warning both to those who despise and
 neglect this book, and to those who add

to it by irrelevant and trifling interpretations).

20, 21.] FINAL ASSURANCE of the Lord, and REPLY of the Apostle on behalf of the Church: and BENEDICTION. He who testifieth these things (the Lord Jesus) saith, Yea, I come quickly. Amen (the reply of the Apostle, not the

conclusion of our Lord's saying), Come, Lord Jesus.

The grace of the Lord Jesus be with the saints (i. e. with the church of God. This, the reading of the Codex Sinaiticus, is no where else found as a parting formula).

REVISIONS

The references in this revision to Arndt and Gingrich are to Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1957. (This is a translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-Deutsches Worterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der ubrigen urchristlichen literatur*.)

Heb. 1:2. Neither "Son" nor "His Son" is correct here. The anarthrous $\nu\acute{\iota}\omega$ demands the rendering *a Son*, the construction serving to enhance His dignity in contrast to the prophets. "Such an exalted personage as a Son" is the idea.

Heb. 1:3. In addition to the idea of sustaining, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ in this passage may convey the thought of carrying forward to a goal, agreeable to the emphasis of the book as a whole. (Cf. II Peter 1:21 for a similar use of the verb.)

Heb. 1:4. Alford's insistence that in our Lord's earthly life He did not have "the whole fullness of his divine nature" in view of His *kenosis*, so that there was not just a hiding but a complete putting off of the same, is certainly open to serious objection, and seems strangely out of keeping with the author's general position. God can never be less than God, *kenosis* or no *kenosis*. It is odd that such a statement should appear here and not in the treatment of Philippians 2:7.

Heb. 1:5. Certainly the $\sigma\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu$ in Psalm 2:7 does not refer to eternal generation, but to historic manifestation as king. The

writer of Hebrews is not chiefly concerned with the second half of the quotation but with the first, in which the sonship is clearly stated.

Heb. 2:10. On the force of the aorist participle ἀγαγόντα see Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, par. 149.

Heb. 2:16. It is not impossible that the writer uses *seed of Abraham* as Paul does, of all who have a faith like his. (See Franz Delitzsch in *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Vol. I, pp. 138, 139, *in loco*.)

Heb. 4:2. The nominative singular of the participle *mixed*, though not as well attested as the accusative plural, is more likely the original. (See Windisch, *Handbuch zum New Testament*). Alford's argument based on μή is of no consequence, and his assertion about faith inconclusive (see 12:2).

Heb. 4:10. The application of ὁ εἰσελθὼν to Jesus is improbable, since the end of the verse sets up a comparison between such a man and God. It is better to take the statement as axiomatic rather than historical. (See Moffatt's translation.)

Heb. 5:10. On the force of αἴτιος, see B. F. Westcott's note in *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (p. 132).

Heb. 6:9. The translation *akin to* for ἐχόμενα is hardly strong enough. Better is *belonging to*, *adhering to*, etc.

Heb. 7:28. Again, as in 1:2, the translation should be, *a Son*. Here His distinctiveness is emphasized by this construction in contrast to *men* who have *weakness*.

Heb. 8:2. See Franz Delitzsch (*Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Vol. II, pp. 20-24) for substantial objections to the view that the *true tent* is Christ's glorified humanity.

Heb. 9:14. Once more the absence of the article is to be noted—a living God, a God of such reality as the Christian revelation makes known, a God deserving of worship.

Heb. 9:16. Most moderns prefer *be established* for φέρεσθαι. Frederick Field, in *Notes on Select Passages of the Greek Testament* (p. 143), however, felt that the idea was that of *being publicly known*, and J. H. Moulton and George Milligan (*The*

Vocabulary of the New Testament, p. 666) think they have confirmation from the papyri for this.

Heb. 10:20. It may well be doubted that the writer would refer to Jesus' body as a veil. Probably the words τοῦτ' ἔστιν τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ are intended to modify *way*.

Heb. 10:27. Alford's rendering of ἐκδοχή as *reception* in the sense of *meed, doom*, is not born out by usage. F. Field's (*Notes on Select Passages of the Greek Testament*, p. 144) note on the passage shows that ancients took it in the sense commonly given—*expectation* or *prospect*. The papyri have thus far yielded no examples of this sort, but the context demands such a meaning.

Heb. 11:1. The papyri validate both *evidence* and *conviction* as meanings for ἔλεγχος, but the latter fits better here as a parallel expression to *assurance*, both being subjective.

Heb. 12:1. Since the word *witnesses* does not mean spectators, it is well to exclude this notion altogether from the verse. The preceding chapter explains the cloud of witnesses. They are men and women who have witnessed by life (and sometimes by death) to the power of faith. God also has borne witness to them in various ways because of their faith.

Heb. 12:1. The description of sin as being that which *so easily besets* has given some trouble because of the nonoccurrence of the word elsewhere. Considerable interest attaches to the reading of P⁴⁶, which has εὐπερίσπαστον, *easily distracting*.

Heb. 12:2. To render *the faith* is confusing, as liable to suggest the objective sense. *Faith* in general is the idea.

Heb. 12:23. Undoubtedly we should translate, *to God of all as Judge*.

Heb. 13:5. The rendering, *contented with things present*, suggests satisfaction with the present order, whereas the meaning is *contented with things lying present with you, things which you have*.

James 1:3. Alford gives a correct translation for τὸ δοκίμιον, namely, *the proof*, but then explains this in terms of *the proving*. Papyri examples have demonstrated that the word was used in

the sense of *genuineness*. (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, pp. 259-262.)

James 1:10. It is not satisfactory to understand the rich man as an unbeliever. See the discussion in Knowling (*Westminster Commentary*).

James 1:11. The aorists are usually construed as gnomic. However, C. F. D. Moule thinks they have dramatic force. "The grass has withered and the flower has faded before you can look around, as it were" (*An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, p. 12).

James 1:13. The force of ἀπειραστός . . . κακῶν is best set out in some such translation as "untemptable of evil." See the long discussion in Mayor, *The Epistle of St. James*, who rejects Alford's view.

James 2:4. It is difficult to decide between division in the sense of double-mindedness, wavering (between truly Christian and external considerations) and discrimination, making (wrong) distinction, as the better way of handling διεκρίθητε. The latter is favored by Moffatt *et al.*, and has been adopted by the R.S.V.

James 2:10. On the meaning of failure in one point of the law, see Plummer, *The Expositor's Bible* (pp. 132, 133).

James 3:1. *Judgment* is a better translation than *condemnation* for κρίμα.

James 3:17. *Without doubting* can be improved on for ἀδιάκριτος. *Without vacillation* or uncertainty gets closer to the meaning.

I Peter 1:6. Regarding ἀγαλλιᾶσθε, Alford contends for a futuristic sense (in v. 8 also), partly because of the aorist participle λυπηθέντες (v. 6), partly because the rejoicing (v. 8) is said to be glorified. Neither argument is conclusive. The first shock of suffering or grief brings pain, but it is overcome by a joy suffused with glory. This is one of the distinctives of Christianity.

I Peter 1:7. For the meaning of τὸ δοκίμιον, see the note on James 1:3.

I Peter 2:5. Alford prefers the imperative to the indicative (so R.S.V.), but this is a dubious construction, since the whole con-

text from this point on for several verses is didactic rather than hortatory. (See E. G. Selwyn in *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 159.)

I Peter 2:12. More likely the day of visitation is that time when, having come to the Lord, these pagans will for the first time be able to understand and to appreciate the Christian manner of life they formerly derided. As E. G. Selwyn in *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (p. 171) puts the matter, "It [the day of visitation] looks forward to this crisis of conversion rather than to final Judgment."

I Peter 3:19. See Selwyn for an able exposition of the view that the spirits in prison are chiefly angels that sinned. What he makes of the preaching is that Christ proclaimed to the powers of evil the fact that their doom was sealed by His death (*The First Epistle of St. Peter*, p. 360).

I Peter 3:21. The meaning of ἐπερώτημα is uncertain. Recent research has opened up the possibility that it may mean a *pledge* (in this case arising from a good conscience) of obedience, etc., on the part of the newly baptized convert. (See Arndt and Gingrich.)

I Peter 4:6. Though Alford and many other expositors have insisted that this passage is of a piece with 3:18, 19, this may be seriously doubted. Peter seems to be thinking in the passage before us of fellow believers who in their lifetime received adverse judgment from unbelievers, but who now enjoy the more-than-sufficient compensation that they live in the spirit and have God's recognition.

I Peter 4:14. E. G. Selwyn's interpretation (*The First Epistle of St. Peter*, pp. 222, 223) is of interest. He does not join τὸ τῆς δόξης with πνεῦμα, but takes it by itself as *the Presence of the Glory*. "What St. Peter means here is that the *Shekinah*, which was manifested in Christ's Transfiguration and Passion, was manifested likewise in the sufferings of His Church when rightly borne."

I Peter 5:1. Strictly speaking, Peter was not an eyewitness of the sufferings of Christ, at least in the sense of the crucifixion. But he was able to testify to the reality and the necessity of those sufferings, about which he had become enlightened.

I Peter 5:13. It is now widely held that the reference is to the church in Babylon (mystical name for Rome) rather than to Peter's wife.

II Peter 1:14. It remains true that *ταχινή* can mean *imminent*. (See Arndt and Gingrich.)

II Peter 2:4. Tartarus occurs in Job 40:20; 41:24; Proverbs 30:16 in the lexicon.

II Peter 2:10. Apparently the *δόξαι* are angels in this passage.

I John 2:1. Because of the conditional statement, the aorist should not be rendered *have sinned*. An accurate translation is, *if anyone should commit sin*.

I John 2:9-11. The use of the term *brother* presents problems here, but they are probably best handled by retaining the usual force of the word, namely, a fellow Christian. Certain errorists claimed to be Christians and yet manifested no love to those who were God's children. It is against them that John speaks out. (See Findlay, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*, *in loco*.)

I John 3:2. The translation *if it were manifested* is not nearly as desirable as *if he be manifested*, making Christ the understood subject. For justification of this, see Westcott's comments on this verse (*The Epistles of St. John*).

I John 3:3. It is unsatisfactory to refer *ἐκεῖνος* to the Father. Throughout the epistle *ἐκεῖνος*, standing alone, always refers to Christ.

I John 5:16. On the obscure reference to a sin unto death, see Law, *The Tests of Life* (pp. 135-142). He is in substantial agreement with Alford.

I John 5:18. No explanation of the verse is satisfactory except that which recognizes a difference between *ὁ γεννηθεὶς* and *ὁ γεγεννημένος*. The former is most readily assigned to Christ, whose power so keeps the believer that the evil one is foiled.

Jude 4. The presence of only one article should decide the reference to Master and Lord as applying to one Person, Jesus Christ.

Jude 5. That *Jesus* is correctly read here is highly improbable, despite the MS testimony for it. The use of this personal name

in connection with an Old Testament incident is unprecedented in the New Testament. The most likely reading is κύριος. (See *Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol. V, pp. 246, 247.)

Jude 12. The choice between *rocks* and *blemishes* is a nice decision. See the discussion in Bigg (*I.C.C. Commentary on Peter and Jude*).

Jude 22. An even better meaning than those suggested for διακρινομένους makes them *doubters*.

Rev. 1:4. Alford makes no comment on the unusual construction which retains the nominative case after ἀπό. Unquestionably this is deliberate, and serves to give prominence and dignity to the series which follows.

Rev. 1:13. It is better to translate, *a Son of man*. The form is due to Daniel 7:13.

Rev. 2:17. On the white stone, see Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, *in loco*.

Rev. 5:10. Interpreters are divided here both as to the proper reading (βασιλεύουσιν or βασιλεύσουσιν) and the time reference intended. Westcott and Hort adopt the present tense, Nestle the future. Perhaps the present holds the edge as being the harder reading (H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, p. 82). Then the question is whether the form is futuristic in its force. Such is the view of R. H. Charles (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, Vol. I, p. 148; *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. XII, p. 409) in distinction from Alford's present, spiritual emphasis.

Rev. 7:14. This generalizing of the Great Tribulation as "the whole sum of the trials of the saints of God" fails to reckon with the prior references to the Great Tribulation in the Old Testament and in the teaching of Jesus. Charles rightly protests against this generalizing tendency among interpreters (*I.C.C. Commentary I*, p. 213).

Rev. 19:6. The aorist may well be ingressive, emphasizing the entering upon a period of reign.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



130 677

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY